




HISTORY OF
GREECE



BY
T. T. TIMAYENIS.








L. A. Price

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

**THE LANGUAGE OF THE
GREEKS - - - - \$1.50**

**ÆSOP'S FABLES, with Vocabulary,
Notes, and References to Goodwin's
and Hadley's Grammars - - - 1.50**

**FOUR BOOKS of XENOPHON'S
ANABASIS, with Vocabulary,
Notes, and References to Goodwin's
and Hadley's Grammars - - - 1.50**

A
HISTORY OF GREECE

From the Earliest Times to the Present.

BY
T. T. TIMAYENIS.

WITH MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

NEW YORK :
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY,
1, 3, AND 5 BOND STREET.

LONDON: 16 LITTLE BRITAIN.

1883.

COPYRIGHT BY
T. T. TIMAYENIS,
1880.

SRLE
URL
DF
214
T48
v.2

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

PART SEVENTH.

THEBAN SUPREMACY.

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I.—RISE OF THEBAN POWER | 1 |
| Character of the Thebans, 1. Epaminondas and Pelopidas, 2. Humiliation of the Spartans—Battle of Tegyra, 6. Congress at Sparta, 10. Battle of Leuktra, 18. | |
| II.—OPERATIONS IN SOUTH AND NORTH-HELLAS | 19 |
| Invasion of the Peloponnesus, 19. Pelopidas in Thessaly, 23. The Tearless Battle, 26. | |
| III.—CULMINATION OF THEBAN POWER | 28 |
| The Persian Rescript, 23. Death of Pelopidas, 30. Battle of Mantinea—Death of Epaminondas, 31. | |
| IV.—RISE OF MACEDONIA | 38 |
| Death of Agesilaus, 38. Decline of the Naval Power of Athens, 40. Anarchy, 41. Second Sacred War, 42. Phillip, King of Macedonia, 45. Demosthenes, 47. End of the Second Sacred War—Growth of Phillip's Power, 54. New Sacred War—Battle of Charoneia, 56. Character of the First Hellenism, 58. | |

PART EIGHTH.

MACEDONIAN HELLENISM.

| | |
|--|----|
| I.—EXTENSION AND REORGANIZATION | 61 |
| Historical Account of Macedonia, 61. Phillip, 64. Reorganization of the Macedonian Army, 69. | |
| II.—THE PHOKIAN AND OLYNTHIAN WARS | 73 |
| Conquests in Thessaly, Thrace, etc., 73. Olynthian War, 77. Athenian Proposals of Peace, 81. End of the Phokian War, 85. | |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| III.—LAST DAYS OF PHILIP | 86 |
| Preparations for the Asiatic Expedition, 86. Assassination of Phillip, 87. Phillip's Position in History, 88. | |
| IV.—ALEXANDER THE GREAT | 91 |
| Consolidation of his Power, 91. Destruction of Thebes, 94. Visit to Corinth and Delphi, 95. Entry into Asia, 96. | |
| V.—BATTLES OF GRANIKUS AND ISSUS, | 97 |
| The Opposing Armies, 97. The Battle at the Granikus, 100. Conquests in Asia Minor, 105. The Gordian Knot, 106. Death of Memnon, 107. Battle of Issus, 108. | |
| VI.—FURTHER VICTORIES OF ALEXANDER | 115 |
| Darius submits Propositions of Peace, 115. Tyre and Gaza, 117. Alexander's Visit to Egypt, 119. Battle of Gaugamela or Arbela, 121. | |
| VII.—ALEXANDER'S PROGRESS TO INDIA | 129 |
| Revolution of King Agis, 129. New Victories and Projects of Alexander, 131. Death of Philotas and Parmenio, 132. Death of Kleitus, 134. Conquests on the Indus, 136. | |
| VIII.—LAST DAYS OF ALEXANDER | 139 |
| The Return from India, 139. Alexander's Innovations—Height of his Power, 140. Death of Alexander, 143. Conclusion, 147. | |

PART NINTH.

THE SUCCESSORS.

| | |
|---|-----|
| I.—REGENCY OF PERDIKAS | 149 |
| Settlement of the Empire, 149. The Lamian War, 155. Death of Demosthenes, 161. | |
| II.—THE STRUGGLE FOR SUPREMACY | 163 |
| Proceedings of Perdikkas, 163. Combination against Eumenes, 165. Death of Perdikkas, 169. | |
| III.—ANTIPATER AND POLYSPERCHON | 170 |
| Affairs in Europe and Asia, 170. Death of Antipater and Demades, 172. Polysperchon—Death of Phokion, 173. | |
| IV.—ANTIOCHUS AND EUMENES | 182 |
| The Struggle for Supremacy, 182. | |
| V.—ANTIGONUS AND HIS SON DEMETRIUS | 190 |
| The War against Antigonus, 190. Condition of Hellas, 193. Athens freed by Demetrius Poliorketes, 195. | |
| VI.—THE EXPLOITS OF DEMETRIUS | 200 |
| Defeat of Ptolemy—Capture of Kyprus, 200. Antigonus in Egypt, 206. Siege of Rhodes, 205. Demetrius in Hellas, 214. Battle of Ipsus—Death of Antigonus, 217. | |
| VII.—LAST DAYS OF ALEXANDER'S GENERALS | 220 |
| Proceedings of Demetrius—Death of Kassander, 220. Death of Demetrius, 224. Death of Ptolemy and Lysimachus, 226. Death of Seleukus, 229. | |

CONTENTS.

v

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| VIII.—THE INVASION OF THE GAULS | 229 |
| Death of Ptolemy Keraunus, 229. Anarchy in Macedonia—Antigonus Gonatas King, 231. | |
| IX.—STATE OF THE HELLENIC WORLD | 233 |
| Expedition of Pyrrhus of Epirus, 233. Hellenism in the West, 236. Hellenism in the East, 237. Macedonia and Hellas, 241. | |
| X.—THE ROMAN CONQUEST | 242 |
| The Æolian and Achæan Leagues, 242. Agis and Kleomenes, Kings of Sparta, 244. Roman Successes, 247. Polybius, 252. Permanence of Hellenic Influence, 253. | |

PART TENTH.

THE ROMAN SUPREMACY.

| | |
|--|-----|
| I.—AFFAIRS IN HELLAS | 258 |
| The Mithridatic War, 258. The Pirates—Krete, 261. The Roman Civil Wars, 262. The Emperors, 265. The Sophists, 267. Trajan, 270. Hadrian, 271. Antoninus Pius—Marcus Aurelius, 273. | |
| II.—BARBARIANS AND CHRISTIANS | 275 |
| Early Decline of the Empire, 275. Hellenism the First Herald of Christianity, 280. | |
| III.—CONSTANTINE THE GREAT | 286 |
| Division of Imperial Power, 286. Conversion of Constantine, 288. Constantine Sole Emperor, 291. Arius, 293. Foundation of Constantinople, 297. The Last Seven Years of the Reign of Constantine, 299. Remarks on the Life of Constantine, 301. | |
| IV.—CONSTANTIUS AND JULIAN | 302 |
| Constantius, 302. Julian the Apostate, 303. The Reign of Julian, 308. | |
| V.—JOVIAN TO THEODOSIUS I. | 311 |
| Peace with the Persians, 311. Basil and Gregory, 312. New Invasions of the Barbarians, 314. Theodosius I, 315. | |
| VI.—ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS | 317 |
| Barbarian Incursions, 317. John Chrysostom, 319. | |
| VII.—THEODOSIUS II | 323 |
| Pulcheria and Eudokia, 323. Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 326. Attila, 327. | |
| VIII.—END OF THE ROMAN RULE | 328 |
| Leo the Thracian, 328. Zeno—Anastasius—Justin I, 329. Justinian I, 330. The Temple of St. Sophia, 339. | |

PART ELEVENTH.

BYZANTINE HELLENISM.

| | |
|--|-----|
| I.—HERAKLIUS | 342 |
| Overthrow of Phokas, 342. Rise of Mohammedanism, 343. Conflict between Islamism and Christianity, 347. | |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| II.—CONSTANTINE IV TO LEO III | 348 |
| Sieve of Constantinople, 348. The Greek Fire, 350. Justinian II, Rhinometus, 352. Leontius—Tiberius Absimarus, 353. Second Period of the Reign of Justinian II, 354. Philippikus—Anastatius II, 356. Leo III, the Isaurian, 357. | |
| III.—LEO III TO LEO V | 359 |
| State of the Eastern Empire, 359. Constantine V, 364. Constantine VI, 364. Nikephorus I, 365. Michael I—Leo V, 366. | |
| IV.—THE DYNASTY OF MICHAEL II | 368 |
| Michael II—Theophilus, 368. The Successors of Theophilus, 370. | |
| V.—THE MACEDONIAN DYNASTY—THE COMNENI | 372 |
| The Reign of Basil I, 372. Leo VI, 373. Alexius I, 374. Robert Guiscard's Invasion, 375. The Crusades, 377. | |
| VI.—THE LATIN AND TURKISH CONQUESTS | 381 |
| The Second Crusade, 381. The Crusaders in Constantinople, 383. Organization of the Latin Empire, 386. Recovery of Constantinople, 388. Fall of Constantinople, 390. | |

PART TWELFTH.

MODERN HELLENISM.

| | |
|--|-----|
| I.—TURKISH RULE | 392 |
| II.—THE GREEK REVOLUTION | 398 |
| General Survey, 398. The Fall of Mesolonghi, 400. Naval Triumphs, 404. | |
| III.—THE KINGDOM OF GREECE | 407 |
| INDEX | 417 |

PART SEVENTH.

THEBAN SUPREMACY.

CHAPTER I.

RISE OF THEBAN POWER.

Character of the Thebans.

WE have already alluded to the character and life of the Bœotians and Thebans. The Thebans were certainly not among the noblest tribes in Hellas. They possessed neither the advantages which the Athenians derived from their matchless intelligence, nor those which the Spartans obtained through their wonderful political and military organization. The very sentiment of Hellenic autonomy was for a long time weak among the Thebans. They had openly united with Xerxes and Mardonius during the invasion of the Persians. But the Thebans were brave soldiers, and possessed souls, if not always noble, yet ever resolute ; bodies, if not prepossessing, yet athletic and well prepared, by exercise and thorough drill from early childhood, for every military duty. The Thebans in the fifth century B. C. repeatedly obtained the honor of having defeated the Athenian hoplites, then in their glory. At Koroneia they showed the Spartans themselves that they were not unworthy opponents. This warlike spirit and dexterity only had need of some powerful motive to accomplish great deeds. The dastardly plot

through which Sparta sought to humble Thebes by the peace of Antalkidas provided this necessity. The violent act of Phœbidas and the tyranny of Leontiades made it more imperative. The indignation which the ruinous policy of Sparta produced at Thebes was exemplified by a few men—first by Ismenias, then by Pelopidas, Mellon, Charon, Gorgias, Theopompus, and others; but it was poured into the veins of all the Thebans, and like some sacred fire kindled and incited them to the contest, and to every sacrifice for the preservation of their restored independence.

Thus may be explained to some extent the sudden prominence of the city of Thebes. The life and government of the Athenians recall to our mind the countries which Nature has made fertile by many and great rivers. The life and constitution of Sparta recall the lands in which art and industry, by an economical use of the few streams running through them, and by the construction of various canals, have succeeded in making fertile even the most arid plains. But the life and constitution of the Thebans were for a long time almost unproductive; until, from a powerful sentiment of liberty and ambition stirring the lowest and apparently insensible depths, there suddenly burst forth a living spring which changed the desert into a garden.

Epaminondas and Pelopidas.

Was the man also a product of that moral revolution, who, by his military genius, his political fitness, and his power of speech, made immortal that period of Hellenic history? Unfortunately, while we can to some extent ascertain the causes of the rise and decline of nations, the growth and power of great men have heretofore remained unexplained. We certainly can not say that the political growth and regeneration of the city of Thebes entirely recreated that man, because only in 371—i. e., seven years after the restoration of independence—does he seem to have held the first rank; yet

on the recovery of freedom, in which he certainly was less engaged than Pelopidas and many other citizens, he was already forty years old, and in the very prime of his bodily and intellectual forces. It can not, therefore, be affirmed that the advancement of the city produced Epaminondas, nor that he caused the growth of the city. Each seems to have grown independently of the other, though they united, and acted the one with the other. Without the growth of Thebes, the genius of Epaminondas would not have received stimulus; and without the genius of Epaminondas, the growth of Thebes would have been limited to the small hegemony of Bœotia.

The family of Epaminondas, son of Polymnis, traced its lineage to the race called Sparti, whose heroic progenitors were said to have sprung from the dragon's teeth sown by Kadmus;* but it was in such reduced circumstances that not even the name of his mother was ever known. Epaminondas was trained from early youth in all the branches of gymnastics and military duty, such as were imposed upon every Theban citizen. In this respect he had need of no better school than that of his own country, because bodily exercise received great attention at Thebes. But he was also distinguished by the diligent care he took of his intellectual education. He eagerly sought the society of philosophers within his reach, among whom were the Theban Simmias and the Tarentine Spintharus, both of them once companions of Sokrates; so that Epaminondas may be regarded in some measure as the pupil of that great Athenian. As the relations between Athens and Thebes, ever since the close of the Peloponnesian war, had become more and more friendly, we may reasonably presume, with Grote, that he profited by teachers of the latter city as well as of the former. But we are told that the man to whom he especially devoted himself, and whom he not only revered as a pupil, but tended

* Pausanias.

almost as a son toward the close of his long life, was a Tarentine exile named Lysis, a member of the Pythagorean brotherhood. With him and many other such men did Epaminondas associate for several years, and engage in all the branches of study and research. But, while possessed of so lofty a genius, and so much addicted to the improvement of the mind, he was at the same time modest and wholly devoid of a boasting spirit. This is especially to be admired, since the Hellenes were noted for their self-love and self-sufficiency. He was indifferent to money, and remained poor throughout his life, leaving not even the means necessary for his burial; while strangers often submitted to him propositions of bribery, and friends offered to relieve his pressing needs. He was distinguished for the mildness of his political sentiments, his repugnance to harsh treatment of conquered enemies, and his refusal to mingle in intestine bloodshed. These virtues are especially worthy of admiration, since they were rare among the Hellenes. If there were men whose conduct justified the severest punishment, they were Leontiades and the traitors with him. They not only opened the gates of the Kadmeia to the Spartans, but also killed Ismenias. Epaminondas, however, disapproved of the scheme of Pelopidas and the other exiles to assassinate them, partly on prudential grounds, but in part from conscientious scruples.*

Epaminondas does not appear in the career of political action before 371 B. C. Let it not be supposed, however, that he had remained idle in the interim. He took an active part in the success of the daring plan, and provided also the means for the defense of Thebes. He was among the first to urge the Thebans to intrench and fence off the fertile plain on the north of the city, from which they derived their principal means of sustenance. At the same time he organized with Pelopidas the famous sacred *lochos* or band, composed

* Plutarch.

of three hundred picked men, bound together by the closest ties of friendship and devoted to each other to the death. This lochos was maintained at the public expense, was constantly drilled, and, being actuated by the noblest sentiments, proved one of the principal supports of the power of Thebes. It filled Hellas with the fame of its achievements, and fell only on that fatal day when the autonomy of Hellas disappeared.

Thus Epaminondas was in the service of his country from the very beginning of its freedom, although during the first seven years Pelopidas held a higher rank than he. It was Pelopidas who first conquered the Spartans, and first restored the hegemony of the Thebans over Bœotia. He was unlike Epaminondas both in his circumstances and habits of life. He was younger than the latter, rich, and a happy father of a family, while Epaminondas was never married. He delighted more in bodily exercises, and amused himself in the wrestling-ring or in hunting, while Epaminondas spent his hours of leisure in philosophical researches. But they were united by the strictest and most inviolable friendship, which remained constant to the last, in all the high posts which they held, both military and civil. This was a rare instance indeed of such union between two leaders and fellow aspirants in ancient Hellas. In fact, the names of these two men are usually mentioned in history side by side. One of the greatest historians of antiquity, the Peloponnesian Polybius, who flourished during the second century B. C., said that the supremacy of the Thebans was formed, flourished, and declined with the lives of Epaminondas and Pelopidas.* But this parallel between the virtues and achievements of Pelopidas and Epaminondas is true only in part. Pelopidas was the best of the Thebans—Epaminondas, the best of the Greeks. Pelopidas began the work

* Καὶ γὰρ συνηξήθη καὶ συνήκμασε καὶ συγκατελύθη τὰ Θηβαίων ἔργα τῷ τοῦ Ἐπαμεινώνδου καὶ τοῦ Πελοπίδου βίῳ προφανῶς,

of the freedom and supremacy of the Thebans, but to Epaminondas are due its completion and the Panhellenic achievements of Thebes. After the death of Pelopidas the city continued to grow under Epaminondas; but after the death of the latter it fell as if by magic. In a word, if the daring of Pelopidas and his devotion to his country were in every point similar to those same virtues in Epaminondas, yet the victor of Leuktra and Mantinea, and he who gloriously advocated in the national congress the rights of his own country, the restorer of Messenia, the founder of Megalopolis, proved himself without doubt greater than his great and noble friend.

Humiliation of the Spartans—Battle of Tegyra.

After the return of Kleombrotus from Bœotia, the Spartans persuaded Agesilaus himself to undertake the war against the Thebans. This veteran warrior repeatedly invaded Bœotia during 378 and 377, but accomplished nothing of importance. The Thebans, assisted by the Athenians, manfully met all the attacks, and in fact began to extend their operations to other Bœotian cities. While Agesilaus was returning from Bœotia in 377 he ruptured a blood-vessel, and his one healthy limb was also injured, rendering him for a long time unfit for service; and the command again passed to Kleombrotus. The latter marched in 376 against Bœotia, but was unable even to cross the Kithæron, which was already occupied by a force of Athenians and Thebans, and turned back without effecting his purpose.

The Spartans, who were daily losing their prestige and becoming humbled, resolved to try their fortunes at sea, hoping to detach the Athenians from the alliance of the Thebans. But their admiral Pollis, in command of sixty triremes, was totally defeated near Naxos in September, 376, by the Athenian Chabrias with eighty triremes. The Athenians, availing themselves of the victory, began to extend

their naval sway, and their influence was felt as far as the Ionian Sea.

In like manner did the Thebans continue to prosper. No new invasion of Bœotia was made by the Lacedæmonians during 376 and 375. In the former year Kleombrotus was unable to cross the Kithæron, and in 375 the attention of Sparta was directed to the movements of the Athenian Timotheus on the Ionian Sea. Hence the Thebans daily gained strength in Bœotia. They had frequent skirmishes with the Lacedæmonian garrisons there, which gave them considerable drill and improvement. "For their spirits," says Plutarch, "were raised, their bodies were inured to labor, and, by being used to these encounters, they gained both experience and courage." The most noted of these combats was the battle of Tegyra, in which the Thebans, led by Pelopidas, achieved a splendid victory, which served as a sort of prelude to that of Leuktra.

Pelopidas, learning that the Lacedæmonian harmost, with two divisions from the garrison at Orchomenus, had gone on an incursion into the Lokrian territory, made a dash from Thebes with the Sacred Band and a small party of horse to surprise the place. On approaching Orchomenus, he was informed that there were other Spartan troops in the town, and that no surprise could be effected. He therefore retraced his steps, but on reaching Tegyra met the Lacedæmonian polemarchs, Gorgoleon and Theopompus, who were returning from the Lokrian foray. The Lacedæmonian force was twice as numerous as that of Pelopidas, and the polemarchs accordingly welcomed this encounter. The Thebans were at first much dispirited, and one of them ran and told Pelopidas, "We are fallen into the enemy's hands." "And why not they," said he, "into ours?" But it was only after repeated exhortations from their leader that they finally regained their courage. A severe battle ensued, which proved how unconquerable was the united strength

and courage of the Sacred Band. The shock began on the spot where the generals fought in person, and raged there furiously. The Spartan commanders, who attacked Pelopidas, were among the first that were slain, while all that were near them were either killed or put to flight. This so terrified the whole army that they opened a lane for the Thebans, through which, if they had pleased, they might have passed safely and continued their route. But Pelopidas, disdainful to retreat, charged those who yet stood their ground, and made such havoc among them that they fled in great confusion. The neighborhood of Orchomenus forbade any long pursuit, so that Pelopidas could only erect his trophy and strip the dead before returning to Thebes.*

This battle, in which the Lacedæmonians were for the first time routed in fair field by numbers inferior to their own, produced a marked sensation throughout Hellas, and raised the hopes and strengthened the energies of the Thebans. About 374 B. C. the latter controlled all the cities throughout Bœotia except Orchomenus, with its dependency Chæroneia. This battle first taught the Hellenes that it was not the Eurotas which alone produced brave warriors, but that wherever the youth are ashamed of what is base, are resolute in a good cause, and more inclined to avoid disgrace than danger, these are the men who are terrible to their enemies.†

At the same time the Thebans began to retaliate upon their neighbors the Phokians, who were not only the allies of Sparta, but also their auxiliaries in the recent attacks on Thebes. They were, however, compelled to withdraw, since Kleombrotus was sent across the gulf to their aid, with four Lacedæmonian divisions of troops and an auxiliary body of allies.

Athens now became jealous of the growing influence and prosperity of Thebes, and hastened to send envoys to Sparta to propose terms of peace. What these terms were

* Plutarch.

† Ibid.

we are not told, but Sparta accepted them at once. Fortunately for the Thebans, this peace did not last long. Timotheus, who had been dispatched with a powerful fleet to circumnavigate the Peloponnesus, alarm the coast of Laconia, and acquire new allies in the west, was now ordered home. On his return he landed at Zakynthus, which had remained faithful to the Lacedæmonians, certain Zakynthian exiles who had served with him during his voyage. The Zakynthian government lodged complaints at Sparta, which demanded redress of Athens. This was refused, wherefore the peace was at once broken off, and war again declared. In 373 a Lacedæmonian squadron besieged Korkyra, which Timotheus had prevailed upon during his *periplus* to declare itself for Athens. The Korkyræans, assisted by the Athenians, compelled the Lacedæmonians to decamp in such haste that much corn and wine, many slaves, and even the sick and wounded soldiers, were left behind. The Athenians afterward sent out another powerful fleet under Iphikrates, and so they fairly ruled the Ionian Sea.

Thus in 372 B. C. the Spartans were humbled on all sides. Their despondency was heightened by the terrible earthquakes and rains which during that year occurred in the Peloponnesus, and which they regarded as tokens of the wrath of the god Poseidon. These formidable visitations were more disastrous than any that ever before or since occurred in the Peloponnesus. Two towns, Helike and Bura, were destroyed, together with a large portion of their population. Ten Lacedæmonian triremes, which happened to be moored on this shore, were sunk with their crews by the tremendous rush of the waters. The Lacedæmonians again, as fifteen years before, sent Antalkidas to Persia, to solicit money and seek once more the interference of the great king in Hellenic affairs. But the king simply recommended to all the cessation of hostilities, on the basis of the peace of Antalkidas. Hence Sparta was little assisted by her ancient

ally, and would have come to still greater stress had not the Athenians again decided to make peace.

Congress at Sparta.

The reasons for abandoning the alliance of the Thebans which existed three years previously had daily become stronger. The fear which caused the union of the Athenians with the Thebans in 378, to fight against the Lacedæmonians, had entirely disappeared. The Athenians, having established their new naval dominion, had no longer ground on which to continue the war, since their supremacy was in no danger whatever from the Lacedæmonians. The war was only prolonged for the sake of the Thebans; and the Athenians justly deemed it unwise to sacrifice their resources, not for the sake of the autonomy of Thebes, but merely to secure their rule throughout Bœotia, which they ever regarded as dangerous to their own interests. It was accordingly voted by the Athenians, and by the majority of her allies, to send to Sparta for peace, where it was well known that similar dispositions prevailed. Notice of this intention was given to the Thebans, who were also invited to unite in sending ambassadors thither if they wished. In the spring of 371 B. C., at the time when the allies of Sparta were assembled in that city, there came also the ambassadors of the Athenians, as well as those of the Thebans and of the various cities which composed the new hegemony of the Athenians. Kallias and Autokles, the most prominent of the Athenian ambassadors, both belonged to the best families of the city. They were accompanied by Kallistratus the orator. Epaminondas, then one of the Bœotarchs, was the only prominent delegate from Thebes.

Of the debates which took place during this memorable assembly of the Hellenic nation we have very imperfect knowledge. Xenophon only alludes to the speeches of each of the three Athenians. Kallias spoke as a friend of Sparta,

and his speech is eminently philo-Laconian in spirit. Autokles, on the contrary, bitterly censured the conduct of the Lacedæmonians. Kallistratus, who spoke after the other two, kept a middle course, acknowledged the mistakes of both, and concluded that the war was damaging to the best interests of all, and that the general welfare demanded peace on both sides. "Sparta," said he, "now commands on the land, and the Athenians rule on the sea; they must be content with this distribution of power, and not continue wrangling, and resembling those foolish dice-players who, if they win, risk double stakes."

The words of the orator were at least conscientious, but they did not please the remaining cities, which saw themselves surrendered to the discretion of Sparta and Athens. Hence the orator added that peace should be made on the basis of the freedom of all the Hellenic cities. But this principle did not meet the views of the others respecting the supremacy of Sparta on the land and that of the Athenians on the sea. It was evident that a peace concluded on such terms would at once produce new causes of discontent. Indeed, such was the result. The Lacedæmonians accepted the proposals of the Athenians "to take away their governors from the cities, disband their armies, both those on sea and land, and leave the cities free. If any city should violate these conditions, all were at liberty to take arms for the support of the injured party; but no one who did not feel disposed was bound to take arms."

When the hour came for the stipulated conditions to be voted upon, the absurdity of the terms became apparent. The Athenians restricted themselves to taking oath only for their own state, and their allied cities also swore each independently. The Lacedæmonians vouched both for themselves and their allies. Now, according to the truce, the cities were autonomous, and the first principle of independence is the right of concluding peace and declaring war.

Thus the Lacedæmonians, by vouching not only for themselves, but also on behalf of the allies, interfered with one of the most precious rights of complete liberty.

When, therefore, the turn of the Thebans came, Epaminondas insisted on his privilege of taking the oath, not for Thebes separately, but for Thebes as president of the Bœotian federation, which included all the Bœotian cities. The ephors, and above all Agesilaus, opposed this measure vehemently, and demanded that Epaminondas should swear for Thebes alone, and each Bœotian city separately for itself. Thus matters became much complicated. Epaminondas daringly opposed the dictatorial conduct of Sparta, while most of the other ambassadors, frightened by her supremacy, lowered their heads before the haughty Agesilaus. Epaminondas declared that only the unjust claims of the Lacedæmonians prolonged the war, and that a lasting peace could not be concluded unless they should agree to lay aside these claims. He alone preserved a proper dignity and freedom both in his manner and his propositions. His speech was in favor, not only of the Thebans, but of Hellas in general. He showed that war tended to aggrandize Sparta at the expense of the other states, and insisted that the peace should be founded upon justice and equality.* “The Thebans,” said he, “are ready to answer only for themselves, leaving the other Bœotian cities each to vouch for itself, but only when Sparta swears for herself alone, leaving not only the allies, but the cities of Laconia itself, to vouch each in its own name.”

The representatives were terrified at this daring proposition. But Sparta presided over this congress, and Agesilaus over Sparta; and the bare idea of the equality of the Thebans with the chief city of Hellas made that ruler almost beside himself. Springing up in anger and interrupting further discussion, which he considered insulting to Sparta,

* Plutarch.

he said to Epaminondas, "Speak plainly. Will you, or will you not, leave to each of the Bœotian cities its separate autonomy?" To which the other replied, "Will *you* leave each of the Laconian towns autonomous?" Without another word Agesilaus caused the names of the Thebans to be struck from the roll, and declared war against them upon the spot.

Such was the result of that memorable congress of the Hellenic nation which took place during June of 371 B. C. Sparta thought that Thebes, as formerly, would succumb to her will without battle, or, in case of battle, that she could easily be crushed. But before the lapse of a year—nay, even before a full month from the dissolution of the synod—that haughty city was destined to see how illusive indeed were her hopes. The Athenians hastened to recall Iphikrates from the Ionian Sea, but took no part for the present in the struggle between the Spartans and the Thebans. The Lacedæmonians also recalled their governors and garrisons from the cities which they held, and turned their attention principally to the speedy overthrow of the Thebans. A peremptory order was dispatched to Kleombrotus, who was at the head of an army of Lacedæmonians and allies in Phokis, on the northwestern frontier of Bœotia, to march at once against the Thebans and compel them to abandon their supremacy over the rest of the Bœotian cities.

Battle of Leuktra.

Epaminondas on his return to Thebes found cordial sympathy with the resolute bearing which he had adopted before the congress. The Thebans felt the greatness of the danger, but they hoped that the enemy might be prevented from penetrating from Phokis into Bœotia; and to this end they occupied with a strong body, under Epaminondas, the narrow pass near Koroneia, lying between a spur of Mount

Helikon on one side and Lake Kopais on the other.* But King Kleombrotus, instead of forcing the passage, which was the regular road from Phokis into Bœotia, turned southward by a mountainous road deemed hardly passable, easily overpowered the Theban division which guarded it, and crossed the ridge of Helikon to the Bœotian port of Kreusis on the Krissæan Gulf. There he captured twelve triremes, left a garrison to occupy the port, and marched without delay over the mountainous ground into the territory of Thespiæ on the eastern declivity of Helikon, where he encamped on an eminence, near the ever-memorable village of Leuktra.

This strategic and daring entrance into Bœotia filled the Lacedæmonians with joy and confidence, while the Thebans were disheartened and terrified. It required all the ability and daring of Epaminondas and Pelopidas to revive the courage of their countrymen. The Hellenes were wont on such occasions to deem every physical or accidental occurrence an evil omen, and these presentiments Epaminondas especially sought to overcome. It is said that he then uttered the famous Homeric adage, "Our best omen is to fight for our country." He finally prevailed upon the Thebans to march to Leuktra, where he encamped on a hill opposite the Spartan camp. Here arose new doubts as to whether they ought to fight on the open field, or to shut themselves up in Thebes for a siege, and send their wives and families away to Athens. But the opinion of Epaminondas again prevailed for a battle "on equal terms," and at the same time propitious omens came which somewhat encouraged the Thebans.

While others confided to omens and superhuman assistance, Epaminondas, to whom had been intrusted the command of the coming battle, took care that no human precautions should be wanting. The work was difficult, and, if we

* This pass was occupied by the modern Hellenes in 1829, and there was fought the last battle of the War of Independence, in which the Turks were completely defeated with severe loss.

accept the testimony of late writers, the army of Kleombrotus was nearly double that of the Thebans, while some of the Bœotians present were untrustworthy, and not a few were without experience.

It was on this occasion that the great military genius of Epaminondas shone in all its brilliancy. Up to this time Hellenic armies had been drawn up in parallel lines; hence the more numerous and the best armed and drilled were necessarily always victorious. If the Thebans had thus met the Lacedæmonians, since the latter were far more numerous and better drilled, no matter how bravely the Thebans might have fought, they must finally have succumbed. Epaminondas thought that, in order to gain the victory, it was not necessary to conquer the enemy throughout his whole line, from one wing to the other. If, by massing upon the center a greater force than that of his opponents at that point, he should break this line, the two wings of the enemy, separated from each other, would be easily overpowered. Likewise, if he could concentrate in superior numbers upon one of the wings, and put the enemy there to flight, he might reach the rear of the center and of the other wing. This plan, which, like every other great measure, seems very simple, Epaminondas conceived on that memorable day, and hastened to execute. Knowing that Kleombrotus, with the Spartans and all the officials, would be on the right of their line, he placed on his own left wing Theban hoplites, with a depth of fifty shields, with Pelopidas and the Sacred Band in front. This arrangement of Epaminondas was afterward largely adopted by military leaders, and by its successful application some of the greatest battles of the world have been gained by such generals as Frederick of Prussia and Napoleon.

Epaminondas, having drawn up his left wing in very deep order for desperate attack, and having posted his cavalry in front of his line, marched down the declivity to the

plain below. Kleombrotus did not realize the importance of this strategy. Trusting to his numbers and to the eagerness of his men, he hastened to the plain with the army marshaled in the old way—i. e., having the center and the two wings on an even line and of equal strength, with a depth of twelve shields. Kleombrotus also stationed all the cavalry before his army. As soon as the battle was begun by the encounter of the cavalry, the result was as Epaminondas had presaged. The Thebans routed the Lacedæmonian cavalry and drove it back upon the infantry, whose ranks were thus thrown into confusion. Kleombrotus, in order to reconstruct the order of battle, at once ordered the infantry to advance, himself personally leading the right. Now, while the victorious cavalry kept back the center and left wing of the enemy, Epaminondas and Pelopidas assailed with great fury Kleombrotus and his right wing. The onset was terrific; and, although the warriors of Sparta fought bravely and well, it was impossible long to hold out against the thick body that fell like a thunderbolt on them. In this desperate encounter Kleombrotus himself fell, and around him lay the most eminent members of the Spartan official staff—Deimon the polemarch, Sphodrias with his son Kleonymus, and several others. After an obstinate resistance and a slaughter such as had never been known before,* the right wing of the Spartans was completely beaten, and driven back to their camp on the higher ground. The center and left wings did not dare to await the assault, and also hastened to seek safety in their encampment, whither the victorious Thebans did not attempt to follow them.

Of the seven hundred Spartans who an hour or two before left their camp, only three hundred returned, while more than a thousand Lacedæmonians lay on the field of battle, together with King Kleombrotus. The allies, who for the most part had marched unwillingly, openly rejoiced

* Plutarch.

at the misfortune. A few of the Spartans pressed for a renewal of battle, but this, after due deliberation, was declared impracticable. The surviving polemarchs sent a herald to solicit the regular truce for burial of their dead. This the Thebans granted, after erecting their trophy and stripping the dead of their arms, the most precious of which Pausanias, five hundred years afterward, saw preserved at Thebes. What the Theban loss was, Xenophon does not tell us. More recent writers say forty-seven, others three hundred. The first number is preposterously small, and even the latter is not any too large, remembering that a victory in close fight, with soldiers like the Spartans (who on this occasion of all others fought with desperate valor), must have been dearly purchased.

This defeat astounded all Hellas. Only a little while before Sparta had haughtily presided over the national congress, and her king had deliberately excluded the Thebans from peace. Many had rejoiced over the brave resistance of the Theban general, but feared the vengeance of all-powerful Sparta. Twenty days had hardly elapsed when it was suddenly reported that the Lacedæmonians had been utterly vanquished in the open field by the Thebans, with a vastly inferior force. But their defeat on the battle-field was not their only misfortune. In their city also appeared signs of the disruption of their ancient national spirit. Formerly the Spartan mothers and wives heard with a superhuman fortitude of the death of their children and husbands; while at Athens, when the great defeat of *Ægospotami* was announced, not a man slept on that night, but passed the hours in grieving not only for the slain, but more for their own fate; so that the wailing and cries of woe, beginning in the *Peiræus*, were transmitted by the guards stationed on the long walls up to the city.* Even on the destruction of the Lacedæmonian battalion at Corinth, the relatives of the

* Xenophon.

fallen heard with joy and pleasure of the death of sons, fathers, and brothers. The ephors now tried to arouse the pristine Spartan fortitude, by urging the women not to raise any cry, but silently to bear the misfortune. They were even forced to issue a *general order* to endure their woe in silence.

The ephors hastened to send at once Archidamus, son of Agesilaus, who was still disabled, with all the available force of Sparta, to the aid of the army at Leuktra. The Thebans now endeavored to obtain reënforcements from without, before following up their recent victory. We are told that they sent to Athens a herald crowned with wreaths proclaiming their triumph, and asking the Athenians to join hands with them in taking full revenge upon Sparta. But the Athenians did not witness with pleasure the laurels of their neighbors, and dismissed the herald without even a word of courtesy. The Thebans next applied to Jason of Pheræ, who shortly before had subdued all the cities in Thessaly, had been proclaimed tagos, and had established one of the greatest powers mentioned in ancient Hellenic history. Jason hastened to their aid, but strongly advised them to permit the departure of the enemy under capitulation, and not to attack them within their fortified camp. A truce was agreed upon, assuring to the Lacedæmonians the liberty of quitting Bœotia. On reaching Ægosthena, the retreating army met Archidamus, who, deeming the purpose of his march completed, advanced no farther. The armament was disbanded, and the Lacedæmonians and their allies returned home.*

* Xenophon.

CHAPTER II.

OPERATIONS IN SOUTH AND NORTH HELLAS.

Invasion of the Peloponnesus.

THE return of the Spartans showed again how much the ancient spirit of the city had degenerated. It has already been stated that the Spartan who survived a defeat lost all the rights of a citizen, and was always an object of contempt. But now, on the proposition of Agesilaus, it was decided that "the laws must be allowed to sleep to-day." In other words, the defeated Spartans were freed from blame, because the number of the citizens was so much lessened, that any new diminution by act of the city itself was deemed dangerous. Aristotle well said that the city was lost through lack of population.*

Epaminondas now took care to secure the supremacy of the Thebans in Bœotia, by compelling the Orchomenians to recognize it. He also expelled the Thespians (because, shortly before the battle at Leuktra, they had sought to abandon the camp of the Thebans), and extended the power of his country over the nations around, by subduing the Phokians, Eubœans, Lokrians (both Epiknemidian and Opuntian), Akarnanians, Melians, and Herakleans. Hence, except during the autumn of 370, he was not able to give his attention to the events which in the mean while had taken place in the Peloponnesus.

Following immediately upon the defeat at Leuktra, a great revolution had broken out against Sparta in the Peloponnesus. Her harmosts disappeared from all the cities, and returned home. Nowhere did the movement become stronger than in Arkadia, the inhabitants of which, seeing their

* Ἡ πόλις ἀπώλετο διὰ τὴν ὀλιγανθρωπίαν.

ancient masters defeated, hastened to free themselves from their tyranny. The Mantineians first of all secured their city, which had been tyrannically overthrown fifteen years previously by the Spartans, by fortifying it with safer walls and towers. It was furthermore resolved to establish a Panarkadian federation, composed in certain proportions of all the sections now autonomous, and invested with absolute power of determining action by the vote of its majority. This "commune Arcadum" found favor in most parts of Arkadia. Tegea itself, the ever-faithful ally of the Lacedæmonians, now cordially united with Mantinea, and only Orchomenus and Heræa (on the west of Arkadia, bordering on Elis) stood aloof.

The Arkadians, feeling the necessity of some external protector against Sparta, solicited the assistance of Athens. Being met with a refusal there, they applied to Epaminondas. He eagerly promised his assistance, and invaded the Peloponnesus with the Thebans and their allies, with whom the Argeians, Arkadians, and Eleians united, swelling his army to about forty thousand men. The Thebans aroused the admiration of all by their warlike appearance, by their exploit at Leuktra, and by their determination to accomplish still greater achievements.

But the greatest advantage of this army was its leader, who, having shown himself a powerful orator and a most excellent general, was now about to give signal evidence of his statesmanship. Epaminondas entered the Peloponnesus, not merely to assist the Arkadians, but to execute the great plan which he had conceived immediately after the victory at Leuktra. This plan was not to destroy or simply overcome the city of Sparta, but to abolish entirely her supremacy in Hellas, limit her to Laconia, restore autonomy to the Messenians, and reorganize both the Messenians and Arkadians, so as to surround that haughty city with two strong bulwarks. To accomplish this, he did not deem it impera-

tive to invade Laconia. But finally, though it was winter, he yielded to the impatience of all around him to revenge upon Sparta her long career of pride and abused ascendancy, and gave the order of invasion.* Slowly and cautiously he entered Laconia, always keeping his Theban troops in the best battle order, and approached almost to the very gates of Sparta.

Great was the confusion which prevailed in that city. Full six hundred years had elapsed since the first establishment of the Dorians in Lacedæmon, and this was the first time in all that long period that they had seen an enemy in their territory. The armies of Sparta had often penetrated into Attica, Bœotia, and indeed every part of Hellas ; but up to that period no one had ever dared to return their visits. Now the confederates advanced without resistance, laying waste with fire and sword, as far as the Eurotas and the very suburbs of Sparta ! It is difficult to depict the tumult and disorder within the city—the outcries of the old men, who moved back and forth expressing their grief and indignation, and the wild behavior of the women, who were terrified even to madness at the shouts of the enemy and the flames which ascended around them. It was the boast of the city that “no Spartan woman ever saw the smoke of an enemy’s camp.” In like manner, when an Athenian disputed with a Spartan on the subject of valor, and said, “We have often driven you from the banks of the Kephisus,” the Spartan replied, “But we never drove you from the banks of the Eurotas.” Near akin to this was the repartee of a Spartan to a man of Argos, who said, “Many of you sleep on the plains of Argos.” The Spartan answered, “But not one of you sleeps on the plains of Lacedæmon.” †

Now, however, a numerous army of implacable enemies suddenly appeared at the very gates of the city, overturning prehistoric claims and casting down the pride of that haugh-

* Xenophon.

† Plutarch.

ty people. Not only did the sentiment of humiliation oppress the Lacedæmonians, but the danger was in itself great. Their allies, with the exception of a few Orchomenians and Phliasians, had abandoned them. Many of the Helots, and of the dissatisfied Spartans known under the ordinary name of the Inferiors (to whom Kinadon had belonged), joined the ranks of the enemy. We may therefore understand the feeling of wounded pride, misfortune, and danger with which that city was now agitated, as the enemy steadily approached. But there was one man who felt more strongly than any one else that strange reverse of fortune. Is it necessary to say that that man was King Agesilaus, who twenty years before managed the Hellenic affairs in Asia Minor, and began the conquest of Persia, and was now compelled to provide for the safety of his own city?

Epaminondas, however, did not attempt to take the city by storm. Satisfied with having defied the Spartans and "manifested his mastery of the field even to their own doors," he turned to the south and reached the Arkadian frontier. It now remained for him to complete the humiliation of Sparta by executing the two enterprises which had formed the special purpose of his expedition—the reestablishment of Messenia and the consolidation of the Arkadians. Accordingly, he strengthened the Arkadian knot by founding the "Great City" (Megalopolis), which he fortified and made the metropolis of the Arkadians. He proclaimed the independence of all the Helots and of the Pericæki of Messenia, called thither all the Messenian exiles, who for centuries had wandered hither and thither in Hellas, and secured the autonomy of that unfortunate land by founding another new city, Messene. Upon the summit of Mount Ithome (twenty-five hundred feet above the level of the sea) the acropolis of the new town was built, with which the town itself, situated lower down on the slope, was connected by a continuous wall.

Having deprived Sparta of all her western land, the best of the Spartan territory, and the inaccessible mountainous regions of Arkadia, and having marched to the very gates of the city, Epaminondas departed from Arkadia to return to Thebes.

Meanwhile the Athenians, yielding to the entreaties of the Lacedæmonians, and being themselves profoundly affected by these proceedings of Epaminondas in the Peloponnesus, decided to humiliate, if possible, the daily increasing power of the Thebans. They accordingly sent Iphikrates to Corinth, with a large number of hoplites, to oppose the Thebans on their march. But Iphikrates, who had performed so many brilliant deeds with his peltasts, was now able to accomplish nothing of importance; and Epaminondas, almost without battle, crossed the isthmus and returned victorious to Thebes.

Pelopidas in Thessaly.

Such was the complete change of affairs which had occurred in the Peloponnesus within the space of eighteen months, from June, 371 B. C., when the Thebans were insultingly driven from the national congress by Sparta, to the spring of 369, when the Thebans advanced to the very gates of Sparta and triumphantly returned home. But outside of the Peloponnesus serious changes had also taken place. It has been stated that Thebes, even before Epaminondas invaded the Peloponnesus, had occupied most of the countries as far as Thessaly. The kingdom of Jason, which, through his ambition, energy, and great force of character, could have become dangerous to the Thebans, did not last long. Jason was murdered in 370 B. C., while in the fullness of his vigor. His two brothers, Polyphron and Polydorus, succeeded to his position of tagos, but not to his greatness. Polyphron murdered his brother, and enjoyed power for a short time; but he was in turn assassinated by a third brother, Alex-

ander of Pheræ. The latter, to make his hold on the throne secure, committed enormous atrocities, killing and banishing many of the most eminent citizens of Larissa and Pharsalus. The Larissæan exiles, many of whom belonged to the great family of the Aleuadaæ, escaped to Macedonia, where Amyntas II, who died in 370 B. C., had been succeeded on the throne by his youthful son Alexander. The latter, having invaded Thessaly at the instigation of the fugitives, occupied Larissa and Krannon.

The Thessalian cities at the same time invited not merely the assistance of Alexander of Macedonia, but also of the Thebans, against the tyrant Alexander of Pheræ. Accordingly, Pelopidas in 369 invaded Thessaly, subdued the greater part of that country, limited to a few cities the tyranny of Alexander of Pheræ, and banished the Macedonian Alexander, who, surrounded by enemies, found enough difficulty in maintaining his own dominion at home, without investing Thessalian towns. After a reign of scarcely two years, he was assassinated (368 B. C.), and new civil wars broke out in Macedonia. Eurydike, the widow of Amyntas, was now left with her two younger children—Perdikkas, a young man, and Philip, yet a youth. Deserted by many of her most powerful friends, she sought the protection of Iphikrates, who, after his return from Corinth, was sent by the Athenians to the coasts of Macedonia and Thrace to strengthen and increase their naval resources. Eurydike reminded Iphikrates that Amyntas was in life not only a faithful ally of the Athenians, but had also adopted him (Iphikrates) as his son, and had thus constituted him brother to the two young princes. Placing the elder, Perdikkas, in his hands, and causing Philip, who was then about fourteen years old, to embrace his knees, she implored the aid of the Athenian as the only chance of personal safety to the family. Deeply moved by this affecting supplication, Iphikrates declared in her favor, suppressed Pausanias, her principal op-

ponent, and surrendered the scepter to the house of Amyntas, under Ptolemy of Alorus as regent for the time.*

Who then could have told the Athenians that with their own hands they were establishing the kingdom of the man who, after the lapse of thirty years, should gain the victory of Chæroneia? But during those years the Athenians naturally suspected no danger from Macedonia, but believed that the fate of Hellas depended upon their relations with Sparta and Thebes.

Since their neighbors the Thebans had grown strong beyond their own boundaries, the Athenians preferred the alliance of Sparta; and accordingly these two states entered into a permanent league, by the terms of which the command both on land and sea should alternate between Athens and Sparta for periods of five days.† They occupied Corinth and Mount Oneium, so as to prevent the Thebans from again penetrating into the Peloponnesus. But these measures did not prevent Epaminondas from repeatedly invading that region during 368 and 367 B. C. He again demonstrated not only his military but also his political virtues. It was the general practice of the Thebans to kill all the Bœotian exiles who fell into their hands as prisoners; but at the capture of a village named Phœbias in the Sikyonian territory, Epaminondas took captive a considerable body of exiles, whom he allowed to depart under ransom. Again, when in 367 he made the Achæans submissive to the Thebans, he agreed to accept them as his allies, without requiring either the establishment of democratical forms in place of the oligarchical, or the banishment of the existing rulers. He was satisfied with their promise that they would faithfully carry out their obligations to the Thebans.

The Thebans were also prosperous in the north of Hellas. In 368 Pelopidas again invaded Thessaly, and still further limited the rule of Alexander of Pheræ. He next advanced

* Xenophon.

† Ibid.

into Macedonia, and compelled Ptolemy to abandon his alliance with the Athenians and join the Thebans, and to give him thirty hostages from the most distinguished families in Macedonia, as a guarantee for his faithful adherence. Among these was the youthful Philip, son of Amyntas, who remained in this character at Thebes for some years, under the care of Pammenes.

The Tearless Battle.

During these years, therefore, Thebes was the ruling city in Hellas. Macedonia, Thessaly, most of the countries between Thermopylæ and the isthmus, and much of the Peloponnesus, obeyed her. But her supremacy was not destined to become more enduring than that of the Athenians or Spartans. Already in 368 the spirit of the Arkadians had been so raised by the formation of the new Panarkadian communion, that, forgetting that they mainly owed their independence to the Thebans, they claimed to divide the leadership with Thebes, as Athens divided it with Sparta. But they were severely punished for their presumption.

About the end of 368 Archidamus implored his soldiers, in an emphatic and pathetic appeal, to rescue the great name of Sparta from the disgrace into which it had fallen, and, availing himself of the absence of Epaminondas from the Peloponnesus, invaded Arkadia, and attacked an army of Arkadians and Argeians near Megalopolis with such fierceness that they fled with scarcely any resistance. The pursuit was a murderous one, especially by the Gallic mercenaries whom the tyrant Dionysius had sent to the assistance of the Spartans. Ten thousand men were slain, without the loss of a single Lacedæmonian.* The Spartans called it "the tearless battle," and so great was the emotion produced by this victory, that all the Spartans who heard the report burst into

* Diodorus.

tears—Agesilaus, the senators, and the ephors setting the example. Multitudes flocked to the river, stretching out their hands and blessing the gods, as if Sparta had washed off her late unworthy stains, and had seen her glory stream out afresh.* A striking proof, as Grote remarks, how humbled and disaccustomed to the idea of victory their minds had recently become!—a striking proof also, when we compare it with the inflexible self-control which marked their reception of the disastrous tidings from Leuktra, how much more irresistible is unexpected joy than unexpected grief, in working on these minds of iron temper! The Arkadians became extremely prudent and cautious after this unprecedented defeat, and recognized the fact that they were not independent of Theban aid.

But even at Thebes there existed, as it appears, a party opposed to Epaminondas. During his first campaign in the Peloponnesus it became necessary for him to extend his office of commander four months beyond the legal expiration of the term. On his return he was “capitally tried,” † but, having eloquently defended himself, he was freed from all blame. In 367 he was again accused, this time by the Arkadians, for his mild course toward the Achæans. The opposite faction now prevailed, and not only reversed the policy of Epaminondas in Achaia, but also refused to reëlect him as Bœotarch during the ensuing year. The result was disastrous for Thebes. A great body of exiles from Achaia was soon accumulated, who expelled the Theban harmosts, and again allied themselves with Sparta.

* Plutarch.

† Ibid.

CHAPTER III.

CULMINATION OF THEBAN POWER.

The Persian Rescript.

THE Thebans, having now discovered that the Lacedæmonians had dispatched ambassadors to the king of Persia, to obtain, if not military, at least pecuniary aid, sent Pelopidas (366 B. C.) to Susa to oppose this measure. The king of Persia, remembering the ancient alliance of Thebes with Xerxes against Sparta and Athens, fully granted his demands. Messene was declared autonomous and independent; the Athenians were directed to order home and disarm their ships of war now in active service; Thebes was declared the head city of Hellas, and any city refusing to admit her leadership was menaced with instant compulsion by Persian force. In other words, the decree of Antalkidas was repeated, except that it was now delivered in behalf of the Thebans and not the Spartans. But when the deputies of the allies were asked to take an oath to the rescript, they flatly refused to adhere to it. The deputies from Arkadia went still further, and entered a general protest against the supremacy of Thebes. When the Thebans saw that the allies collectively refused to adhere to the royal decree, they resolved to try the efficacy of individual application; but they were again disappointed. All the cities that were visited refused to bind themselves by any common oaths with the king of Persia. The Thebans, in their efforts to have their supremacy recognized throughout Hellas, sent envoys not only to the Peloponnesus, but also to Thessaly and the northern districts of Hellas.

Pelopidas was the envoy appointed to Thessaly, and while in the execution of his duty was seized and detained as prisoner by Alexander of Pheræ. When the Thebans

were informed of this outrage they were filled with indignation, and gave orders to their army to march directly into Thessaly and liberate their beloved leader. But, unfortunately, Epaminondas did not command this army. That bitterly wronged but ever moderate man served then as a simple hoplite. His worthless successors, unable to accomplish anything against Alexander, were forced to retreat homeward ; and so unskillful was their generalship that the entire army was in imminent danger of being destroyed. Therefore with one voice they called upon Epaminondas to assume the command. This he did, and succeeded in repelling all the attacks of the enemy and in conducting the army safely back to Thebes. The Theban generals returned home in disgrace, and were condemned to a fine of ten thousand drachmæ and deposition from their office ; and at the same time Epaminondas was given the command of the army that was to act in Thessaly.

Epaminondas, knowing the savage disposition of the tyrant, and the little regard he paid to reason or justice, was careful not to reduce him to such despair as might prove fatal to the prisoner. He kept Alexander in suspense, until he finally became so terrified at the name and character of Epaminondas that he hastily sent an embassy to offer satisfaction. Epaminondas refused to admit such a man into alliance with the Thebans ; he only granted him a truce of thirty days, engaging to evacuate Thessaly in return for the release of Pelopidas. His terms were accepted, and he had the delight of conveying Pelopidas in safety to Thebes.* It soon became evident, however, that the influence of Thebes in Thessaly was materially diminished after this occurrence, and that Alexander of Pheræ was henceforth its true ruler.

The supremacy of the Thebans had already begun to crumble. Like its predecessors, it was based not on an equality of rights, but on a domination which Hellenic *in-*

* Plutarch.

dividuality could not suffer. The Thebans, however, were destined yet to see some glorious days. Many Peloponnesians recognized the autonomy of Messene, and concluded peace with the Thebans. Thus their supremacy was at least established in the Peloponnesus. But let us not forget that Alexander of Pheræ was the ruler of Thessaly, and that the Athenians during 365 and 364 B. C. wonderfully extended their naval power, recovered Samos and a part of the Thracian Chersonese, and captured many cities of Chalkidike. They were assisted by Perdikkas, king of Macedonia, who, having murdered Ptolemy of Alorus, regent of that country, seemed favorably disposed to the Athenians.

Death of Pelopidas.

Pelopidas, burning with ardor to revenge both the city and himself for the ill-treatment he had received at the hands of the tyrant Alexander, prevailed on the Thebans to place him at the head of a fresh army for the purpose of invading Thessaly.*

The successes of the Athenians, under their admiral Timotheus, also excited the jealousy of the Thebans, and Epaminondas resolved to grapple with Athens on her own element and abolish her supremacy on the sea. A powerful opposition arose at Thebes against this scheme, which was characterized as a hazardous attempt, since the Thebans had never distinguished themselves as sailors. But the eloquence and emphatic language of Epaminondas aroused the zeal of the Thebans to such a degree that it was immediately voted to equip one hundred triremes, and construct docks and ship-houses for the maintenance of such a number. As soon as the fleet was ready, Epaminondas crossed the Ægean, and visited Byzantium and other cities near it subject to the Athenians. He brought back his fleet at the end of the year, without having gained any marked victory; but by his

* Plutarch.

presence and energy he had materially weakened the claim of the Athenians to the supremacy of the sea. He intended in the next year (362 B. C.) to push his maritime enterprises still farther, but unexpected circumstances called him to another field of battle.

In the mean time Pelopidas invaded Thessaly in order to depose the tyrant Alexander, then in the zenith of his glory. He routed the forces of Alexander near a place called Kynos Kephalæ or the Dog's Heads. Suddenly perceiving the tyrant encouraging and rallying his mercenaries, he was no longer master of himself, but, sacrificing both his safety and his duty as a general to his passion, he sprang forward a great way before his troops and was slain. His death was a great loss to the Thebans. His soldiers were deeply afflicted, calling him their father, their savior, and their instructor in everything that was great and honorable. When night came on, a melancholy silence prevailed throughout the camp; the soldiers refused to kindle a fire or take refreshment, as if, instead of gaining so great a victory, they had been worsted and enslaved by the tyrant.* Nevertheless, the Thebans, as though still inspired by the spirit of that great man, pressed Alexander hard and compelled him to submit to their own terms. He was forced to abandon all his dependencies in Thessaly, to confine himself to Pheræ, with its small territory near the gulf of Pagasæ, and engage by oath to submit to the Thebans and to keep his forces in readiness to execute their orders. At the same time the Magnesians, Phthiotæ, and Achæans recognized the supremacy of the Thebans; and thus their influence was more than ever before established in the northern districts of Hellas.

Battle of Mantinea—Death of Epaminondas.

In the mean while matters became seriously complicated in the Peloponnesus. Not only the Achæans, but even the


* Plutarch.

Eleians, oppressed by the Arkadians, had already united with the Spartans. Worst of all, the Arkadians were divided among themselves; one portion of them, led by the Mantineians, leagued itself with Sparta, while another remained in alliance with the Thebans. Therefore, about the middle of 362 B. C., Epaminondas deemed it necessary to march again into the Peloponnesus, in order to strengthen the adherents of the Thebans and put down their numerous opponents. This was the last and most glorious of his expeditions.

The army which he led comprised nearly all the Greeks beyond the isthmus—Bœotians, Eubœans, Thessalians, Lokrians, Ænians, and others. On reaching Tegea, it was further increased by the addition of all his Peloponnesian allies—the Arkadians of Tegea, Pallantium, Asea, and Megalopolis, the Messenians, and the Argeians. His opponents, concentrated at Mantinea, consisted of the Mantineians with the major part of the other Arkadians, the Eleians, and the Achæans. They expected to be joined by the Athenians and the Spartans, led by Agesilaus, now in his eightieth year.

Epaminondas decided to engage the Mantineians in battle before the Spartans and Athenians joined them. He accordingly marched close to Mantinea, but the enemy kept carefully on their guard, not wishing to risk battle. Epaminondas retreated to his camp, as they were too strongly posted to be forced. Being apprised that Agesilaus was on the way to Mantinea, he decamped from Tegea in the night, unknown to the Mantineians, took a different road to Lacedæmon from that chosen by Agesilaus, and led his Theban force with all speed toward Sparta, hoping to come upon that town "as upon a nest of unprotected young birds," at a moment when no resistance could be made.* He would certainly have become, without battle, master of the city, and would have thus in-

* Plutarch.



——— March of Epaminondas from Tegea. TIMAYENIS' GREECE
 ——— Army of Epaminondas as formed for attack
 ■■■ Opposing Army, Mantineians, Lacedaemonians, Athenians, Eleians, &c.

Battle of MANTINEIA
B.C. 362.



flicted on his opponents a mortal blow, had not a Kretan runner hurried to Agesilaus with the news that the Thebans were marching rapidly southward from Tegea.* Agesilaus instantly led back his troops to Sparta, and succeeded in placing the city in an effective state of defense before the Thebans arrived. In a little time the Thebans passed the Eurotas and attacked the town. Agesilaus defended it with a vigor above his years. He knew that this was the time for the boldest and most desperate efforts. Every Spartan on this occasion proved himself a hero. Archidamus, son of Agesilaus, with one hundred hoplites, dashed against the Theban lines, and actually beat them back with some loss, but was finally himself repulsed and forced to retreat.

But the bravery of the Spartan Isidas, son of Phœbidas, was the most extraordinary and striking spectacle, not only to his countrymen, but to the enemy ; and it did signal honor to Sparta, in this day of her disaster and comparative decline. "He was," says Plutarch, "tall and beautiful in his person, and just growing from a boy into a man, which is the time the human flower has the greatest charm. He sallied forth naked and unshielded, with his body oiled as in the palæstra. Wielding in his right hand a spear and in his left a sword, he rushed with desperate valor against the enemy, striking down every man he engaged with. Yet he was suffered to retreat unwounded, as he appeared to his adversaries to be something more than human. The ephors honored him with a wreath for the great things he had performed, but at the same time fined him one thousand drachmæ for daring to expose himself without defensive armor."

It was by such acts of heroism that the Spartans warded off the present danger, and snatched the town out of the hands of Epaminondas. But the Theban general had many arrows in his quiver. He knew that the Arkadians and their other allies in Mantinea would be immediately sum-

* Xenophon.

moned to Sparta, to avert all danger from that city. Accordingly, he marched against Mantinea, already destitute of defenders. On reaching Tegea he saw that it was absolutely necessary that the infantry should rest after such severe fatigue; for the hoplites had been kept for nearly forty hours in incessant movement. The cavalry, however, was sent to Mantinea, as alone sufficient to accomplish the object. But, although the Arkadians and Spartans and the other allies were far from the town, the Athenian cavalry had arrived almost an hour before, and had just dismounted from their horses within its walls. An engagement ensued, in which the Athenian cavalry forced the assailants to retire. We must bear in mind, however, that the Theban and Thesalian horsemen were wearied by two days and nights of almost incessant march, and had not tasted food for many hours, while the Athenians had taken their evening meal and rested at the isthmus of Corinth. The Athenian cavalry commander, Kephisodorus, and Gryllus, son of the historian Xenophon, were both slain in the battle. The famous contemporary painter Euphranor, in a splendid picture which adorned the city of Athens, commemorated the battle and the distinguished valor of Gryllus, to whose memory the Mantinians also paid great honors.

Thus two well-conceived plans of Epaminondas failed by the strange concurrence of unexpected events. The general then decided to meet the enemy in the open field. The latter, in the mean time, had united their forces and encamped at a narrow defile near the city of Mantinea. Epaminondas came out from the northern gate of Tegea, leading his army to battle. He first marched straight toward the enemy at Mantinea, but presently changed his course, turning to the left, and slowly advanced toward the Mænalian range of mountains, which forms the western boundary of the Mantinico-Tegeatic plain (two thousand feet above the level of the sea), and which he probably reached somewhere near the site

of the present Tripolitza.* Thence he marched northward, skirting the flank of the mountains, until at length he neared the right wing of the enemy. Here he ordered his phalanx to halt, face to the right, and stack their arms, as if he intended to encamp.

The enemy, who had watched him ever since he left Tegea, thought at first that he was coming directly against them for the purpose of offering them immediate battle, but now supposed, from these movements, that he had given up the intention of fighting that day. Hence they broke up their ranks and scattered about the field. But Epaminondas, who even in the hour of rest kept his phalanx in a compact body, suddenly ordered his army to take up arms and march forward. The enemy saw the danger and hastened to recover their arms; but it was evident that these hurried preparations could only prove disastrous. It was certainly not to be expected that soldiers thus taken unawares "were in a condition to stand the terrific shock of chosen Theban hoplites in deep column."

In the allied army the Mantineians occupied the extreme right wing (because the battle was to be fought in their territory), together with the other Arkadians. Next to them were the Lacedæmonians, Eleians, and Achæans. On the extreme left were the Athenians. The cavalry was not drawn up, as at Leuktra, in front of the infantry, but on both wings—the Athenian on the left, and the Eleian on the

* Colonel Leake's account of Tripolitza is accurate. It is the greatest of that cluster of valleys in the center of the Peloponnesus, each of which is so closely shut in by the intersecting mountains that no outlet is afforded to the waters except through the mountains themselves. "This plain stretches from north to south, bordered by the mountain ranges of Mænalus on the west, and of Artemisium and Parthenion on the east. It has a breadth of about eight miles in the broadest part, and of one mile in the narrowest. Mantinea is situated near its northern extremity, Tegea near its southern; the direct distance between the two cities, in a line not much different from north to south, being about ten English miles."

right. It is not known whether Agesilaus or any other king of Sparta was present. Epaminondas repeated here the same tactics which he had used in the battle of Leuktra. He formed on his left a colossal phalanx, composed of all his Bœotians, having a depth of fifty shields, intending to bear down the enemy on that side with irresistible force. He ordered his right and center not to attack until the battle should have been thus wholly or partially decided. His splendid Theban and Thessalian cavalry was drawn up, like that of the enemy, on both wings. Diodorus estimates the number of the allied forces at twenty thousand foot and two thousand horse, and those of Epaminondas at thirty thousand foot and three thousand horse. But little value can be assigned to such statements, especially since Xenophon mentions no numbers whatever.

The battle began with an attack by both the infantry and cavalry of Epaminondas stationed on the left. His fine cavalry soon broke and routed that of the Eleians, and then turned to the right to fall upon the phalanx of infantry. In the mean time Epaminondas had assailed with irresistible force the much less compact ranks of the Mantincian and Lacedæmonian hoplites, and, after a desperate conflict of shield against shield, spear against spear, and sword against sword, he put them to flight. At the same time the Arkadian, Messenian, and other allies of Epaminondas bore down upon the now terrified Achæans and Eleians, whom they easily routed. Thus the whole army of the enemy was driven from the field, and Epaminondas appeared to have completely established the supremacy of his country, when, as he was pressing on the retiring enemy at the head of his Theban phalanx, he received from a spear a mortal wound in his breast. We must remember that a Greek general fought on foot in the ranks, and carried the same arms as a private soldier. Epaminondas was ever foremost in braving danger, and on this occasion exposed himself in the thickest of the

conflict as a means of encouraging his men and breaking the wing, upon the accomplishment of which victory depended.

The fall of Epaminondas produced in the victorious army the most extraordinary and unique occurrence in military history. As soon as the fact was known, the arms of the multitude of men about him, which up to that moment had been deemed unconquerable, fell as if by magic. We do not speak of this to praise the Thebans. Those nations are not to be envied whose existence depends upon the life or death of one man. But is it possible not to revere the genius of men like Epaminondas, who cluster about themselves the whole national spirit to such an extent, that through them and by them alone it seems to exist? Epaminondas, still alive, was carried to the camp, and the physicians declared that he must die as soon as the spear-head was withdrawn. The general heard unmoved the decision of science, and first of all asked whether his shield was safe. His shield-bearer answered in the affirmative, and showed it to him, when he again asked what was the result of the battle. Being told that his own army was victorious, he desired to see Iolaïdas and Daïphantus, who he intended should succeed him in the command. He received, however, the ominous news that both had perished. "Then," said he, "you must make peace with the enemy." He ordered the spear-head to be extracted, when the efflux of blood speedily terminated his life. We are told that even in his last moments he did not lose the consciousness of the great deeds which he had accomplished. Being told by those about him, "Thou diest childless, O Epaminondas!"—"No! by Zeus," he said, "for I leave two daughters, the victory at Leuktra and that at Mantinea." Epaminondas died in July, 362 B. C., at about the age of fifty-seven.

To determine correctly the relative value of great men is not only a difficult but perhaps even a vain task. Supposing that the historian can accurately weigh the various degrees

of genius, yet such is the difference of circumstances and the means through which great men have accomplished their deeds, that one may easily appear unjust in his comparisons and estimations. But, while both in ancient and modern times various opinions have been expressed concerning the great men of Hellas, there has ever been for Epaminondas only praise and admiration. He was the last great political and military leader of the first historic period of the Hellenic nation; the last of those many and glorious heroes who typified, led, and held together the Hellenic community. After he fell, political anarchy prevailed for twenty-five years, ending only in the Macedonian supremacy, from which period there begins another phase of Hellenic life. Here ends also the last great historic work of this first period of Hellenism, the "Hellenika" of Xenophon. Henceforward, for a long period, we know the incidents of Hellenic history only through historians who lived long afterward—Diodorus, Plutarch, Pausanias—and through the unconnected and often untrustworthy information found in the works of the orators.

CHAPTER IV.

RISE OF MACEDONIA.

Death of Agesilaus.

THE Thebans hastened to follow the dying advice of Epaminondas, and concluded peace—probably at once, before the army left the Peloponnesus. It was decided to maintain the *status quo*—to leave everything exactly as it was before the battle; yet "admitting Megalopolis, with the Panarkadian constitution attached to it, and admitting also Messene as an independent city." Sparta vehemently

opposed this measure, but we are told that not one of her allies sympathized with her feelings.

Thebes by this peace did not wholly master the Peloponnesus, as she would have done had Epaminondas lived ; yet she retained many important advantages through which she could still be regarded as the strongest city in Hellas. But soon the Phokians revolted, and not long after the Eubœans. Thus this body, however vigorous it might have appeared, was already deprived of its soul, and the slightest breath of wind threatened to dissolve it into its component parts.

Still more unfortunate was the condition of Sparta, which was deprived not only of her Peloponnesian allies, but of the greatest and most fertile part of her country. Agesilaus, hopeless from this state of affairs, though now more than eighty years old, and with his body full of wounds and scars, decided to seek his fortune elsewhere. The paralysis of the Persian empire during those years was at its height, as most of the western satrapies had revolted against the great king. Tachos, king of Egypt, supported with all his might this revolution. Agesilaus thought that, by assisting Tachos with a thousand Lacedæmonians and other Peloponnesians, he would inflict a mortal wound upon the Persian empire, and revive the undertaking which at the acme of his vigor he had been unable to carry out. On reaching Egypt, however, he was received with little respect, and not long after he became displeased with Tachos. Nevertheless, contrary to his dignity and nature, he submitted to the barbarian until he could find an opportunity to shake off his yoke. That opportunity soon presented itself. Nektanabis, nephew to Tachos, revolted, and, Agesilaus having proclaimed in his favor, was chosen king by the Egyptians. Agesilaus now decided to return home, and marched from the Nile toward Kyrene, whence he intended to sail to Lacedæmon. But he died on the march, without reaching Kyrene. His body was conveyed home by his troops for burial, in a preparation

of melted wax, since honey was not to be obtained.* The last events in the career of Agesilaus and his last dreams befittingly sealed a life which, while it ever pursued the greatest aims, was condemned by fortune to the small and trivial.

Decline of the Naval Power of Athens.

Immediately after the battle at Mantinea the city of Athens seemed the strongest in Hellas. She not only preserved the naval supremacy which she had established since the rebuilding of her long walls, but in 358 B. C. she detached Eubœa from the Thebans and effected the conquest of the Thracian Chersonese. But this second naval supremacy crumbled like a building whose weak foundations could not bear its own weight. The Athenian confederacy had its origin in a generous spirit of common maritime defense; † but the promises made to the allies, and especially that the property of the latter should remain their own and not become the private property of Athenian citizens as Klerouchi, were all forgotten after the humiliation of her great enemy, Sparta, at Leuktra. Discontent naturally grew, and in 358, when the Athenian confederacy seemed to have acquired its greatest impetus, the islands of Chios, Kos, and Rhodes, together with the important city of Byzantium on the Thracian Bosphorus, declared themselves detached from Athens and her confederacy. The Athenians sought to reduce them to subjection, but were driven back from Chios, where the Athenian commander Chabrias fell, and finally, in 355, were compelled to recognize the complete autonomy and severance from their confederacy of the revolted cities.

The inglorious termination of this war, known as "the Social War" (358-355 B. C.), again demonstrated the decline of Athens. That city, which in 412 B. C. was able, notwithstanding the terrible losses she had suffered in Sicily, to

* Plutarch.

† Demosthenes.

fight alone the combined force of Hellas and Persia, was now obliged, after three years of fruitless attempts, to lay aside its arms, and recognize the autonomy of these few revolted cities.

Anarchy.

Such was the state of Hellas about the middle of the fourth century B. C. All the wars which had been waged for the purpose of establishing one empire had ended in nothing. The three great cities which successively sought this end were not only unsuccessful, but had exhausted their forces to such a degree that no more hope was left for renewing the attempt. No city in Hellas seemed able to succeed to their supremacy and become the center of Hellenism. Alexander of Pheræ had indeed attained great power after the death of Epaminondas, but was in 359 murdered by the brothers of his own wife Thebe, and Thessaly relapsed into its usual anarchy.

Still less influence could the city of Syracuse wield in the affairs of Hellas. After the death of Dionysius the Elder (367 B. C.) a long civil war broke out, during the reign of his successor Dionysius the Younger, among the Hellenic cities in Sicily. Syracuse sent to Corinth a pathetic and urgent appeal for a leader who would extricate her from her present difficulties, and preserve Hellenism as well as freedom, which was becoming extinct on the island. Corinth heard with favor and sympathy the appeal of her most distinguished colony. Accordingly, Timoleon, a man distinguished "no less for his courage than for the gentleness of his disposition,"* was sent to Syracuse, expelled the tyrannical Dionysius the Younger, and succeeded within a short time in quelling disturbances and greatly limiting the power of the Carthaginians. But the subsequent fortunes and history of Syracuse are closely linked with the history of the Romans.

* Plutarch.

Hellas, therefore, the focus of the Hellenic nation, continued without a head. It was evident that the divided and agitated body would inevitably become lifeless, unless some new element should spring up capable of uniting and vivifying it. In fact, in the north of Hellas, in a country inhabited originally by tribes akin to the Hellenic, and in time wholly Hellenized—in Macedonia—there appeared during that epoch a man who, having established a powerful monarchy, actuated by the noblest elements of Hellenism, opened for Hellas a new career of energy. But Hellas was destined, before reaching this second phase of her political life, to pass through a state of anarchy which conclusively showed not only the change in the mind and sentiments of that country, but even what would have been her lamentable end if the Macedonian hegemony had not just then appeared, and granted to her the means of pursuing a noble and useful career in Hellenizing nations hitherto in an abject state of servility.

Second Sacred War.

The Amphiktyonic Council, which had originally not only a religious but to a certain extent a political character, had for more than two centuries rarely meddled in political affairs. But ever since the Thebans became the leading power in Hellas, and had taken the two votes which the Bœotians originally had in the assembly, they decided to employ this ancient and venerable institution as a means of satisfying their political antipathies. This of course shows the decline of religious sentiment in Hellas, when the influence of the time-honored council was made the means of political aggrandizement. After the battle of Leuktra the Thebans, through its influence, imposed upon Sparta a fine of five hundred talents, for having treacherously seized the Kadmeia (the citadel of Thebes) in a period of profound peace. This sentence was of course never carried out ; it

only proved the humiliation of Sparta and the insolence of Thebes. Yet the intervention of the council in political matters, after so long a torpor, became the cause of evils destined to bring about most ruinous results.

In 357 B. C. the Thebans, irritated at the Phokians for having broken off from their alliance, and availing themselves also of the ancient antipathy of the Lokrians and Thessalians against them, persuaded the Amphiktyonic Council again to impose upon the Phokians a heavy fine (of what amount we are not told), which was altogether beyond their means of payment. The ground of accusation is not definitely known. They were probably accused of having cultivated some portion of the Kirrhæan plain, belonging to the temple of Delphi. The Phokians of course did not submit to pay; they had probably neither the means nor the inclination to do so. The council, therefore, at the instigation of the Thebans, issued a decree by which it was decided to inflict upon them the punishment which the Kirrhæans had suffered two centuries before. At the same time, threats were uttered against the Lacedæmonians for non-payment of the fine, and it was finally decided to pass against them a vote of something like excommunication.

The Phokians, seeing themselves threatened with such imminent danger, decided not only to resist to the last, but also to seek allies. They received promises of assistance from the Athenians, Spartans, Peloponnesians, and Achæans. But the Thebans and Thessalians, assisted by the Lokrians, Dorians, Ænians, Phthiot-Achæans, Magnetes, Perrhæbians, Athamanes, and Dolopes, decided to carry out the sentence of the assembly. Thus the Phokians found themselves surrounded by many enemies situated very near to them, while their allies were distant, and on account of their own weakness could not render any energetic assistance. Hence the Phokians understood that they must rely wholly on their own resources; and accordingly, at the proposition of their

general, Philomelus, they decided to lay hands on the property of the Delphian temple.

Philomelus therefore seized the sanctuary, and then began a series of impious acts by which the greatest and most venerable fane of the Hellenic nation was violated and robbed of its treasures—an evidence that the nation had now ceased to have any religion, and hence was incapable of any longer preserving its autonomy. First of all, Philomelus seized and put to death the members of the family called Thrakidæ, and confiscated their property. The Thrakidæ were one among several consecrated families, who for centuries had controlled the political and religious interests of the place. Next he required the Pythian priestess to sanction his violent acts. She obstinately refused to obey him, and he laid hold of her and forcibly made her mount the tripod. Frightened for her personal safety, she involuntarily exclaimed that “he might do what he chose.” Philomelus forthwith caused the answer to be put down in writing, and declared himself authorized by the god to do as he chose. This scandalous act again showed the depth of impiety that Hellas had now reached. Such violence and insolence were certainly unprecedented in the country. Other acts were destined to follow, attacking not only the religious convictions of the people, but also their most venerable national traditions and the very foundations of public faith, as well as the material interests of the whole nation.

It has already been said that there were laid up in the temple many great treasures—precious articles dedicated by citizens and cities, the tithes of booty (and especially that which was seized from the barbarians), the tithes of findings, costly presents of foreign kings and communities, etc. The treasure thus accumulated was supposed to be worth at least ten thousand talents, the value of which to-day can not be considered less than four hundred millions of drachmæ (nearly \$69,000,000). Philomelus now decided to seize these

treasures, not only for the purpose of maintaining his mercenaries, but also to bribe his allies. The act was scandalous and unprecedented. Ominous indeed was the impression produced on the Hellenic world by this sacrilege, by which not only was the temple of Delphi robbed of its public and private treasures, but even the dedicatory offerings which were linked with the most sacred traditions of the nation, and especially with its imperishable feats against the barbarians, for ever disappeared. Thus the first Hellenism, before its expiration, sought with its own hands to destroy the evidences of its piety, glory, and prosperity. The use made of the money was also especially repugnant to the common conscience. As no honorable man could be prevailed upon to serve for money proceeding from a sacrilegious act, the troops which Philomelus mustered were composed of cutthroats, thieves, and murderers—of the most reckless malefactors in Hellas. Again, many of the public men of the country were bribed by the Phokians to remain faithful to their alliance. The Athenians, many Thessalians, and above all King Archidamus II of Sparta, his wife, the ephors, and all the elders, were not ashamed to receive money from the Phokians.

By such causes and such resources the war was carried on for ten years—355–346 B. C. At first Philomelus repeatedly routed his enemies; but he was finally overtaken near a narrow and mountainous spot, and completely defeated. Unwilling to surrender, he dashed himself to pieces by leaping down a craggy rock. Onomarchus, a man far more capable, now assumed the command, and his energetic measures soon retrieved the Phokian loss. It was during his command that Philip, king of Macedonia, first took part in Hellenic affairs.

Philip, King of Macedonia.

Philip, as has been said, was educated at Thebes, and it is not definitely known when he departed from that city. It is certain, however, that he was in Macedonia during the

reign of his brother Perdikkas ; and when the latter fell in battle against the Illyrians, leaving an infant son, Philip at once seized the sovereignty. When he ascended the throne he found Macedonia threatened by many enemies. The Illyrians, Pæonians, Thracians, and others were preparing to overwhelm her. But he completely subdued them, and was already preparing to extend his dominion over the sea-coast towns when the Eupatridæ of Thessaly, and especially the Aleuadæ, severely oppressed by the successors of Alexander of Pheræ, sought his assistance, while at the same time Lykophon and many others of their opponents sought the assistance of the Phokians.

Philip entered Thessaly after having first seized Methone, a possession of the Athenians on the Macedonian coast, situated near the theatre of war. Lykophon, who came to meet him, assisted by a large force of Phokians, was completely defeated and forced to flee the country. Hereupon Onomarchus himself marched against Philip, defeated him twice, and forced him back to Macedonia. The Phokian general, elated by his victory, marched into Bœotia, conquered the Thebans in battle, and made himself master of Koroneia, in addition to Orchomenus, which he held before. But in 352 Philip again invaded Thessaly, and completely routed Onomarchus in a decisive battle, during which that general himself perished, six thousand Phokians were slain, and three thousand of them are said to have been taken prisoners. Philip now became master of Thessaly, and proclaimed himself the avenger of the Delphian god and the defender of the insulted Hellenic religion. He wished to penetrate at once into Hellas, but was repelled by the Athenians, who, to their credit be it said, displayed then an energy that was rare during the last days of their political existence, and, by occupying Thermopylæ in season, paralyzed for a time the ambitious projects of Philip. But this delay was of little avail to the Athenians and the Greeks in general, who in the mean time

were torn to pieces, not only by the murderous Phokian war, but by fresh hostilities which broke out in the Peloponnesus.

While Hellas was thus expending in vain and inglorious wars her last resources, Philip was daily extending his empire, organizing his army, and unceasingly preparing himself to avenge the defeat which he had suffered at Thermopylæ, and to accomplish his purpose of reducing all Hellas to his sway. But it was not destined that the last days of the first Hellenism should thus ingloriously set upon the malefactors who were carrying on the Phokian war. A noble, thrilling voice was destined to resound throughout Hellas; a voice which should defend the rights of Hellenic autonomy by the most finished speeches that ever fell from mortal lips; a voice which did not, indeed, save the first Hellenism, because no voice could now save it, but which at least covered its fall with a veil of honor, beauty, and splendor.

Demosthenes.

Demosthenes was born, according to what seems the most trustworthy among contradictory accounts, in 382 or 381 B. C. His father, also named Demosthenes, was one of the principal citizens of Athens, and "of a character so unimpeachable that even Æschines (the most bitter opponent of his son Demosthenes) says nothing against him." His mother, Kleobule, was one of the two daughters and co-heiresses of an Athenian citizen named Gylon, who, it is said, was forced to flee on a charge of treason against the commonwealth. Having become rich as a land proprietor and exporter of corn in Bosphorus, he sent his two daughters to Athens, where they married Athenian citizens, Demochares and the elder Demosthenes. The father of Demosthenes had two distinct manufactories: one of swords and knives, employing thirty-two slaves; the other of couches and beds, employing twenty. He died about 375 B. C., leaving his son Demosthenes, then seven years of age, to the care of three guardians. His patrimony of four-

teen talents (equal to about 500,000 modern drachmæ) was so faithlessly administered that, on attaining his civil majority at sixteen years, when, according to the laws of Athens, he was justified in assuming the administration of his property, the sum paid to him was less than two talents. He was therefore obliged to bring a judicial action against his guardians; and five speeches delivered by Demosthenes, three against Aphobus and two against Onetor, brother-in-law of Aphobus, are still preserved. But it appears that he recovered nothing, and was finally obliged to relinquish most of his claims.

Demosthenes received during his youth instruction in grammar and rhetoric, such as the richest of the Athenians usually obtained, and very early showed a wonderful inclination to rhetoric. But he was from childhood of a sickly constitution and feeble muscular frame, and hence his mother did not choose that he should be put to the hard and laborious exercises of the palæstra.* So delicate indeed was his clothing, and so effeminate his habits, that the boys are said to have given to him the contemptuous name of *Batalus*, i. e., "the effeminate," which remained attached to him nearly throughout his life. Hence Demosthenes never combined the two requisites of a complete citizen as understood by Plato, Isokrates, and Aristotle, mental growth and bodily strength and endurance. This disproportion between the physical and mental force of Demosthenes was destined to be immortalized by the following famous inscription placed on his statue after his death :

"Had thy valor, Demosthenes, been equal to thy eloquence,
The warlike Macedonian would never have ruled in Hellas." †

But perhaps, on the other hand, his sickly constitution and feeble muscular frame contributed to his wonderful

* Plutarch.

† *Εἴπερ ἴσῃν βῶμην γνώμη, Δημόσθενης εἶχες,
Οὐποτ' ἂν Ἑλλήνων ἦρξεν Ἄρης Μακεδῶν.*

mental and rhetorical eminence, since he may have felt that by this alone could he achieve the glory which his noble ambition sought. His family position gave him many opportunities to appear in public as a pleader and political orator. Plato, Isokrates, and Isæus were then in their full celebrity, and many scholars flocked from all parts of Hellas to listen to them. Demosthenes is said to have put himself under the teaching of Isæus, and no doubt he profited largely by the discourse of Plato, Isokrates, and others. But he was not satisfied with those living teachers only. He studied the ancients with great diligence, and especially devoted himself to Thucydides, whose history, according to one account, "he copied eight times over with his own hands"; according to another, "he learned it all by heart, so as to be able to rewrite it from memory when the manuscript was accidentally destroyed." In fact, in the works of the great orator we can easily discern the majestic phraseology of Thucydides, divested of its extreme brevity and obscurity, and clothed with a clearness and grace in no wise inferior to those of Lysias, the simplest and gentlest of orators.

Rhetorical art does not alone make an orator. That this accomplishment may have an influence over the multitude, there is need of certain other peculiarities, both bodily and mental, which Demosthenes seems to have entirely lacked; for he had neither the magnetic voice of Æschines nor the ready and vehement improvisation of Demades. Before venturing to ascend the bema, he had always to put his thoughts together by laborious preparation; his voice was weak, and even lisping; his enunciation was not clear and distinct; his breath was short; his gesticulations were ungraceful; moreover, he was easily confused by the manifestations of the multitude. Such and similar natural defects compelled Isokrates to avoid the assembly of the people, and to limit himself to a select audience of his friends and pupils.

But Demosthenes was not dismayed by his first failure, nor by the laughter and clamor which the novelty of his speech incited. He was bound to succeed, and he did succeed, and became the glory and boast of that assembly which was accustomed to listen to the most famous orators of the world.

His wonderful power of will, and his patience in overcoming his defects, so as to satisfy a critical assembly like the Athenian, is what we especially admire in the man. He prepared himself to overcome the tumults of the assembly by declaiming in stormy weather on the sea-shore of Phalerum. He strengthened his voice by running or walking up hill, and, during the consequent shortness of breath, pronouncing some passage in an oration or a poem. He sometimes passed two or three months together in a subterranean study, practicing night and day to form his action and exercise his voice, and shaving one side of his head, so that, if he should happen to be ever so desirous of going abroad, the shame of appearing in that condition might keep him in. After several unsuccessful trials in the assembly, he was wellnigh discouraged, when Eunomus and other old citizens reassured him by comparing his manner of speaking to that of Perikles, and exhorting him to persevere a little longer in the correction of his external defects. Another time, when his speeches had been ill received, and Demosthenes was pouring his disappointment into the ears of the famous actor Satyrus—saying that, though he was the most laborious of all the orators, and had almost sacrificed his health to his study, yet he could gain no favor with the people, while drunken seamen and other unlettered persons were heard and kept the bema—"You say true," answered Satyrus; "but I will soon explain the cause, if you will repeat to me some passage in Euripides or Sophokles." When Demosthenes had done so, Satyrus pronounced the same speech with such art and grace that it appeared to the orator quite

a different passage. He therefore began anew the task of self-improvement, and practiced before a looking-glass, constantly watching and correcting his movements. After persistent application for many years, he achieved complete success. His delivery became full of decision and vehemence, and in his harangues he often spoke as by a supernatural impulse. A few critics still ridiculed his modulation as artificial and savoring of low stage-effect, while others condemned his speeches as over-labored and smelling of the lamp.* But the criticism of the modern world and that of the grandest orators of France and England unanimously places Demosthenes at the head of orators, and accepts the enthusiastic judgment of Dionysius of Halikarnassus, who says: "Whenever I read any of the speeches of Isokrates, I become serious, and my mind is calm and settled; . . . but when I take those of Demosthenes, I am inspired and carried hither and thither, passing from one passion to another, distrusting, suffering, fearing, despising, hating, pitying, sympathizing, becoming angry, envying, and, in fact, sharing in all the passions which affect the human mind."

Demosthenes was twenty-seven years old when he first appeared (354-353 B. C.) as the political counselor of the people of Athens. A report was spread that the king of Persia was preparing to march against Hellas, and Athens in particular. Demosthenes, with a Panhellenic patriotism worthy of Perikles, then delivered his oration "De Symmoriis." † His second oration, "Pro Megalopolitanis," which favored the defense of Megalopolis against Spartan reconquest, was delivered in 353-352. But his political and oratorical career had its true beginning in the following year (352-351), when he delivered the first of those famous orations known as "the Philippics." "He had now," says Plutarch, "a glorious subject for his political ambition, to defend the cause of Hellas against Philip, and he defended

* Plutarch.

† Περὶ τῶν Συμμοριῶν.

it like a champion worthy of such a charge." It was in this oration that Demosthenes first declared his unmitigated hatred of Philip and of Macedonia—a hatred which lasted throughout his life.

We acknowledge the difficulty of an attempt to criticise the political system of Demosthenes. The opinion has prevailed from antiquity that the man was the last defender of Hellenism; that all who claim that he failed in the choice of his political career, which Grote characterizes as "the combination of earnest patriotism with wise and long-sighted policy," appear to be committing an act of impiety toward the most sacred of sentiments. We appreciate this difficulty still more, since we find ourselves overcome not only by his conquering eloquence, but also by his Panhellenic patriotism and disinterestedness. But we must confess that Demosthenes did not foresee the great and glorious fortunes which the Macedonian hegemony prepared for the Hellenic nation, nor the ruin into which the nation would have fallen had not that hegemony furnished it with a new center of union and a new career of energy. The experience of two hundred years had shown that no union could be accomplished in Hellas by the elements then existing in that country. Again, the Hellenic nation would not have achieved the great work of Hellenizing Asia, from which resulted its subsequent fortune. That nation, left to the narrow limits of Hellas proper, would not only sooner or later have become the easy booty of the first foreign invader that might have attacked it, but in all probability, having exhausted its forces, it would have disappeared from the face of the earth. Again, Philip was a Greek, as Isokrates, Herodotus, and the facts themselves testify, since his ancestors were accepted in the Olympic festivals, in which only Hellenes could take part. The assertion of Demosthenes, therefore, that Philip was a barbarian, is false. Philip was a Greek, and the Macedonians were quite as Hellenic as the Akarnanians and

other nations in Hellas. Philip sought to unite in one the Hellenic nation, that he might march against Asia. His hegemony was much like that of Sparta, Athens, and Thebes ; and hence Demosthenes, by opposing it, attacked the only means by which the nation could still act a prominent part in history. In fine, he undertook a contest evidently futile. We do not mean to justify all the methods which Philip used for the promotion of his ends, although they were those of a statesman, and by no means as base as many of the violent acts of the Athenian and Spartan hegemonies.

Again, many men throughout Hellas, and especially at Athens, conscientiously regarded a war against Philip as ominous, and, with a clear conscience and accurate understanding of the true interests of Hellas, recommended the preservation of peace. Among them, the most prominent were Isokrates and Phokion. The latter, who was called "Phokion the Honest," was born about 402 B. C., and was thus twenty years older than Demosthenes. He belonged to a family of small means, being the son of a pestle-maker. He lived eighty-four years, and was forty-five times elected to the prominent office of a *strategos* (general). He proved himself worthy of his exalted position by his courage and talents for command, as well as by his uprightness and wisdom. He despised flattery and avoided long speeches to the people, and was yet so successful in his addresses that he proved himself a worthy opponent of Demosthenes himself.

Thus we see that the political career of Demosthenes was condemned even by many honest and practical men of his own time. And yet, so great is the power of that inimitable eloquence, that the world has not ceased to admire the contest that one man undertook against the decrees of fate. So deep also is the enchantment which the first Hellenism produced, that, however grand and glorious a career the Macedonian hegemony opened to the nation, many to this day are not persuaded that the Macedonian Hellenism was

a continuation of the first Hellenic life, and still declare that true Hellenism expired at the battle of Chæroneia, regarding Demosthenes not only as the greatest of orators, but the last defender of Greece. However noble these sentiments, they are antagonistic to the truth and to the facts as shown in the last two thousand years. They are disproved by the blood which flows in the veins of the modern Hellenes, by their aspirations, their enthusiasm, and their glorious sacrifices for the preservation of Hellenic autonomy.

End of the Second Sacred War—Growth of Philip's Power.

The Athenians could not be prevailed upon by the eloquent arguments of Demosthenes to make the necessary exertions for limiting the power of Philip, who in 350 B. C. had subdued the Olynthians, and by 347 had become master of all the remaining cities in Chalkidike. Not long after he succeeded in invading Hellas itself. The Phokians had in the mean while compelled the Thebans to seek the assistance of the king of Macedonia. Philip entered with his Thessalians into Phokis, because the Athenians, as usual, did not hasten to the assistance of the Phokians. Master of Phokis as he now was, Philip again convoked the Amphiktyonic Assembly, which issued the following resolutions: All the towns in Phokis, twenty-two in number, excepting Abæ, which took no part in the spoliation of the temple, should be dismantled and broken into villages. No village should be allowed to contain more than fifty houses, and the inhabitants should cultivate their territory and pay an annual tribute of fifty talents, until the wealth taken away should have been made good. All Phokian fugitives should be deemed accursed, and be liable to arrest wherever they should be found. Furthermore, the two votes which the Phokians had in the assembly were given to Philip and his successors. At the same time Philip was chosen to preside, together with

the Bœotians and Thessalians, over the celebration of the Pythian games.

Thus, in 346 B. C., the king of Macedonia punished the sacrilegious Phokians and became master of the Amphiktyonic Council. The Athenians were also forced for the present to accept these decrees. Philip in the mean time did not cease to follow up the completion of his plan. Extending his power both to the north and south, he secured his hold in Hellas by protecting in 344 the Messenians, Arkadians, and Argeians against the incessant attacks of the Spartans; and in 341 he laid siege to Perinthus and Byzantium, for the purpose of completing the conquest of Thrace.

The Athenians—now acting under the exhortations of Demosthenes, who urged them to bury in a generous oblivion all their past grounds of offense against Byzantium—decided to hasten to the rescue of both the threatened cities, especially since the Chians, Rhodians, and many others, offered to unite with them, to prevent Philip from becoming master of the great passage through which corn was imported into the Hellenic seas. But the Athenians were doomed to do nothing in the right way, for they dispatched the loose and rapacious general Chares to the allies, whom the latter refused to accept. The Athenians were sorely distressed; but Phokion—who, although he had often advised them to keep aloof from war, had never yet refused to risk his life in behalf of his country when war was once decided upon—told them that they “should not feel grieved against the allies, but against the generals who render us an object of hate, even to those who can be saved only through us.” The Athenians accordingly sent Phokion to the allies, and Philip was compelled to abandon the siege of Byzantium as well as of Perinthus. Philip deemed it best for the present to conclude peace with the Athenians and the other Greeks, knowing well that, as matters were then in Hellas, an opportunity

would soon offer itself for the accomplishment of his great project.

New Sacred War—Battle of Chæroneia.

The orator Æschines not long after furnished this opportunity. Remembering that the Lokrians of Amphissa had cultivated a piece of land belonging to the temple of Delphi, he called upon the Amphiktyonic Assembly to pass sentence against them. But as great delay occurred in the execution of the judgment, the Amphiktyons determined "to invoke the interference of Philip, appointing him commander of the combined force, and champion of the god, in the new Sacred War, as he had been in the former." Philip accordingly invaded Hellas with an army of thirty thousand foot-soldiers and two thousand horse. Such was the speed of his warlike movements that he had already captured Amphissa and Elateia before the Athenians had decided, by advice of Demosthenes, to form a combined alliance of the Greeks against him. In vain did Phokion endeavor to restrain them from engaging in this war. The Athenians resolved to fight, and Demosthenes himself hastened to Thebes and persuaded that city to make common cause against Philip. A few smaller cities united with the Athenians; and finally, on the 3d of August, 338 B. C., the two armies were drawn up on the plain of Chæroneia. The Athenians and their allies were more numerous than their opponents; but the Macedonian army had received such an ascendancy through the superior tactics of Philip and his constant expeditions, that the Greeks, although they fought bravely, were finally conquered. The Sacred Band of the Thebans to a man fell in this battle as they stood in a solid phalanx, not one of the three hundred yielding a foot. To the youthful Alexander was due the chief credit of this victory, for, after routing the Thebans, he forced the Athenian generals to retreat.

Philip now became master of Hellas. He severely chastised Thebes, which, from being his ally, suddenly took arms against him. He put to death several of its leading citizens, banished others, and confiscated the property of many. He established a council of three hundred, which he invested with the government of the city, and with powers of life and death over every one. He also placed a Macedonian garrison in the Kadmeia. With the Athenians, however, he hastened to conclude peace on mild terms, and they in turn did not hesitate to recognize him as chief of Hellas. The great and glorious subsequent career of Hellas in no wise bears out the criticism of Grote that this peace was a renunciation of all the proud historical past, and the acceptance of a new and degraded position for Athens, as well as for Hellas generally.

Philip for the most part acted leniently toward the Greeks, for he freed without ransom the two thousand prisoners whom he captured in battle, and granted autonomy to all the cities which promptly recognized his supremacy. Sparta alone stood aloof, and refused all recognition of the supremacy of Philip. He invaded Laconia, and in various ways humbled Spartan haughtiness; yet he did not seek to reduce the city, but hastened to the realization of his great project. He convened a congress of Hellenic cities at Corinth, and informed them that he intended to march against the great king, to free "the brethren" in Asia and avenge the invasion of Hellas by Xerxes. He was accordingly chosen general-in-chief of all Hellas. One vote only was wanting—that of stubborn Sparta; but this city had now become so small and weak that Philip could easily afford to despise her policy. Thus under the Macedonian hegemony was finally concluded the fourth political union of the nation, which, although it did not last a long time, yet accomplished achievements worthy of the most brilliant epochs of Hellenic history.

Character of the first Hellenism.

By the battle of Chæroneia and the congress held in Corinth, Hellenism was not abolished ; yet these two events may be regarded as the end of its ancient type. It differs from the second or Macedonian Hellenism in the following points : During the first the national life achieved its growth through the complete freedom of the individual cities, but during the second mainly through the Macedonian monarchy, under which the autonomy of the cities was materially limited. But if, in its want of union, the earlier political organization was faulty, on the other hand, by the excessive growth of the individual cities, its intellectual and moral life became varied and complete. Each separate community was small, and the relative importance of the citizen was greater than in larger communities. Much attention was therefore paid to the preservation and growth of that importance, by means of every possible intellectual and bodily exercise. So great, indeed, was the extent to which the citizen and the city acted and reacted one upon the other, that they seemed to coalesce into a perfect harmony. Hence resulted that wonderful union of the private and public life, of the intellectual and the physical, of the theoretical and the practical. We see, too, that all great national events were at once depicted by corresponding productions of the mind. As soon as the nation had succeeded in an achievement, the deed was at once immortalized in poetry, history, philosophy, architecture, sculpture, painting. To such a degree were events the productions of the mind, and the mind the result of events.

The heroic life of Hellas was represented by the Iliad and Odyssey ; its first legislative attempts, by the works of Solon, Theognis, Alkæus, and the other political poets ; its sacred, musical, and athletic contests, by the lyric poems of Pindar ; its first great war of independence, by the history

of Herodotus and the tragic muse of Æschylus ; the glorious events of the hegemony of Athens, by the masterpieces of Pheidias, Iktinus, and Polygnotus ; the internal life of the city, by the comedies of Aristophanes and the philosophical researches of Sokrates ; the Peloponnesian war, by the history of Thucydides ; the hegemony of Sparta and of Thebes, and the genius of Agesilaus, by the "Hellenika" of Xenophon ; the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks under Xenophon, by the "Anabasis" of the same author ; and, to speak of the most prominent, the last efforts in behalf of its autonomy, by the inimitable eloquence of Demosthenes. Thus all the works of mind and of art came from the very heart of the nation. They were the productions of the national and not of private intellect, imagination, or heart ; they reflected the national conscience, and for this reason they possess an imperishable life. Therefore they are admired to this day, and are considered, in many instances, so inimitable, that all the intellectual and moral life of modern civilization turns to them as to a model, in the search for the beautiful, the lofty, and the grand.

But the political organization of the Hellenes, though deprived of the invulnerable panoply of complete national union, had a mighty influence on the public interests of modern civilization. The Greeks first of all nations created a clear and true political life ; first permitted to the individual the right to participate in public affairs ; first granted the right of suffrage, and first recognized and verified the truth that the state must be regulated according to the progress of the intellectual attainments of the nation. On this account all the principles of the most free and prosperous constitutions of our times have their source and beginning in the first Hellenism. The right of common council, the responsibility of officers, equality before the laws, equitable taxation, liberty of speech, the publicity of judicial proceedings, the prerogative of the courts to administer oaths, the

right of self-defense, and, in fine, all the salutary principles on which the most prosperous of nations pride themselves, have their beginning there.

Let us not omit to mention the wonderful elasticity of this first Hellenism. Many other nations have flourished in this world which, as soon as they fulfilled the task imposed upon them, either disappeared from the face of the earth, like the Babylonians, Egyptians, Romans, etc. ; or, if they still exist, they exist, like the Jews and the Armenians, without power and authority. The first Hellenism alone, while it seemed to have accomplished its public and political life, and to have nothing else to do but to surrender to others its career of energy, suddenly appears, clad in monarchical robes, attempting to extend throughout Asia and Africa the exhaustless intellectual, political, and artistic treasures accumulated in this small corner of the earth during the first period of its history. The first Hellenism communicated this reforming spirit through the second to the third, and through the third to ours, or modern Hellenism. Thus we find that the Byzantine Hellenism is the same as the Macedonian, changed somewhat through the Christian religion and the Roman conquest. Again, our own Hellenism is the same Byzantine, changed by the Turkish rule and the influences of European civilization. So that the Hellenic nation has existed for three thousand years, speaking always the same language, and possessing the same sentiments, mind, and name.

PART EIGHTH.

MACEDONIAN HELLENISM.

CHAPTER I.

EXTENSION AND REORGANIZATION.

Historical Account of Macedonia.

MACEDONIA, before its enlargement through the conquests of Philip, was an exclusively inland country, lying between the mountain-ranges of Skardus and Bermius on the northern side of the great Kambunian chain. The language of its inhabitants, widely different from that of the Thracians on the east and the Illyrians on the west, was so nearly akin to the Hellenic that the latter tongue was easily acquired by them. Like their Hellenic neighbors, they employed a regular and systematic method of warfare. They bore a general resemblance to the Thessalians and other less cultivated nations of the Hellenic race.

In the earliest times they were divided into a variety of independent tribes, each of which had its own king or chieftain. That tribe which ultimately obtained supremacy over the rest originally occupied the country about Ægæ or Edessa, which down to the latest historic times remained the sacred city of the nation, although the capital was at an early period removed to Pella. According to tradition, the real founders of the greatness of Macedonia were fugitives from Hellas, belonging to the royal Herakleid line of Argos, who

are supposed to have arrived in the country during the seventh century B. C., and to have established the Macedonian kingdom on a permanent basis.

The first Macedonian sovereign of real historic importance was Amyntas, the father of the Alexander whom we have mentioned in connection with the Persians. Amyntas (520-500 B. C.) extended his conquests eastward as far as the Thermaic Gulf, and maintained friendly relations with the Peisistratidæ of Athens, which friendship continued between his son Alexander and the Athenians after the expulsion of the tyrants. Perdikkas II, the son and successor of Alexander, entered into still closer friendship with the Hellenes, and extended his dominion as far as the river Strymon. Later, however, Perdikkas became the enemy of the Athenians, and it was from his intrigues that all the difficulties of Athens on that coast took their origin. But, whatever may have been the craft and energy of this king, his monarchy possessed elements of anarchy by which its progress was always retarded. The order of succession was not definitely settled, and hence the death of a king was usually followed by dissensions and civil wars. Perdikkas deprived his brother Alketas of the throne.

About 413 B. C. Archelaus, illegitimate son of Perdikkas, seized upon the kingdom through the murder of the rightful heir. He, however, showed himself worthy of the sovereignty, and Macedonia during his reign shared largely in the blessings of the more southern Hellenic civilization, while it was acquiring a greater military strength than ever before. Archelaus increased the army and the material basis of defense, and constructed many roads throughout his kingdom. In addition, he munificently instituted a periodical contest in honor of the Olympian Zeus and the Muses, and established friendly relations with the Athenian poets and philosophers, persuading Euripides and many of the poets to take up their residence in Macedonia. He was

murdered in 399 B. C. by two Thessalians and a Macedonian named Dekamnichus. Archelaus had been strongly attached to the two former, but had offended them by insulting treatment and non-performance of promises. The Macedonian was led to join the assassins by the following considerations : Euripides, who, as we have said, went to Macedonia by invitation of the tyrant, died in that country about 405 B. C. The great tragedian, before whose genius and grace all Hellas bowed, was troubled with an offensive breath. He was once wantonly insulted on this score by Dekamnichus, who was delivered over to the poet for punishment. This is particularly to be regretted, because Euripides, the encomiast of philanthropy and stigmatizer of revenge—Euripides, the citizen of the free and law-abiding city of Athens—himself executed the barbarous sentence. Six years after the death of the poet, Dekamnichus, who could not forget the ignominy to which he had been subjected, took the opportunity to assist the murderers in their nefarious deed. The events which followed show the weakness of the Macedonian constitution. It presents itself to us as an absolute monarchy, in which no law, no tribunal, guaranteed individual security ; or, as Grote says, *L'État, c'est moi* is a principle which stands marked in the whole series of national proceedings ; the personality of the monarch is the determining element.

Orestes succeeded his father Archelaus ; but, as he was a minor, Aëropus acted in his stead. The latter, after about four years, murdered his ward, and usurped the throne. At his death his son Pausanias succeeded, but after a year's rule was murdered by Amyntas II. This Amyntas, the father of Philip and the grandfather of Alexander the Great, was related to the royal house, but had been nothing more than an attendant of Aëropus, until he found means to destroy Pausanias and seize upon the kingdom. He reigned for about twenty-four years (393–369 B. C.)—years of trouble and distress for Macedonia, and of occasional exile for him-

self. The warlike organization which Archelaus had established was disorganized about this time, since the repeated banishments and assassinations of kings, begun after Perdikkas and continued through the reign of Amyntas, deranged the central government and shattered the Macedonian rule.

Central Macedonia was bordered on the north by barbarous and warlike tribes, whose frequent incursions made them an object of just terror. By reason of these repeated invasions, the Macedonian empire became limited and almost destroyed. It was also seriously threatened by the strong Olynthian confederacy, occupying the coast, which was ultimately overthrown by the Spartans, with the coöperation of Amyntas, who had recovered part of his power.

Philip.

After the death of Amyntas there was again much disturbance in the affairs of the country, and a constant interference on the part of the neighboring nations. Alexander, the eldest son of Amyntas, had succeeded to the throne, but was assassinated about two years later, and other civil wars followed. Eurydike, the widow of Amyntas, finally through the assistance of Iphikrates subdued Pausanias, the principal opponent of her two children—Perdikkas, a young man, and Philip, as yet scarcely more than a boy. It was accordingly through the interference of the Athenian Iphikrates that the family of Amyntas was maintained, and Ptolemy of Alorus established as regent. When afterward the affairs of the hither Greeks passed into the hands of the Theban hegemony, Pelopidas penetrated into Macedonia, and compelled Ptolemy to enter into an alliance with his state. To secure the regent's fidelity, he took thirty hostages from the principal families of Macedonia, among whom was the young Philip, son of Amyntas, who accordingly spent three years in Thebes in this capacity. Not long afterward Perdikkas, the elder brother of Philip, assassi-

nated the regent Ptolemy, and seized the throne. But he ruled only about five years (360-355), having been murdered, as it is supposed, at the instigation of his mother Eurydike. His son Amyntas was still a boy, and Macedonia was again threatened both from within and without.

In the midst of this crisis Philip succeeded to the sovereignty. He had received from his earliest youth such an education as might have been bestowed on the best of the Greeks. Not only during the time he spent in Thebes, but from his very birth, he had lived in a Hellenic atmosphere. The opinion that before him Macedonia was a land of barbarians is erroneous, because the Macedonians were not only related to the Hellenes, but from very early times had followed to some degree the intellectual progress of the nation. The immediate predecessors of Philip sought as much as possible to approach the Attic mode of life. It has been stated that, forty years before, King Archelaus introduced many social improvements after Hellenic models, and was much attached to the youthful Plato and his teacher Sokrates. In like manner, Amyntas showed himself throughout his reign a friend of the most eminent Athenians, and his physician was Nikomachus, father of the famous Aristotle. Amid such surroundings Philip was educated. At the age of fifteen he was taken to Thebes as a hostage, but returned to Macedonia while Perdikkas was still reigning. Though a hostage, he was honorably and cordially welcomed, received a scientific and oratorical training, and studied philosophy, but did not exhibit much inclination for its subtleties. He especially availed himself of the intimacy and the examples of Epaminondas and Pelopidas, who were the ornaments and pride of all Hellas. His stay at Thebes, which under their administration had become so strong and warlike, had a considerable influence on the formation of Philip's character. The sight of the Theban army could not but move a young man of an ambitious and energetic nature,

destined to the command of a nation which, although warlike, was destitute as yet of an adequate military organization. His surroundings enabled him to become familiar with the most advanced strategic ideas of the day, and his mind was naturally thrown into the track of reflection, comparison, and invention on the art of war.

On his return from Thebes he was intrusted with the government of an unimportant province in Macedonia, under his elder brother Perdikkas. He began at once to organize a small but well-disciplined military force. At the death of Perdikkas he received intimations that he could probably obtain the sovereignty, and, assisted by his well-equipped army, he achieved success. Philip at first assumed the government of the country as guardian of his young nephew Amyntas, but circumstances were such that he was forced by his friends to take control of the kingdom in his own name. Amyntas lived throughout the entire rule of Philip, and was finally put to death on a charge of treason against Alexander.

When Philip had overcome the principal obstacles between him and the throne, he had yet many enemies. Above all, he sought to pacify the Thracians by seasonable presents and promises. But the Athenians, supporting his rival Argæus, were opposed to him on the sea, and the Illyrians on land. Accordingly, he hastened to increase his military force by applying throughout his kingdom the laws which he had early introduced into his own province, and encouraging his friends by addresses such as had never before been heard by Macedonians. He then proceeded against his remaining enemies, using either force or diplomacy, as the particular occasion demanded. He knew that the Athenians had been carrying on war against Macedonia, and assisting Argæus, because they wished to occupy Amphipolis. He therefore wrote to Athens that he desired to preserve the friendly relations which his father Amyntas had formerly established

with that city, and that he was ready to withdraw from Amphipolis the Macedonian garrison whereby "Perdikkas had held it against them." This made the Athenians indifferent to Argæus, and their admiral Mantias remained idle in the harbor of Methone, while Argæus, with some fugitives, a body of mercenaries, and a few Athenian exiles, marched toward Ægæ or Edessa, hoping to procure admission into that ancient city. The inhabitants refused to receive him, and Philip attacked and completely routed his forces. He treated the Athenian prisoners kindly and sent them home, with renewed propositions of amity to the people of Athens. He afterward defeated the Pæonians and compelled them to recognize the Macedonian supremacy. He also conquered the Illyrians, and forced them to seek peace and to deliver up all their provinces.

Having accomplished all this during the first year of his reign (359 B. C.), he attempted in the second (358) to recover Amphipolis, which was indispensable to the security of his dominion, both as being near the bridge over the Strymon, and as a convenient trading-post for the ship-timber, gold, and silver of the regions surrounding Mount Pangæus. During the preceding year Philip had surrendered Amphipolis to the Athenians; but, as they took no pains to hold the city, we can hardly blame him that, seeing them indifferent toward this splendid gift, he himself wished to recover it. After beginning the siege of Amphipolis he wrote a courteous letter to the Athenians, informing them that he desired to punish the Amphipolitans because they had given him much occasion for war, but that he besieged the place in the interest of the Athenians, and upon its conquest would deliver it to them.* He did not, however, fulfill his promise, but kept the city for himself, and fortified it. This action is certainly blameworthy; but how many conquerors, judged by the principles of common morality,

* Demosthenes cont. Aristokrat.; also the oration De Halonneso.

would escape like condemnation? Ought not the Athenians, who could not find words strong enough to stigmatize the conduct of Philip, rather to have accused themselves for the fatal inaction which had now become their besetting sin? They had taken no care to occupy the city surrendered to them, and they were foolish enough to believe that Philip would sacrifice his time and his army in order afterward to hand over to them a possession which they had lost through their own supineness. Viewed in the light of justice, it does not appear in what respect the Athenians had more right than Philip to occupy Amphipolis. Both were conquerors, seeking to possess a city belonging to neither, solely to further their own interests.

The Athenians not only neglected to garrison Amphipolis, but also committed another mistake. On the coast of Macedonia was situated the Hellenic city of Olynthus, formerly the head of a great confederacy, which had been dissolved by the Spartans. In the course of time, however, it had succeeded in regaining a part of its importance. The Olynthians, afraid of Philip after the capture of Amphipolis, sought alliance with the Athenians, that both in common might oppose the Macedonian monarch, now daily growing more formidable. It is evident that, if the Athenians were willing to make good their pretensions by corresponding sacrifices, they ought at once to have accepted the propositions of the Olynthians. But it is none the less clear that, during this period, the Athenians spent their time rather in the utterance of words than in the performance of deeds. It was also about this time that they became engaged in the so-called Sacred War. They therefore dismissed the Olynthian ambassadors without granting their request. Philip was desirous of treating the Olynthians well, and they, finding themselves abandoned by the Athenians, were equally eager to come to terms with the king. The latter even ceded to them the territory of Anthemus, and in addition, having

secured Potidæa, an important stronghold of the Athenians, he surrendered it to the Olynthians.

In this way Philip occupied himself during the two years 358-356 B. C. ; and soon after he openly declared himself an enemy to the Athenians. He deprived them of their hold upon the Thermaic Gulf, in which they now seem only to have retained the town of Methone. In the mean while Philip became master of the gold-producing regions of Mount Pangæus, formerly an object of dispute between Athens and the Thasians. The Thasians had recently founded there a city called Krenides, which Philip now enlarged and named Philippi. It became the center of the great metallurgical works in the neighborhood, which received such an impetus that they yielded to him, according to Diodorus, a yearly income of one thousand talents. He also caused a new gold coin to be struck, bearing a name derived from his own (*philippeion*). Thus Philip, almost from the beginning of his reign, and before becoming even master of the entire coast, was in receipt of a yearly income greater than that which the Athenians and the Spartans obtained in the very acme of their power. He was consequently enabled to enlarge his military force, which was receiving constant drill in the frequent wars with the neighboring barbarians.

About this time Philip married Olympias, daughter of Neoptolemus, prince of the Molossi, a reputed descendant of the heroic Æakidæ. He had become acquainted with her in the island of Samothrake, whither both had gone to be initiated into its religious mysteries. The jealous, savage, and revengeful nature of this woman was destined to cause much sorrow to the king. In 356 she bore to him a son, the famous Alexander the Great.

Reorganization of the Macedonian Army.

Philip finished these achievements during the first four years of his rule. He had banished his domestic opponents,

routed or subdued the barbarous nations about Macedonia, and deprived the Athenians of their possessions on the coast. He had also gained possession of the mines near Mount Pangæus, and thus secured a large revenue. But his greatest achievement was the creation of the means by which he was enabled to accomplish his great deeds. He began the reorganization of that army which, after securing his kingdom, was destined at a later period to spread Hellenism throughout Asia.

Before the time of Philip the military force of Macedonia was composed, like that of the Thessalians, of an excellent cavalry and of the troops called peltasts; but these latter were poorly clothed and poorly armed, because foot service was not in honor among the natives, and "the Macedonian infantry in their general character were hardly more than a rabble." Philip effected a complete transformation in this state of affairs. The soldiers were not to blame for their deplorable condition, for they were strong in body and resolute in spirit. Philip began to impart to them all the accomplishments of the Hellenic infantry, besides seeking to habituate them to the use of a new and heavy weapon, very effective when carried by a compact body of troops. This new weapon was the *sarissa*—the Macedonian pike or lance. It was used both by infantry and by particular regiments of cavalry, and was of great length, though much shorter for cavalry than for infantry service. The *sarissophori*, or bearers of the *sarissa*, were a sort of light-horse carrying this long lance, by which they were distinguished from the heavier cavalry, which carried the *xyston* or short pike. The *sarissa* of the horsemen was about fourteen feet long—as long as the Cossack pike now is; while that of the infantry was twenty-one feet long. This would be almost incredible were it not for the assertion of the historian Polybius, who was not only an eye-witness of its use, but also by profession a competent judge of such matters. The *sarissa* in its horizon-

tal position was held with both hands, and was distinguished in this respect from the pike of the Greek hoplites, which occupied only one hand, while the other held the shield. The sarissa was held in such a manner that it extended fifteen feet beyond the body of the pikeman, while the remaining portion, six feet in length, was of sufficient weight to maintain an equilibrium. Thus the sarissa of the man standing second in the file extended twelve feet in front of the first rank, that of the third man nine feet, of the fourth six feet, and of the fifth three feet. Consequently, from each division there was opposed to the enemy a quintuple series of pikes; and of these five, the first three and perhaps the fourth extended farther than the pike of the Hellenic hoplites. The soldiers behind the fifth rank were mainly employed in sustaining the front and guarding the whole phalanx from the missiles of the enemy, by carrying the sarissa, not in a horizontal position, but slantingly over the shoulders of those before them.

The *phalangites*, or soldiers serving in the phalanx, were generally drawn up in files sixteen deep, with an interval of three feet between the ranks. They carried, besides the sarissa, a short sword and a circular shield with a diameter of rather more than two feet, and wore a breastplate, leggings, and a white, broad-brimmed hat, called *kausia*. But the long pike was their principal weapon. The only defect of the phalanx was the fact that it could not face about or maintain its position on uneven ground. Therefore the Roman legions, which were better organized, finally overcame it, although Philip had endeavored, by the addition of other bodies of soldiers, to neutralize this serious defect.

The composition of Philip's military force may be briefly summed up as follows: 1. The Phalanx or the heavy infantry, practiced in the use of the sarissa; 2. The Hypaspists—shield-bearers or Guards—lightly armed, and employed for the personal defense of the king; 3. The *Hetæri* or Compan-

ions, forming the heavy cavalry, chiefly native Macedonians; 4. The *Sarissophori* or Lancers, a new and lighter variety of cavalry, used for advanced posts or for scouring the country. The Macedonian army also included a numerous assemblage of desultory or irregular troops, as, for instance, the Thessalians, who furnished a cavalry force not inferior to that of the Macedonians themselves, together with many Grecian volunteers armed with their national weapons. Philip completed his military organization by the introduction of an excellent engineering corps, possessed of a great stock of projectile and battering machines, "superior to anything at that time extant." To this great array, so heterogeneous yet so systematically divided, we must add the armories, in which those who had been drafted were enlisted and drilled; the magazines, in which the arms and ammunition were kept; the establishments for furnishing cavalry-horses, etc. Thus we obtain an idea of the wonderful military organization which Philip instituted.

Pella was a small city when Philip ascended the throne; at his death it was not only strong as a fortification and place of deposit for royal treasure, but also as the permanent central war-office of this great military power. Never before was an army so perfectly organized, and the Macedonian phalanx became even more powerful than the famous Hellenic infantry. We are told that the Roman general Paulus Æmilius was seized with terror on first seeing this phalanx in battle array at Pydna. But we must not forget that this magnificent Macedonian army was nothing else than the ancient Hellenic army better and more fully equipped. The principles were the same; the measured step and the compact line of the phalanx were the same. Even the idea of the engineering corps was derived from the Hellenes.

Thus Macedonia was recreated by Philip from Hellenic elements. From time immemorial it was composed of tribes akin to the Hellenic; it finally assumed many of the advan-

tages of Hellenic civilization ; spoke principally the Hellenic tongue ; was always ruled by kings of Hellenic descent ; acted in the name of Hellenism, and spread a dominant and pervasive Hellenism in Asia and Africa. Neither Philip and his successors, nor even the nations against whom they fought, considered that the Macedonians had any other purpose in view than the extension of Hellenism. Two important modifications of this Hellenism took place during the process of its encroachment : its constitution, instead of being democratic, became monarchical ; and its energy, instead of being restricted to internal and political affairs, became external and conquering. The period commencing with Philip can only be regarded, therefore, as another phase of Hellenism, which, in order to distinguish it from the first, we have named Macedonian Hellenism.

CHAPTER II.

THE PHOKIAN AND OLYNTHIAN WARS.

Conquests in Thessaly, Thrace, etc.

THE events of the so-called Sacred War have already been partly related. The Thebans, to punish the Phokians who had revolted from their alliance, moved for a sentence of the Amphiktyonic Council, by which the land of the Phokians should be taken from them and dedicated to the god at Delphi. The Phokians, in desperation, insulted the Pythian prophetess, bribed the allies, spent in lasciviousness and other vices the money of the nation, and made the Athenians and the Spartans and other Peloponnesians participants in their orgies. Could Philip not avail himself of this folly, or was it quite as becoming that Hellas should ingloriously fall by her own hand—that country from which his ancestors

descended, whose language he spoke, whose civilization he admired and adopted, whose political and military energy could, as he believed, become still more renowned? Philip's intervention was not only unavoidable, but even a positive means of safety. Not that Philip proceeded to the execution of his plans in the most honorable way, but his policy was not worse than that of the Spartans or the Athenians. The principal cause of the final submission of Hellas to Philip was the pusillanimity and lack of public spirit among the Greeks, and especially among the Athenians.

Philip at this time was occupied in expelling the Athenians from the coasts of Thrace and Macedonia. About 353 B. C. he gained Methone, the only remaining possession of the Athenians in Macedonia. At the same time the Eupatridæ of Thessaly, and especially the Aleuadæ, being much harassed by the successors of Alexander of Pheræ, pleaded for the assistance of Philip; while Lykophron, the successor of Alexander, sought the assistance of the Phokians. The Macedonians and the Phokians, therefore, frequently fought on the Thessalian plains, until in 352 the Phokians were utterly routed, and Philip, capturing Pheræ, abolished the dynasty of the successors of Alexander, declared the city free, and proceeded to besiege the neighboring town of Pagasæ, the most important maritime station in Thessaly. The interests of the Athenians demanded that this valuable spot should not be captured, because it commanded the Pagasæan Gulf, the great inlet of Thessaly. But the Athenians were unwilling to contribute either men or money for the equipment of their ships; hence, though assistance was decreed to Pagasæ, the matter proceeded so slowly that when the proffered aid arrived Philip had already captured the city.

He thus became master of all Thessaly, as well as the destroyer of the Pheræan dynasty; and by routing the Phokians he stood forth the defender of the temple against its sacrilegious robbers. Availing himself of this prestige,

he sought to enter Phokis, in order to terminate the unholy war and assume the leadership of Hellas. It was necessary to pass through Thermopylæ, and the Athenians, awakening at last from their lethargy, occupied the pass and placed it in such a condition of defense that Philip did not think it wise to venture an attack. Nevertheless, he was not only master of the coasts of Macedonia and of all Thessaly, but also made the Athenians, who on account of their timely occupation of Thermopylæ had boasted themselves the saviors of Hellas, bear the blame of upholding the sacrilegious Phokians and the enemies of the god at Delphi.

But while the Phokian war continued under the protection of the Athenians, exhausting the last material forces of the nation and undermining its most sacred traditions, and while the Spartans wasted their scanty resources in trifling combats against the Messenians and Arkadians, Philip did not cease to augment his military power. Demosthenes had already in his first Philippic, delivered about this time, openly declared that it was impossible for the Athenians to muster an army capable of contending against Philip. The fame of his military genius and tireless energy, and the reputation of his officers and soldiers, became prevalent throughout the length and breadth of Hellas. Philip had furthermore obtained by the capture of the Pagasæan Gulf a large naval force, with which he afterward ravaged the possessions of the Athenians, and even the very coasts of Attica. Hence the unavoidableness of a general war against the Greeks became daily more evident. Philip, however, appeared for the present to be abandoning Hellas to her fate, and occupied himself principally in strengthening his hold upon Thrace and the Macedonian coasts. He trusted that this delay would rather facilitate his ultimate success, because in the mean while the Greeks did nothing but make still more imperative his intervention in Hellenic affairs.

Not long after Philip penetrated into Thrace, where he

took part in the dissensions of the native rulers and rendered his influence more secure. During this expedition he approached the Thracian Chersonese, besieged the Heræon Teichos, and threw the neighboring Athenian colonists into much alarm. News of this reached Athens in November, 352 B. C., and the danger was deemed so pressing that "a decree was immediately passed in the public assembly to equip a fleet of forty triremes; to man it with Athenian citizens, all persons up to the age of forty-five being made liable to serve on the expedition; and to raise sixty talents by a direct property-tax." But soon afterward fresh messengers arrived from the Chersonese bearing tidings that Philip had fallen sick, and next that he was dead. This last report was false, but the sickness of Philip was a fact, and had for some time delayed his military operations. It is clear that the Athenians should have availed themselves of this opportunity by redoubling their efforts; but they were little inclined either to spend money or to endanger their personal security. Consequently they were induced by this report to avoid carrying out the resolution adopted. In vain did Demosthenes show to his fellow citizens the results of their present inactivity; in vain did he urge them to display their former energy and independence; in vain did he point out the way by which a splendid fleet might be equipped. The ridiculously small effect produced by this eloquent appeal was seen in the month of September, 351, when the Athenians, after having passed the summer in complete idleness, sent to Thrace only five talents and a fleet of ten triremes, scantily manned with sailors, but with no hoplites on board, and commanded by the mercenary chief Charidemus. Demosthenes attributed the disregard of his wise counsel to the machinations of men who, bribed by Philip, had on various pretexts dissuaded the Athenians from the performance of their duty. But Demosthenes was wrong if he believed that Philip could have accomplished what he did through the

perfidy of a few Greeks. If the Greeks of that day had had in their veins a few drops of that blood which one hundred and fifty years before they had shed so freely at Marathon, Thermopylæ, and Salamis, not all the treasures of the world could have prevented them from fighting for the liberty and glory of their country.

Olynthian War.

We have seen that Philip, in the beginning of his reign, befriended as much as possible the Olynthians. The latter, though defeated by the Spartans in 379 B. C., had since recovered from that disaster and again presided over a powerful confederacy, which included nearly all the Hellenic cities in Chalkidike. But now that he had become master of Thessaly and a great part of Thrace, and had acquired a large revenue and vast military and naval forces, he thought that the time had come when he ought to subjugate the Olynthians and rule the Macedonian coast. The Olynthians, noting the increase of his power, foresaw imminent danger from the attack which soon after took place. They naturally sought alliance with the Athenians, and the latter promised to help them. Demosthenes, by his three speeches called the Olynthiacs, delivered during the last six or seven months of 350 B. C., strove to represent the necessity of displaying more activity than ever before, by employing the theoric funds (the money appropriated for the celebration of festivals) for war purposes. But the Athenians again did almost nothing for the support of their allies. They sent a body of mercenaries to the aid of the Olynthians, but no Athenian citizen-soldiers. We are told that they gained a victory over Philip, and the Athenians, already supposing that they had destroyed, or were in a fair way of destroying, his empire, deemed it useless to take immediate measures for sending an armament of citizens.

The foreign relations of Athens were seriously disturbed

at or before the commencement of 349 B. C. by the revolt of Eubœa, instigated, it is supposed, by Philip. This is not improbable, though even before the time of Philip the allies of the Athenians had often revolted from them. The Athenians sent Phokion to Eubœa in command of a body of hoplites. His forces were small, his enemies numerous, and success was finally gained only by his indomitable courage and eminent military wisdom. Notwithstanding his achievements, Phokion was recalled and replaced by another general, named Molossus. The latter carried on the war with such bad fortune as to fall himself into the enemy's hands.* Accordingly, hostilities were prolonged for many years.

During this war Demosthenes twice abandoned his post in the army: first, on the ground that he wished to be present at Athens during the celebration of the Dionysia, as the choregus of his own tribe; and secondly, because he was elected about the middle of 349 one of the five hundred senators. These excuses were certainly sufficient in themselves to free him from military service; but the man who asserted that military duty was the surest means of providing for the safety of the city, ought to have demonstrated in practice that its performance was of paramount necessity. At any rate, it is certain that he was charged on the first occasion with desertion, while Æschines, who had been frequently accused of treason, fought with such bravery by the side of Phokion, that he was rewarded by being sent to Athens as the messenger of victory.

In the mean time Philip continued to wage war against both the Olynthians and Chalkidians. The advice of Demosthenes to employ against him the money appropriated to public festivals was apparently accepted, because, at the proposition of the senator Apollodorus, such a decree was voted upon; but in reality this resolution was practically enforced only a few days before the battle of Chæroneia.

* Plutarch, "Phokion."

A curious feature of this event was that, while the proposition of Apollodorus was passed (without a single dissentient voice, we are told), Apollodorus himself was fined one talent for making an unlawful proposal. Hence it is evident that the Athenians had no inclination to risk their lives and property, or even make the slightest sacrifice, for the actual war.

About the middle of 349 they sent to Olynthus the cavalry force which was at Eubœa. But not only had the Olynthians a sufficient cavalry, but the Athenian squadrons could not successfully fight against the better-armed and more numerous Macedonian and Thessalian horsemen. It is true that during the latter portion of the Olynthian war the Athenians made considerable efforts; for Demosthenes (in a speech six years afterward) says that the Athenians had sent to the assistance of the Olynthians four thousand citizens, ten thousand mercenaries, and fifty triremes; but even if this is true, it did not prevent Philip from capturing the thirty-two cities in Chalkidike, and Olynthus itself. During this war, while he was forcing the passage of the river Sardon, he was wounded in the eye by an Olynthian archer, and lost the sight of that eye, notwithstanding the skill of his famous Greek surgeon Kritobulus.

At the close of the Olynthian war Demosthenes began to charge that Philip had treasonably become master of the cities of Chalkidike, and that he afterward made himself a barbarian by selling his captives into slavery, and "so thoroughly and cruelly ruined their cities as to leave their very sites scarcely discernible." These are accusations such as the vanquished are wont to make in order to cover their own defeat. Philip without doubt had many adherents in Chalkidike; but it is evident that traitors do not suffice for the success of such enterprises. There were traitors at Athens during the battle of Marathon, yet they were not able to turn the tide of that famous victory. As to the cruel deeds charged against Philip, it appears that Demos-

thenes forgot the many barbarous acts committed both by the Athenians and the Spartans during the Peloponnesian war, such as the wholesale murders perpetrated among the Plataeans, Æginetans, Melians, and others. Far more manly was the endeavor of Demosthenes and his followers to form a common alliance of Hellas against the king of Macedonia, for which end they sent ambassadors to the Peloponnesus and elsewhere ; but their efforts were doomed to meet with failure.

Philip, to celebrate his new victory, instituted a splendid feast in Macedonia in honor of the Olympian Zeus, in which he showed unbounded liberality. He distributed costly presents for various gymnastic and poetic contests. How unjust is the appellation of "barbarian," and how much, on the contrary, he had espoused the Hellenic character, is evident from the fact that he not only made no distinction in his rewards between the Macedonian and Greek contestants, but also received most cordially the distinguished poets and others who flocked to see him. These disciples of the Hellenic muse, however, did not go to the king for the sake of gain only. Many availed themselves of his kindness to petition him for leniency in the treatment of his captives. The tragedian Satyrus, for instance, the teacher of Demosthenes, sought as his only reward the liberation of two maidens, daughters of one of his friends. Philip gladly granted the request, and throughout showed his generous nature and his power of attracting to himself distinguished men. He had, indeed, good cause to rejoice ; for he had reached the pinnacle of glory and power, and his opponents strove in vain to make head against him. Most of the ambassadors whom the Athenians had sent to other parts of Hellas with the design of forming a common alliance against the king returned to Athens without success.

Meanwhile, the destructive Sacred War continued, and the Thebans were forced to ask for the intervention of

Philip. It is true that one party of the Phokians invited the Athenians to occupy Thermopylæ ; but Phalækus, the general of the Phokians, opposed this plan. Accordingly, the Athenians understood that the only course remaining was to make peace with Philip ; but they showed throughout the negotiations a lamentable want of energy. While their principal object should naturally have been to prevent the entrance of Philip into Hellas, the affair was conducted in a manner rendering his entrance absolutely necessary.

Athenian Proposals of Peace.

During November of 347 B. C. the Athenians decided to send to Philip ten ambassadors to make peace with him, if possible. Among these was Demosthenes. Aglaokreon of Tenedos was also sent as envoy extraordinary, representing the allies of the Athenians. About the beginning of 346 the ambassadors reached Pella, where Philip, surrounded by his political and military court, received them with great magnificence. The Athenian envoys successively addressed him in the order of seniority. Last of all came Demosthenes, the youngest of the ten, Æschines being next above him. Demosthenes, who in his early youth had been easily discomposed, but who by long practice in the Athenian assembly had overcome this difficulty, had now before him a different audience. He stood in the presence of the man whom he had so often reviled ; he saw him surrounded by all the symbols of strength and glory, and encircled by the Macedonian generals, who, unlike Philip, did not try to conceal their real sentiments. He began his speech, long before laboriously prepared ; but soon, overcome by his feelings, his language became more and more confused. In vain did Philip try to encourage the speaker. Demosthenes, discomfited the more, was forced to stop short, and thus the meeting was broken up.

Shortly after, Philip recalled the ambassadors, and replied to them with such wonderful readiness of speech and pres-

ence of mind as "to excite the admiration of all the envoys, Demosthenes among the rest." What Philip said we do not know. But it appears that the Athenians claimed Amphipolis, for which, although it was promised to them, they still continued waging war against Philip, so that the promise made could not well be carried out. Again, that an envoy on the part of Athens, the losing party, should now stand forward to demand from a victorious enemy the very place which formed the original cause of the war, and which had become far more valuable to Philip than when he first took it, was a pretension altogether preposterous.* Philip, having dismissed them in a friendly manner, sent a letter to the people of Athens, in which he stated that he was eager not only to make peace, but also to become an ally. At the same time, he decided to send ambassadors to Athens to conclude peace.

The ambassadors of the Athenians returned home on or about the first day of the month of Elaphebolion (March), 346 B. C., and not long after the embassy from Philip arrived. But, although Philip's letter was couched in very courteous language, he would grant no better terms than that each party should retain what it already held. The Athenians, seeing no hope of regaining their lost possessions, agreed to the peace. But the question now arose how to prevent Philip from marching into Hellas. Although the Athenians had lost much, they had at least saved their independence; but once let Philip enter Greece, and he would rule over it as supreme. It has been stated that the Thebans had called Philip to assist them in subduing the Phokians. The Athenians, therefore, ought to have found some way to prevent what they regarded as a great misfortune. But herein, indeed, they showed great lack of diplomacy. To debar Philip from entering Hellas, they should have removed the occasion for his entrance, the war between the Phokians and The-

* Grote, vol. xi, part ii, chap. lxxxix.

bans, and thus have rendered useless the appeal made to him by the latter. This would not have been difficult. Both combatants were wearied and exhausted. The Athenians should, no matter at what sacrifice, have put an end to this internal war; but hoping that, since peace had been declared between themselves and the king, he would not accept the appeal of the Thebans, they took no active measures for the suppression of the war. The hope was groundless. So long as the Sacred War continued, the king was not foolish enough to abandon the execution of his most earnest desire, that of obtaining a foothold in Hellas. He even refused, under any circumstances, to have the Phokians included in the treaty, and the Athenians were obliged to conclude it without them.

Thus peace was declared at Athens in March, 346 B. C., on the basis that both parties should retain their present possessions. The ambassadors of the Athenians then went to Philip, to receive his oath for the maintenance of the conditions agreed upon.

Meanwhile, Philip continued to enlarge his possessions in Thrace. According to agreement, he should have returned all the territory obtained after the treaty, and it was thus the imperative duty of the ambassadors to proceed with all possible speed to Philip. But, strange as it may seem, instead of hastening to Thrace, they delayed their departure from Athens for many days, and then proceeded slowly to Macedonia. At Pella they awaited in idleness the return of Philip, which did not take place until fifty days after the commencement of their journey. Finally, the ambassadors, after so long a delay of their own making, found themselves in the presence of Philip. There were also assembled the envoys of many other Hellenic states—Thebes, Sparta, Eubœa, and Phokis—all imbued with the belief that the future of Hellas depended upon the Macedonian king. They also saw him surrounded by a numerous and victorious army, just

returned from Thrace and ready to attempt any new expedition.

The Athenian ambassadors were divided in their opinion as to what should be done. Demosthenes maintained that they ought to demand the surrender of all that Philip had obtained since the oaths of his representatives. Æschines thought that, since Philip was about to enter Hellas, their first consideration should be the welfare of the Phokians. The question was a serious one, and after a long deliberation the ambassadors failed to agree. At last they decided that each should say to Philip what he thought best, and that the youngest should speak first. Philip took advantage of this dispute to prolong the discussion and to increase the dissension. In the mean time he advanced from Pella into Thessaly, followed by all the ambassadors, whom he treated equally well. On reaching Pheræ the representatives of the Athenians finally accepted his oath, from which, as has been said, the Phokians were declared excluded.

The events which took place at Athens on their return show that the frequent allegations of Demosthenes concerning the treason of his fellow ambassadors, and the treacherous promises of Philip, are, to say the least, exaggerated. The senate, of which Demosthenes was that year a member, appeared well disposed toward him. Although the protest of the orator against the conduct of his fellow ambassadors was not openly accepted, yet neither did the senate commend the ambassadors for their work, nor did it invite them to a banquet in the Prytaneium—an insult which Demosthenes characterizes as without precedent. The senate also voted that fifty triremes should be fitted out at once, for use in any emergency. But this resolution was not confirmed by the assembly of the people. This body, having heard Æschines, not only approved of the peace concluded, but added that, unless the Phokians should yield possession of the Delphian temple to the Amphiktyons, the people of Athens would

compel them to do so by armed intervention. More complete satisfaction could not have been given to the fellow ambassadors of Demosthenes.

End of the Phokian War.

Philip continued his march to the south, and soon reached Thessaly. There Phalækus, the general of the Phokians, was stationed with an army of eight to ten thousand hoplites and one thousand horsemen. Archidamus, king of Sparta, had also come to his assistance with one thousand Lacedæmonians. This force was amply sufficient to prevent the entrance of Philip, especially if the Athenians had given aid by sea. But the common opinion of Hellas was hostile to the sacrilegious Phokians, and well disposed toward the coming reorganizer of the temple. The Thebans threatened the army at Thermopylæ from the rear, and, the Athenians having declared themselves against the Phokians, Archidamus deemed it wise to retreat before the arrival of Philip, while Phalækus surrendered his position to the king, and himself departed under truce to the Peloponnesus.

Philip immediately called together the Amphiktyonic Council, which had not assembled for ten years—since the seizure of the temple by Philomelus. The Amphiktyons deprived the Phokians of their two votes and gave them to Philip, and also permitted him to lead henceforth the Pythian games in common with the Bœotians and Thessalians. The Amphiktyons also decided that all the cities of Phokis, twenty-two in number, except Abæ, whose inhabitants had taken no part in the sacrilege, should be turned into hamlets, their walls being destroyed; and that each hamlet should have no more than fifty houses, with a minimum distance of a furlong between the hamlets. They also decreed that as many of the Phokians as had shared in the sacrilege should be excommunicated, and that the rest should occupy their country, with the exception of a certain portion of the fron-

tier transferred to the Thebans, but with the proviso that they should pay annually to the temple a tribute of fifty talents, until the plundered treasures should all be made good.

CHAPTER III.

LAST DAYS OF PHILIP.

Preparations for the Asiatic Expedition.

THE succeeding events down to the battle of Chæroneia and the assembly at Corinth, related in the preceding part, are unimportant. In 337 B. C. Philip succeeded in the object which he had so long pursued, that of being proclaimed hegemon of Hellas in an expedition against Asia. The minute details of these events would also show the same zeal among the Athenians for opposing the influence of Philip, the same negligence in the accomplishment of their design, and the same inevitable failure ; in Philip, the same tenacity of purpose, the same tact in the execution of his plans, and the same final success. The future of Hellas was decided from the very day that Philip first set foot upon her soil. All the subsequent events, up to the battle of Chæroneia and the assembly at Corinth, were the unavoidable results of Philip's entrance into Hellas.

The king returned home from Corinth in 337 B. C., and made so many preparations for his intended expedition into Asia that he exhausted his accumulated treasures. At the same time he was engaged in military operations, and fought a severe battle against the Illyrian king Pleurias. In the spring of 336 he sent to Asia a portion of the Macedonian army under Parmenio and Attalus, to begin hostilities at once, until he himself should assume the command of the expedition.

Assassination of Philip.

But Philip was not fated to carry out that great undertaking. His nature was extremely passionate and excitable. Besides Olympias, he had successively taken several other wives, the last of whom, Kleopatra, niece of the Macedonian Attalus, persuaded him to send away Olympias, who is said to have possessed an irritable temperament. Olympias went to her brother in Epirus, and a dispute arose between the followers of the two queens, which was increased by the wrath of Alexander, son of Philip and Olympias, who expressed a strong resentment at the repudiation of his mother. How terrific were the passions aroused in the court of Philip is evident from an occurrence at the banquet which took place on the occasion of his marriage with Kleopatra. In the drunkenness of the symposium, Attalus proposed a toast and prayer that a *genuine successor* might be born to Philip and Kleopatra. Alexander, enraged at this, exclaimed, "Do you then proclaim me as illegitimate?" at the same time hurling a goblet at him. Philip rushed upon his son, sword in hand; but, blinded by rage and wine, he fell, and thus Alexander was saved from an untimely death.

After this, father and son were separated. Alexander accompanied his mother to Epirus, and then went himself to the king of the Illyrians. Some months afterward Philip recalled him, but another cause of dispute arose between them. This was the more unfortunate, since the expedition against Asia had already begun, and Philip, preparing to depart from Macedonia, justly feared lest Olympias might persuade her brother Alexander, king of Epirus, to overturn the present state of things during his absence. He deemed it therefore wise to ally himself with that king by a stronger link, and to this end he gave him in marriage Kleopatra, his daughter by Olympias. At the celebration of the nuptials in August, 336, many costly and splendid entertainments were given.

Philip wished on this occasion to celebrate the birthday of the son born to him by Kleopatra, and hoped that by flattering both parties he would put an end to the dissensions. But the savage passions which were probably excited to a great degree by his own fiery nature were not easily to be subdued.

Among the body-guard of the king was Pausanias, a noble young man, who had once been insulted by Attalus, the uncle of Kleopatra, and, not receiving justice at the hands of Philip, had resolved to murder him. He was urged to this act by the implacable enemies of Attalus and Kleopatra, and probably by Olympias herself, since she openly rejoiced at the result. The charge that Alexander connived at this murder is wholly without foundation. Philip, who knew nothing of the plot, walked radiant and untroubled toward the theatre, already crowded with spectators, when, on approaching the door, he was suddenly assassinated by Pausanias. The murderer at once sought to escape, but was seized and killed by Leonnatus and Perdikkas.

Philip's Position in History.

Thus died Philip, at the age of forty-seven, after a reign of twenty-three years. Concerning his manner of ruling and life, most antagonistic opinions have been advanced. That Philip was unrestrained in his passions, is evident from accounts well authenticated. Other facts justify the conclusion that he possessed that inspiration which we may term "genius," together with much refinement and nobility of sentiment. The king who gave to his son Aristotle for a teacher knew certainly how to judge and esteem the grandeur of intellectual superiority. The king who so much loved and admired Hellenic art and philosophy had certainly a consciousness of the beauty and loftiness of those works which still stand unequalled. The king who was frequently in a position to attack the city of Athens and inflict the severest

blows, yet always spared her and returned her captives without ransom, gave certainly conclusive evidence of his veneration and respect for the descendants of those men in whom is centered the imperishable renown of Hellenic civilization.

The life of Philip presents us with a picture of one of the greatest men in Hellenic history. When he ascended the throne, the Macedonian kingdom was a narrow territory around Pella, separated from the neighboring sea-coast by many autonomous Hellenic cities. When he died, his kingdom extended from the Propontis to the Ionian Sea and the Ambrakiot, Messenian, and Saronic gulfs. All the cities within these limits had recognized the dominion of the king; and only Sparta and a few mountaineers like the Ætoliens, who by the roughness of their country were enabled to preserve their liberty, were hardy enough to dispute his claims.

If Philip, whom Grote calls "the destroyer of freedom and independence in the Hellenic world," had sought simply to rule Hellas, he would have no title to our admiration. But he was not one of those common conquerors so often mentioned in history. Many ancient and a few modern critics do not accept this view, regarding him rather as a tyrant and the cause of countless misfortunes to Hellas. This opinion is so hostile to fact, that it is difficult to understand how it can prevail in our time. It is not surprising that the ancients believed it, because many of the writers of the epoch did not survive to see the great diffusion of civilization in Asia, and thus did not understand the near or distant results of the work. But that modern historians, having before their very eyes the Hellenism existing in historic Christianity, and the grand results which had so important a bearing on the fortunes of the Hellenic nation, should still hold the view of the subjection of Hellas and the overthrow of Hellenism by Philip, seems incomprehensible.

To confine ourselves, for instance, to Grote, the most prominent of modern historians, we find that he does not hesitate to compare the relations of Philip and Alexander to Hellas with those that existed between the Emperor Napoleon and the German contingents, especially those of the Confederation of the Rhine. As the Germans, he says, who had no public interest in the victory of the invader, were nevertheless compelled to serve him, so the Greeks were made to serve under Philip and Alexander. But did the great historian really mean this? The Germans certainly had no interest whatever in the subjugation of Spain, nor in that disastrous invasion of Russia in 1812. But is it true that the Hellenes were compelled by the Macedonian kings to march against Asia, though prompted by no inclination and actuated by no national, political, or social interest? Was not the conquest of Asia, from the heroic times downward, the one unfading dream of Hellenic nationality? Was not this the theme of their most ancient epic production? Did not Kimon for this very purpose erect his trophies at Eurymedon and Knidus? Did not the elder Thucydides counsel the same thing? Did not Agesilaus make the attempt? Did not the Athenian Isokrates constantly advise Philip to this course? And finally, did he not organize the expedition as the leader elected by the Hellenic nation for this very purpose? The idea of the conquest of Asia, therefore, was from the first entirely Hellenic, though its realization was due to Philip and Alexander. The conquest of Spain and Russia was wholly foreign to the interests of the Germanic nation, which was forced to cooperate in its achievement. But Hellas first of all sought to free the Hellenic cities of Asia from the yoke of the barbarians. Again, the numberless cities which Alexander and his successors established were colonized by Hellenes; were organized after the Hellenic political laws; were adorned by Hellenic artists; were governed by Hellenic generals; and produced Hellenic phi-

losophers, astronomers, geographers, grammarians, and orators, who alone would be sufficient to immortalize the name of the Hellenic people.

CHAPTER IV.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Consolidation of his Power.

ALEXANDER was born in July, 356 B. C. His principal teachers were Leonidas, a kinsman of Olympias, and an Akarnanian named Lysimachus. One of the first books that he read was the Iliad, to which he became devotedly attached, and a copy of which, corrected, as it is said, by Aristotle, he carried with him in his military campaigns.

At the age of thirteen his education was intrusted to Aristotle. Unfortunately, we do not definitely know what studies were taken up by Alexander. It is certain that for at least three years he continued with that teacher, to whom he became much attached. It is also known that he acquired great familiarity with the Hellenic tongue, and that in the midst of the constant wars and dangers of his Asiatic expeditions he never ceased to be delighted with the study of Hellenic philosophy and poetry.

At what age he began to take part in public affairs is not known. It is related that while still very young, during the absence of his father, he received the Persian ambassadors, and astonished them with the ease of his manners and the depth of his questions. In 340 B. C. Philip marched against Byzantium and Perinthus, and Alexander, though only sixteen years old, was left in charge of affairs in Macedonia. At that time he subdued a rebellion in a neighboring Thra-

cian tribe, took one of its towns, and founded it anew under the title of Alexandria. Two years later, in 338, he advanced with his father against Hellas, commanded under him at Chæroneia, and contributed to the victory by destroying the Sacred Band of the Thebans.

Notwithstanding the many disputes between father and son, Philip knew well the ability of Alexander, and with perfect confidence intrusted to him the most serious affairs.

After the murder of Philip, Alexander was surrounded with imminent dangers. Having buried his father with great magnificence, he instituted a strict inquisition for the punishment of all the guilty, and actually put many of them to death. There had prevailed in Macedonia so much anarchy that almost all the kings were compelled to secure the throne by measures of severity. Alexander, knowing that all the subject nations were ready to revolt, and that Hellas itself was much disturbed, deemed it imperative to rid himself of every internal opponent before putting into execution his plans of foreign conquest.

When the news of the death of Philip was received at Athens, there was an outbreak caused especially by Demosthenes, who represented his death as holding forth new hopes of freedom to the city. He eulogized the deed of Pausanias, insulted Alexander by calling him "boy" and "Margites" (the name of a silly character in one of the Homeric poems), and finally proposed that the people should make a sacrificial thanksgiving to the gods. There was also much disturbance in other Hellenic states.

When Alexander was informed of this crisis of affairs, he hastened to Hellas with a considerable army, within two months after the death of his father; thus giving evidence of his wonderful energy, and manifesting by deeds how much Demosthenes erred in insulting and despising him. The Thessalians received him kindly, and passed a decree granting to Alexander the hegemony of Hellas in place of his

father Philip, which decree was soon after confirmed by the Amphiktyonic Council. Alexander next came to Thebes, and thence passed over the isthmus of Corinth into the Peloponnesus, with no opposition. At Corinth he assembled a common council of the Greeks, which gave him, as it had done to Philip two years before, the hegemony of the expedition against Asia. The Lacedæmonians alone stood aloof, refusing all concurrence. Alexander certainly could easily have forced them to succumb, but did not deem it expedient to use violence against that single city, while all the rest willingly acknowledged his supremacy.

Affairs being thus arranged in Hellas, Alexander in the beginning of 335 B. C. returned to Macedonia, to complete the preparations for his expedition. Before crossing into Asia, however, he deemed it wise to secure his dominion against the Illyrians, Thracians, and Pæonians, who, although subject to Philip, were unwilling to yield allegiance to his successor until they should see actual evidence of his strength. In the spring of 335 he forced the passage of Mount Hæmus (Balkan), routed the strong tribe of the Triballi, reached in three days' journey the shores of the great river Ister (Danube), crossed it, and put to flight the tribes of the Getæ (chiefly horsemen armed with bows, analogous to the Thracians in habits and language), living on the opposite shore. He then recrossed the river, since his intention was not to extend his conquests in that direction, but simply to secure his dominion over Thrace. So great terror did his achievements inspire in the neighboring tribes, that many hastened to send presents and ambassadors to Alexander in order to secure his favor. After concluding peace with such a nation, he would again dash with incredible swiftness north, south, east, or west, finally bringing into complete subjection every people that appeared indisposed to obey him.

Destruction of Thebes.

He had hardly accomplished these successes when, in August, 335, he received news from Hellas that the Thebans had revolted, and were besieging his garrison in the Kadmeia. Nations lose their power much more readily than their customs and rights. The Hellenic communities still clung to their ancient independence, and availed themselves of every project that might tend to its restoration. The absence of Alexander lit up anew the hope of independence. Men in such circumstances are ever ready to believe that which is propitious to their wishes, and the report prevailed that Alexander had been defeated and killed. The Thebans therefore at once revolted, and sent ambassadors to the other Hellenic states, seeking assistance to overthrow the Macedonian dynasty. But the rest of the Greeks confined themselves to promises; excepting the Arkadians, who sent auxiliaries, who, however, did not advance farther than the isthmus. Thus the Thebans were left to their own resources, and alone besieged the Macedonian garrison in the Kadmeia, when suddenly the report fell upon their camp like a thunderbolt that Alexander with his victorious army had arrived at Onchestus in Bœotia. This seemed so incredible that at first the leaders of the revolution maintained that this Alexander was another person altogether, and not the son of Philip.

Unfortunately for the Thebans, the enemy now marching against them was that same Alexander, who three months before had defeated the barbarians at the river Ister, and who within fifteen days had shattered near Lake Lychnitis the armies of Kleitus and Glaukias. The amazing rapidity with which, like a mighty flood, the army had poured into Hellas, evinced the completeness of the military organization of Macedonia and the unequalled energy of the general.

Alexander did not wish the destruction of the Thebans. He declared a general amnesty, and promised to keep the

agreement sworn in the preceding autumn, on condition that they would surrender to him Phœnix and Prochytes, the leaders of the anti-Macedonian party. But the Thebans had made up their minds "to perish with the freedom of their city." Compromise became impossible, and a fierce combat ensued, for the Thebans fought with desperation; but the city was finally captured. The Macedonians, who were wellnigh infuriated over the loss of five hundred of their fellow soldiers, spared neither old men, women, nor children, and six thousand were slaughtered. The Plataeans, Phokians, and the other Greeks who had aided Alexander in reducing the city, clamored now for the complete extermination of Thebes. Their request was granted. Thirty thousand captives were collected, all of whom are said to have been sold into slavery; and the city was leveled to the ground, with the exception of the house of Pindar and the Kadmeia, in which a garrison was left.

Visit to Corinth and Delphi.

The Athenians were horrified at the calamity of the wretched city. They hastened, however, to send ambassadors to appease the wrath of the king, who, already repenting his severe punishment of the Thebans, granted their request. He asked of them only the banishment of Charidemus and Ephialtes, the two anti-Macedonian military leaders, who passed into Asia, where they took service under Darius.

Affairs having been thus settled with the Athenians, that city continued under Macedonian rule. Without visiting Attica, Alexander marched to the isthmus, where he received the representatives of the various cities, heard their assurances of submission, and specified the force that each should send during the coming spring for his expedition to Asia.

Then also occurred the famous interview with Diogenes of Sinope, who resided at Corinth. While so many politicians and scholarly men flocked thither to salute the king,

that Cynic philosopher alone took no interest whatever in the greatness of the man, and did not even wish to see him. Alexander therefore went to Diogenes, who happened to be lying in the sun. Seeing so many men crowded about him, he raised himself a little, when Alexander asked him if he needed anything. "Only stand aside from my sunshine," replied Diogenes. Those about Alexander laughed on hearing the answer, but the independent character of the man so impressed the king that he said, "If I were not Alexander, I should wish to be Diogenes."*

He next visited the temple at Delphi, and, receiving a propitious oracle in regard to his intended expedition, he departed from Hellas, which he was never again destined to see. In the autumn of 335 he returned to Pella, and occupied himself throughout the following spring with his preparations. He also instituted magnificent sacrifices to the gods, and scenic contests in honor of Zeus and the Muses.

Entry into Asia.

The Persian empire, which had been nearly paralyzed, had now recovered, and seemed capable of offering a stubborn resistance. Artaxerxes II, surnamed Mnemon, who had killed his brother Cyrus at Kunaxa, died in 359 B. C., and was succeeded by his son Artaxerxes, surnamed Ochus. The latter was poisoned (338 B. C.) by a satrap of high rank named Bagoas, who placed upon the throne Arses, one of the king's sons, killing all the rest. Two years later this same Bagoas put to death Arses, together with all his children, and proclaimed as king Darius Codomannus, descended from one of the brothers of Artaxerxes Mnemon. Darius showed himself in many respects a man of energy and action. His rule was recognized throughout the empire, which was now united and could make common cause against an enemy.

* Plutarch, "Alexander."

In the beginning of 334 Alexander, having completed his preparations, was ready to pass into Asia. He appointed Antipater, one of the oldest and ablest officers of Philip, to act as viceroy of Macedonia. An army of twelve thousand infantry and fifteen hundred cavalry was left with him, to quell disturbances and oppose any attack of the Persian fleet.

Alexander led the army intended for Asia from Pella into Amphipolis, crossed the river Strymon, and continued his march through Thrace until he reached Sestos. Here he found his fleet, which consisted of two hundred and sixty triremes, many transport-vessels, and other ships, sent by the various Hellenic cities, and especially by Athens. The passage from Sestos in Europe to Abydos in Asia was accomplished without accident, and was under the surveillance of Parmenio, as Alexander had gone to the landing-place near Ilium called the harbor of the Achæans, in order to make sacrifice to the prominent heroes of the Trojan war. He visited the tomb of Achilles, and is said to have exclaimed, "O fortunate hero, who while living didst obtain so faithful a friend, and who in death hast found so grand a herald of thy achievements!" As a lasting memorial of his passage, Alexander erected somewhere on the point of Europe which his army had quitted, and on that of Asia where it landed, altars in honor of Zeus, Athene, and Herakles.

CHAPTER V.

BATTLES OF GRANIKUS AND ISSUS.

The Opposing Armies.

THE Macedonian army was composed of 30,000 infantry and 4,500 cavalry. The phalanx and hypaspists consisted of 12,000 men, the allied infantry of 7,000, and the mercenaries

of 5,000, all under command of Parmenio. In addition there were 6,000 light-armed barbarians. Next came the heavy Macedonian and Thessalian cavalry (the former under command of Philotas, son of Parmenio, and the latter under Kallas, son of Harpalus), each numbering 1,500, and the light-armed Hellenic, under Erigyus, to the number of 600, as well as 900 light Thracian and Pæonian horse, under Kassander. This is nearly the exact force of Alexander; for, although other numbers are mentioned, even the highest statements do not give more than 43,000 infantry and 5,500 cavalry. The king had with him also an effective train of projectile machines and engines for battles and sieges.

From the outset Alexander's resources both in men and money seemed ill adapted for the undertaking. His treasury was nearly empty, containing not more than seventy talents, while some affirm that he had no more than would maintain his forces one month. He succeeded in completing his preparations only by borrowing eight hundred talents, which added to the five hundred that Philip had previously borrowed swelled the public debt of Macedonia to eight millions of ancient drachmæ, or fifty millions of modern. Thus the means with which Alexander sought the conquest of Asia appear insignificant when we bear in mind the army which one hundred and fifty years before Xerxes led against Hellas. But poverty was perhaps the mainspring of victory, as Alexander himself had shown. It is said that when about to sail from Europe he distributed to his friends almost all the estates of the crown. Perdikkas, one of his most prominent generals, asked him, "What do you leave for yourself, O king?" to which he replied, "Hope."

But the greatest source of power to the Hellenic army was the military genius of its commander. Many deny to him the ability of a statesman, while acknowledging that as a warrior he never had an equal. His daring was such that many called it rashness; his indefatigable energy and his

endurance of toil and hardship seemed to surpass the measure of human strength. Such virtues in a king, since they act powerfully on the multitude about him, are often in themselves sufficient to accomplish the most glorious achievements. But Alexander was not only a born soldier, he was also a most accomplished general. His military plans, his surpassing skill in using his heterogeneous forces for the accomplishment of his projects, his constant foresight, his broad military conceptions, that superhuman power with which he ever mastered incessant difficulties, the quickness of his movements in every country and on every occasion, proclaim him the greatest not only of ancient generals, but the greatest of all commanders. Such a hegemon was certainly equal to many armies. Such was his greatness that it has never found a historian equal to the task of representing it. Not only his contemporaries, but even modern authorities and whole nations, have deemed Alexander the possessor of a superhuman nature, whose achievements really overstep the limits of speech and art. This is the reason why he has never been delineated in a manner worthy of his deeds. Nor is it difficult to understand how the Macedonian army, though small, was persuaded that it could accomplish all things. In fact, it dared and performed actions such as were never before achieved.

The first and fatal mistake of the Persians was in not opposing the passage of Alexander into Asia. Had their fleet, which was more powerful than the Hellenic, been concentrated in the Hellespont, they perhaps would have averted the threatened danger. But another and equally unpardonable blunder was committed. When Alexander landed in Asia, a large Persian force was assembled near Zeleia in Hellespontine Phrygia, commanded by distinguished Persian officers, and composed, as reported by Arrian, of 20,000 horse and 20,000 infantry, among which latter were many Greek mercenaries. Diodorus estimates the Persian force

at 10,000 cavalry and 100,000 infantry, while Justin places it as high as 600,000. The numbers of Arrian are, as Grote remarks, the more credible ; in those of Diodorus the total of infantry is certainly much above the truth—that of cavalry probably below it. Memnon the Rhodian was with this army, and he endeavored to persuade the Persians not to risk an open battle, but to retreat into the interior, laying waste the land, and if necessary destroying even the towns themselves, thus raising difficulties for the invader ; and at the same time to transfer the war into Europe, by landing there a large Persian force to attack Alexander in his own country, and to encourage active hostility against him on the part of the Greeks and other neighbors. The ignorance, haughtiness, and selfishness of the Persian officers rendered this plan futile. Rejecting Memnon's advice, they decided to await Alexander on the banks of the river Granikus.

The Battle at the Granikus.

This rivulet, which is mentioned in the Iliad and immortalized by the battle fought on its banks, takes its rise from one of the heights of Mount Ida near Skepsis, and flows northward into the Propontis.* It is not deep, and was fordable at many points where the Persians were encamped. But its right shore, upon which the Greeks wished to debouch, was high and craggy ; hence the crossing was not easy. The Persians occupied the eastern side of the Granikus, near Adrasteia, a Hellenic city, situated between Priapus and Parium, also Greek cities.

Alexander, starting from Arisbe, where for the last time he had reviewed his army, came on the fourth day to the Granikus, in careful order, with his main phalanx in double file, his cavalry on each wing, and the baggage in the rear. Reaching the river, he at once drew up his army in battle array. Parmenio had advised that the battle should be post-

* Strabo.

poned until the next day ; but the king, knowing, like Memnon, that he had all the chances in a pitched battle in his favor, resolved not to give the Persians an opportunity of retreating during the night.

Alexander stationed in the midst of his array six *taxeis* or divisions of his phalanx, which were commanded (reckoning from right to left) by Perdikkas, Kænus, Amyntas, Philippus, Meleager, and Kraterus. Immediately on the right of the phalanx were stationed the hypaspists, under Nikanor, son of Parmenio ; then the *sarissophori* (the light-horse or lancers), the Pæonians, and the Apolloniate squadron of Companion-cavalry, commanded by the Ilarch Sokrâtes, all under Amyntas, son of Arrhibæus ; lastly, the body of the Hetæri or Companion-cavalry, the bowmen, and the Agrianian darters, all under Philotas, son of Parmenio, his division forming the extreme right. The left of the phalanx was also strengthened by three divisions of cavalry : first, the Thracians, under Agathon ; next, the cavalry of the allies, under Philippus, son of Menelaus ; lastly, the Thesalian cavalry, under Kallas, whose division formed the extreme left. Alexander himself assumed the command of the right wing, and committed that of the left to Parmenio.

On the opposite shore of the Granikus was drawn up the Persian cavalry : the Medes and Baktrians on the right, under Rheomithres ; the Paphlagonians and Hyrkanians in the center, under Arsites and Spithridates ; while on the left were Memnon and Arsamenes with their divisions. The infantry, both Persian and Hellenic, was stationed a short distance in the rear as a reserve guard, since the enemy wished to oppose their horse to the passage of Alexander.

Drawn up in this way, the two armies stood in silence facing each other. Since at that day neither fire nor smoke disturbed or darkened the objects between the opponents, each from his respective position could see distinctly the movements taking place in the opposite line. The Persians,

accordingly, easily distinguished Alexander on the right of the Macedonian army, both by the splendor of his equipment and the respect shown to him by all. Hence the most eminent of the Persian generals hastened to their own left, which they strengthened by the best of their cavalry, in order to oppose him personally. Alexander, having encouraged his army with a few words, ordered them to advance. First came the squadron of Companion-cavalry, commanded on this day by Ptolemy, son of Philippus, closely followed by the light-horse or lancers, the Pæonian darters (infantry), and one division of regularly armed infantry, seemingly hypaspists. Next Alexander himself led the right wing into the river, and immediately Parmenio hurried on with the left. The foremost body, under Ptolemy and Amyntas, had already met with a strong resistance. The Macedonians fought with all the might of desperation to cut a passage through the Persian cavalry, but without success. Fighting from below, upon unfavorable ground, against the best of the Persian cavalry, the van was repulsed with loss, and wheeled toward the main body led by Alexander. On the king's approach to the shore the contest was renewed with greater fierceness. Alexander dashed forward in the face of the enemy's arrows, in spite of the steep banks lined with cavalry, and of the rapidity of the river, which often bore him down or covered him with its waves. The battle, though a conflict on horseback, resembled rather an infantry combat, because the men fought horse to horse and face to face, the Macedonians striving to drive the Persians back into the plain, and the Persians straining every nerve to prevent their landing. Finally Alexander reached the bank, owing his success principally to the long Macedonian spear, which was much more effective than the short Persian *palton* or missile javelin.

The combat was now transferred from the river to the adjacent plain. Here Alexander placed himself among the foremost. His pike was shattered, and turning to Aretis,

one of his mounted body-guard, he asked for another. The latter held up his half-broken weapon, but at this instant the Corinthian Demaratus, one of the Companion-cavalry close at hand, handed to the king his own. Thus armed anew, Alexander dashed again toward Mithridates, son-in-law of Darius, who at the head of a large body of cavalry was coming directly against him. Laying Mithridates dead at his feet, he turned at once upon another Persian leader, who had struck him a slight blow on the helmet, and pierced him to the heart. But at that very moment a Persian officer, Spithridates, approaching in the rear, had already raised his arm and sword to kill him, when Kleitus, son of Dropides—one of the old officers of Philip, high in the Macedonian service—rushed forth and struck the raised arm, severing it entirely from the body, and saving the life of the king. The death of Spithridates infuriated the Persians still further, and all assailed Alexander, who received many blows upon his armor. His friends at the greatest hazard rescued the king. The ranks of the Persian cavalry were broken, and their flight became general. Alexander and his officers did not allow a long pursuit, because the Persian infantry, stationed behind the cavalry, still remained intact, looking without movement, because without orders, on the engagement which had just terminated.

The king next directed the phalanx and hypaspists to attack the infantry in front, and the cavalry to surround it on all sides. The issue of this latter engagement was not doubtful; and although the infantry, composed to a great extent of Greek mercenaries, fought bravely, it was quickly overthrown and mercilessly butchered. If the statement of Arrian is to be credited, out of the twenty thousand men composing this force, only two thousand escaped death. The loss of the cavalry was relatively small, only one thousand having fallen; but many prominent Persians were slain while daringly exposing their lives.

This great victory of Alexander was attended with but slight loss. Twenty-five fell in the first unsuccessful attempt to pass the river. In addition sixty of the other cavalry were slain, and thirty of the infantry. The number of wounded is not mentioned; but if we suppose them ten times as numerous as the dead, the Macedonian army lost in all less than thirteen hundred, while of the enemy about twenty thousand fell.

Alexander took care of the wounded, visiting them in person, consoling and praising them. On the day following he interred the dead with great military pomp, and ordered the burial of the Persian leaders and the mercenary Greeks who had died fighting in behalf of the enemy. After this he provided for the rewards and punishments. Lysippus, the famous statuary, then flourished in Hellas, and to him alone would Alexander accord the honor of constructing his statue. Alexander ordered him to prepare twenty-five brazen statues of those who first died in this battle, and commanded that they should be placed at Dium in Macedonia. To their parents and children he gave immunity from every tax, and freedom from every personal service. He thought that he could not honor himself and his victorious army more than by sending to Athens three hundred Persian panoplies, to be dedicated to Athene in the Acropolis, with this inscription: "Alexander, son of Philip, and the Hellenes except the Lacedæmonians, out of the spoils of the barbarians inhabiting Asia." He sent the two thousand captive Greeks in chains to Macedonia, to work as slaves, "in accordance with the decision of the Hellenes, because they, being Greeks, fought against Hellas in behalf of the barbarians." Thus he did not cease to declare his work to be purely Hellenic.

Such were the the rewards and punishments decreed by Alexander after this decisive victory. But the greatest recompense which the army received was that it became master

of nearly all Asia Minor. No other force was sufficiently strong to oppose it. Darius had, as it seems, espoused the opinion of Memnon, and hoped that, should the war be prolonged, Alexander would be obliged to retreat. Hence he did not prepare another army, nor did he make haste to concentrate his military resources in the neighboring countries of Syria and Mesopotamia. And yet the news of the terrible disaster soon reached him : the news that most of his relatives and many prominent Persians had fallen in battle ; the news that many of them were struck down by Alexander's own hand, and that that hero, endangering himself everywhere, appeared invested with some unconquerable power. If to-day, after the lapse of so many centuries, we still admire his superhuman courage and daring, it is evident that the impression which it made upon the imagination of his contemporaries was much more astounding, and that the court of Darius, which had to mourn the loss of so many friends and relatives, sank at first into extreme despondency.

Conquests in Asia Minor.

Alexander hastened with wonderful energy to avail himself of the fear his achievement had caused. The commandant of the citadel at Sardis surrendered to him at once that important fortification. Alexander then hastened against Ephesus, which he also occupied without battle, because the Persian garrison escaped by sea on hearing of his advance. He restored to all the Hellenic cities taken by him their democratic governments and their ancient laws. Having captured Miletus after a vain resistance on the part of the Persian fleet, he proceeded to the south against Halikarnassus. The siege of that city was much longer and more laborious ; not only because the garrison, composed of Asiatics and Athenians, fought bravely, not only because the fortifications were very strong, but also because the defenders received succor from the powerful Persian naval force

under Memnon, now proclaimed by Darius the hegemon of lower Asia and of all the fleet. The siege of Halikarnassus was in fact the most arduous enterprise which Alexander had yet undertaken. His repeated assaults were repelled, many of his machines were burned, and the Macedonian loss was heavy. But again the king succeeded by his perseverance, art, and courage, and victoriously entered the city.

Alexander, deeming it unprofitable to waste time here, left Ptolemy with a force of three thousand men to guard the place, while he himself pressed forward. After sending his artillery to Tralles, which Parmenio had already seized, he ordered this general to proceed, with a large portion of the cavalry, the allied infantry, and the baggage-wagons, to Sardis, and thence to Phrygia. Alexander occupied himself during the last winter months in the conquest of Lykia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia. After accomplishing this difficult work, he turned to the north, and came to Gordium on the river Sangarius, where Parmenio was directed to meet him, and where his winter campaign was concluded.

The Gordian Knot.

Alexander reached Gordium about February or March, 333 B. C., and remained there for some time to rest that division of the army which had endured such severe toil in Pisidia. While at Gordium he performed the celebrated act of cutting the Gordian knot. There was in that city, under careful guard, an ancient wagon of rude construction, which according to tradition had once belonged to the farmer Gordius and his son Midas, the primitive rustic kings of Phrygia. The cord serving to unite the loop of the yoke with the pole, made of fibers from the bark of the cornel-tree, was so complex that neither end nor beginning could be distinguished, and to untie it was deemed impossible. An ancient oracle declared that whoever should undo the knot would become the conqueror of Asia. When Alexander

visited this sacred remnant of antiquity, all the Phrygians and Macedonians about him anxiously waited to see if the conqueror of the Granikus and Halikarnassus would overcome this new difficulty. At first Alexander was much perplexed, but finally, with his natural impetuosity, he cut the knot in two with his sword—an act which all declared to be a solution of the problem which secured his right to the supremacy of Asia.

Death of Memnon.

Fortune, however, was preparing for him a much more positive advantage. After the capture of Miletus, Alexander had sent away his fleet, keeping only a small portion for the transportation of provisions and of his army. He did this because he saw that on the sea he could not contend with his powerful enemy, and because he believed that for occupying Asia he would have no need of naval forces, and that by taking the sea-coast towns he would necessarily cause the destruction of the Persian fleet. But in the beginning of 333 B. C. he ran the risk of losing all that he had possessed in anticipation.


After the capture of Halikarnassus, Memnon attempted, by the aid of his powerful fleet, to rule over the islands in the Ægean, and to transfer the war to Hellas and Macedonia. He had already become master of Chios and Lesbos, and had had friendly communications with many other islands, when suddenly he became sick and died. Thus an attempt was frustrated which might have materially interfered with the expedition. There were certainly many other brave men, both Greeks and Persians; but no one of the Persians had the naval and political experience of Memnon, and perhaps no one of the Greeks could have obtained the confidence of Darius so fully as this Rhodian had done by many faithful services. The king of the Persians, having no longer that counselor in whom he had every confidence,

decided to abandon the defensive system of war, which by his advice he had thus far maintained, and prepared to contend in open field with the Macedonians.


Battle of Issus.

The force which Darius had collected on the plains of Mesopotamia was suited by its immense numbers to encourage all the Asiatics. Although the contingents from Sogdiana, Baktria, and India had not yet arrived, this army was composed already, according to some, of 400,000 infantry and 100,000 cavalry, and according to others of 600,000 men, among whom were between 20,000 and 30,000 Grecian mercenaries. Every one prognosticated a certain victory, and Darius himself was confident of a favorable issue. But an experienced soldier could easily detect the weakness of this multitude. Such a one was found, and he courageously expressed his opinion. This man was Charidemus, an Athenian fugitive, who, being asked by the great king what he thought of his numberless army, unhesitatingly replied that he advised Darius not to hope much from this Asiatic multitude, but to use his treasures rather for the mustering of a larger Hellenic force. Darius, drunk with empty hopes of victory and glory, and supported in his baseless opinion by the blind and haughty generals about him, deemed the answer insolent and treacherous, and at once ordered the unfortunate Greek to be put to death. The latter on his way to execution prophetically cried, "The king will soon repent of this, and will speedily receive his deserts, when he beholds the downfall of his kingdom."

Darius, therefore, decided to fight with Alexander in the open field. While hitherto fortune had continued to smile on the leader of the Greeks, at Tarsus it suddenly abandoned him, either because of the incessant dangers to which he had exposed himself, or because while in a perspiration he threw himself into the river Kydnus, and thus contracted a danger-



**THE BATTLE
OF
ISSUS
B.C. 333**



ous fever. Worst of all, in the midst of the sorrow and uneasiness which was spread throughout the army by this event, the physicians hesitated to undertake the responsibility of curing him. But Philippus the Akarnanian, an old friend of Alexander's and much esteemed by him for his knowledge, promised to save the king by a powerful purgative draught, and Alexander commanded the medicine to be prepared. Just before taking it he received a letter from Parmenio, in which he was advised to guard himself against Philippus, because it was said that the latter, bribed by the money of Darius, was plotting to kill him. The king read the letter and placed it under his pillow, showing it to no one. Presently Philippus entered, holding the medicine. Alexander took it, swallowed it without remark, and at the same time gave the letter to Philippus and scrutinized the expression of his countenance. The eyes, the words, the appearance, the gestures of the physician—everything bespoke his innocence; and as he indignantly denied the accusation, Alexander repeated again his complete belief in the salutary results of the medicine. At first, owing to the strength of the remedy, the king's condition grew worse; but finally the fever ceased, and joy pervaded the whole army on hearing that he was out of danger. A few days were sufficient for his vigorous frame to regain its former health and strength.

His first proceeding after recovery was to dispatch Parmenio, at the head of the Greeks, Thessalians, and Thracians, to secure the pass called the Gates of Kilikia and Syria. At the same time Alexander occupied himself in mastering some mountainous tribes of Kilikia. Next he pushed on to Mallus, a city which he freed from all tribute, as being a colony of the Argeians. It was here that he received the first reports concerning the immense army of Darius, who was said to be waiting at Sochi in Syria, on the eastern side of Mount Amanus, about two days' march from the mountain-pass now

called Beylan. Accordingly, Alexander hastened against him, and passed through Issus, where he left some sick and wounded with a moderate guard. Next he crossed through the Gates of Kilikia and Syria, and thence, after two days' march, reached the seaport Myriandrus, the first town of Syria or Phœnicia.

Here he received accounts utterly at variance with the former, and was compelled to make an entire change in his plans. The Persian army had marched away from Sochi, and was already in Kilikia, in the rear of the Macedonians, near Issus. How could Darius, who, having arrayed his numerous army on the plains of Syria, had decided to fight in the open field, suddenly change his mind and march into the narrow defiles which he had permitted Alexander but recently to leave? Darius, with his sixty myriads of men, regarded himself as unconquerable. Having heard that Alexander was detained at Tarsus by sickness, and was also waiting there to subdue the mountainous tribes of Kilikia, he imagined these delays to be evidences of hesitation and cowardice. Thus blinded, he paid no heed to the advice of the Greek officers in his service, and decided not to await his opponent, but to meet him in the narrow passes of Kilikia. To this end he crossed Mount Amanus, but not by the same passage as the Macedonians. Two narrow roads lead over the mountain, one on the south and the other on the north. While the Macedonians were crossing by the southern passage in order to attack Darius on the plain, the latter pushed through the northern passage into Kilikia to meet the Macedonians there. The Persian king had with him his mother, wife, and household, and a large amount of treasure, although much of the latter had been sent to Damascus in Syria. On reaching Issus he put to death the sick and wounded of the Macedonians, and encamped near the river Pinarus. Darius did nothing for the present, except to complete the tale of his many military mistakes. Having left the Gates of Kili-

kia and Syria unguarded, he suddenly abandoned his former resolution of contending on the plains of Syria, where he could use his immense army and excellent cavalry to advantage, and determined to fight Alexander in the narrow passes of Kilikia, where his immense force would be nearly useless; thus practically obliterating the numerical disparity of the two armies, while in quality the Macedonian soldiers were by far the better of the two.

It is not strange that Alexander, on hearing of this movement of Darius, did not at first credit it, until he was assured by his own scouts. Then the king, calling his generals, announced to them the coming contest, explained the mistakes of Darius, and reminded the Greeks that they were to contend again for the common interests of Hellas, while their countrymen assisting Darius fought merely for pay. He recalled to their memory the achievement of the ten thousand under Xenophon, who were without cavalry, and assured them of certain victory. All applauded, and begged to be led at once against the enemy.

Alexander was about eighteen miles distant from the Persians. Departing on the same evening, he reached at midnight the gates through which he had passed two days before. Once more becoming master of this stronghold, he halted his army for the remainder of the night, to allow them the needful repose, and about daybreak moved forward against Darius.

As he approached the river Pinarus, which flowed across the pass, he drew up his army in battle array. On the extreme right were stationed the hypaspists; next, reckoning from right to left, five taxeis or divisions of the phalanx, under Kœnus, Perdikkas, Meleager, Ptolemy, and Amyntas. Kraterus had the command of these last three divisions on the left, and was himself subject to the orders of Parmenio, who held the supreme command of the entire left. The breadth of the plain between the mountain on the right and

the sea on the left was only about fourteen stadia, or somewhat more than an English mile and a half. Alexander, however, fearing lest he should be surrounded by the vast hordes of his opponents, ordered Parmenio not to withdraw from the neighborhood of the sea, and at the same time stationed the Companions, together with the Thessalian cavalry and the larger portion of the light-armed infantry, on the right, while he sent to Parmenio on the left all the light cavalry and the Thracian and Kretan light infantry.

Darius decided to fight where he was encamped, behind the river Pinarus, the shores of which were more or less precipitous. He transported to the other side of the river a force of thirty thousand cavalry and twenty thousand infantry. Next he filled the breadth between the mountains and the sea with ninety thousand hoplites, thirty thousand of whom were Greeks holding the center, flanked on each side by thirty thousand Asiatics, called Kardakes, armed as hoplites. On the heights to the left were stationed twenty thousand infantry, to attack the right and rear of Alexander. The main body of the army, owing to the narrowness of the road, was rendered useless, their divisions being heaped together in a disorderly mass in the rear of the Greeks. But when the line was formed, Darius again ordered the thirty thousand horse and twenty thousand infantry which he had sent across the Pinarus to recross the river; they were finally stationed on the right wing, where was accordingly assembled the best Persian cavalry. Darius himself stood on a chariot in the center of the line, behind the Greek hoplites.

Alexander succeeded in distinguishing the exact position of the enemy only after the retreat of the Persian covering detachment, which for some time obscured his view. Then he deemed it best to make certain changes, and, above all, to establish an equality between his front and that of the Persians.

The position of Alexander was certainly superior to that of Darius ; but as there was clustered near the river a Persian force three times as large, and much of this consisted of Grecian hoplites, the strife bade fair to be bloody. Owing, however, to the cowardice of Darius, the Persian army was destined to meet with a speedy overthrow. Alexander, after a short rest, advanced at a slow pace, supposing that the enemy would be the first to cross the river and attack. Seeing them motionless on the other side, he continued to advance, and when within a bowshot, taking the cavalry, hypaspists, and divisions of the phalanx on the right, he quickened his step, crossed the river, and dashed like a thunderbolt against the Kardakes on the Persian left. They were soon put to flight, and Darius, supposing that he was in extreme danger, was seized with a panic, and immediately followed in the track of the foremost fugitives. The battle had hardly commenced. Most of the army was still stationary, including sixty thousand hoplites, one hundred thousand cavalry, and many myriads of infantry ; all their opponents did not number more than thirty thousand, and the pursuers were less than half that number. But Darius was seized with uncontrollable fear. Meeting with narrow passes, he jumped from his chariot, and continued his flight on his horse, casting away his bow, shield, and royal mantle.

The result of this base cowardice it is almost superfluous to describe. The center and the right of the Persians, where stood the Greek mercenaries and the best of the Persian horse, held their ground courageously as long as they supposed Darius to be present. The Greek mercenaries especially fought so desperately that the general of the attacking division, Ptolemy, son of Seleukus, with one hundred and twenty of the front-rank men or choice phalangites, remained upon the field. But as soon as Alexander had completed the defeat of the left wing, he fell upon the flank of the Greek mercenaries, at the same time that the report spread through-

out the host that Darius had disappeared from the field of battle. Then both the center and the right wing of the Persians were put to flight. The defeat was complete and destructive, since Darius had taken no care to give orders in case of retreat, and no one dared to assume the chief command ; nor, indeed, would any one have been obeyed, or so much as listened to, if he had presumed to issue orders to the deserted army.

The pursuit was not of long duration, since the battle was fought in the month of November, and commenced in all probability late in the afternoon, so that the gathering darkness compelled Alexander to return to the camp. Nevertheless, the booty and the destruction were great. The camp of Darius, his mother, his wife, his sister, his infant son, and two daughters, fell into the hands of the victor. The booty included his chariot, his shield and his bow, and a sum of three thousand talents in gold, together with much furniture. A hundred thousand of the Persians are said to have perished, besides ten thousand horses, and a large number of Persian grandees. Out of that immense army that had crossed the Euphrates with Darius, only four thousand Persians and eight thousand Greek mercenaries kept their ranks, and these, partly by land and partly by sea, succeeded in escaping to Egypt. All the remaining multitude disappeared like a scudding rack before the fury of a violent wind. The Hellenic army lost only three hundred foot and one hundred and fifty horse.

Such was the battle of Issus, and such were the results of the repeated mistakes of Darius—most of all of that ignoble cowardice, which seemed the more strange, since the Persian commanders were usually noted for their bravery, and Darius himself, before he attained the sovereignty, was distinguished for his daring. But the touch of the scepter, as often happens with weak souls, had enfeebled and degraded the man.

CHAPTER VI.

FURTHER VICTORIES OF ALEXANDER.

Darius submits Propositions of Peace.

ALEXANDER, who proved himself a great general in this battle, afterward showed himself equally remarkable for the philanthropy and virtue with which he behaved toward the mother, wife, and children of his opponent. Returning in the night from the pursuit, he found the tent of the great king prepared to receive him. But before supping he heard in an inner compartment the weeping and wailing of women; and on learning that the wife and mother of Darius were lamenting for him whom they supposed dead, he hastened to send one of his friends to assure them that Darius lived, and to add that the desire of Alexander was that they should retain their royal escort and the title of queens. Another part of his behavior to them, says Plutarch, was still more noble and princely. Though they were now captives, he considered that they were ladies, not only of high rank, but of great modesty and virtue, and took care that they should not hear an insulting word, nor have the least cause to suspect any danger to themselves. Nay, as if they had been in a holy temple, or an asylum of virgins, rather than in an enemy's camp, they lived unseen and unapproached, in the most sacred privacy.

At that time Alexander was at his greatest moral height; and since he was also at the very acme of that manly beauty with which nature had lavishly adorned him, this union of beauty, strength, and virtue invested him with that air of majesty which the nations conquered by him so eagerly adored, confounding it with all that is venerable in deity.

On the day following the battle, although he was himself

wounded, he nevertheless visited the wounded soldiers according to his custom, and ordered the dead to be buried with great military honors. Next he marched through Kœle-Syria to the Phœnician coast, and dispatched Parmenio to Damascus, which he easily occupied, seizing there much treasure and not a few captives. Alexander also occupied without resistance the first Phœnician towns. In one of these, Marathus, he received ambassadors and a letter from Darius, asking for the return of his mother, wife, and children, offering friendship and alliance, as from one king to another, and asserting that Philip had commenced hostilities against the Persians, that Alexander had continued them, and that Darius fought only in self-defense. Alexander hastened to give to this letter this most characteristic reply :

“Your ancestors invaded Macedonia and the rest of Hellas, and inflicted injuries on us, without provocation on our part. I, the hegemon of the Hellenes, wishing to punish the Persians for their unjust dealings, crossed into Asia. Again, you have assisted our enemies the Perinthians, and made war against the Thracians, whom we control. You have compassed the death of my father (as you in your letters have boasted), and have killed Arses and Bagoas. Having also unlawfully seized the sovereignty, you have unjustly treated the Persians, and sent hostile letters to the Hellenes concerning me, instigating them to revolt, and forwarded for the accomplishment of this purpose money to the Lacedæmonians and to all the other Greeks. Again, your ambassadors bribed my friends and attempted to violate the peace which I concluded with the Hellenes. I have therefore marched against you, since you began hostilities. But now that I have conquered you, and as many as were arrayed with you in battle, and hold your country with the aid of the gods, and am master of all Asia, come without fear to me. But if you are afraid lest you may suffer anything from me, send some one of your friends to receive pledges

from me. When you come to me, ask me and you shall receive back your mother and wife and anything else which you please. When next you write to me, however, address me not as an equal, but as lord of Asia and of all that belongs to you; otherwise I shall act toward you as if you were a wrong-doer. If you intend to contest the kingdom with me, stand and fight for it, and do not flee; for wherever you may be, there I shall march against you."

This letter is for many reasons worthy of note. Alexander, in order to justify the war against Darius, had to recall the many disputes between Persia and Macedonia; but he mentioned, as the first and principal cause of this expedition, the great invasions of Hellas by the Persians, enumerating the other reasons for war as of secondary importance. Finally, he calls himself already master of all Asia. He had yet occupied only Asia Minor and a small part of Syria. Darius was still ruler not only of Egypt, but also of all the vast territory on the east of Syria and Asia Minor as far as India; he had yet the countless treasures of Persepolis and Susa; he could muster armies of one and two hundred myriads. Yet Alexander declared him already fallen from the kingdom, and himself possessed of his dominions: such was the confidence he had in his ultimate success. He had received repeated proofs of the weakness of the Persian empire in the battles already fought, and now easily took possession of most of the Phœnician cities, including the prosperous Sidon.

Tyre and Gaza.

Tyre itself, the most powerful, richest, and most commercial of all those cities, sent to him magnificent presents and a golden crown, together with assurances of submission, so that Alexander could pass by Phœnicia without battle; but suddenly there broke out an unexpected strife by which he exposed himself to more arduous struggles than he had ever before undertaken. The Tyrians were willing to sub-

mit to the supremacy of Alexander, on condition that the Macedonians should not enter their city—a privilege they had not allowed to their former masters, the Persians.

Alexander, enraged at this claim of immunity, decided to occupy the city by force, and began in February, 332 B. C., the famous siege, which lasted seven months, and is certainly, by reason of the persistency, art, and courage shown on both sides, the most remarkable in ancient history. Not only did the almost impregnable position of the city secure great advantages to the Tyrians, but their excellent navy was of much assistance. At length Alexander received reënforcements, and became master both on sea and land. The Tyrians, however, exhibited such marvelous daring, courage, and persistency, that they would have really succeeded in rendering fruitless the attempts of Alexander had Darius come to their assistance, and shown himself worthy in some degree of the empire which he ruled. But, instead of making the best of his opportunities, he contented himself with petitioning Alexander for peace ; and toward the end of the siege of Tyre, instead of marching thither with an army, he sent a new embassy, offering ten thousand talents, with the cession of all the territory west of the Euphrates, as ransom for his mother and wife, and proposing that the Macedonian king should become his son-in-law, as well as his ally. Alexander submitted these proposals to an assembly of his generals, and Parmenio is said to have exclaimed, "If I were Alexander, I would accept them." "So would I, by Zeus," said Alexander, "if I were Parmenio."* He wrote in reply that he had no need whatever of money, neither would he consent to receive a part in place of the whole. He invited Darius to come to him, promising a cordial reception ; otherwise he himself would march against him.

* Plutarch, "Alexander."

Alexander's Visit to Egypt.

Soon after Alexander became master of Tyre, and was then obliged to attempt the siege of Gaza, the last city before entering on the desert tract between Syria and Egypt. That place was reduced in two months, and now the way lay open for the unconquerable king of Macedonia to advance against Egypt. After seven days' march from Gaza, Alexander entered Pelusium without resistance. This was the frontier fortress of Egypt, commanding the eastern branch of the Nile, whither his fleet, under the command of Hephæstion, had also gone. He sent the fleet up the river to Memphis, and marched himself to the same place by land. The satrap of that city surrendered himself, with all the royal treasure, eight hundred talents, and much other costly material. Alexander rested here, and celebrated a splendid sacrifice to all the gods, and especially to the Egyptian Apis. He also instituted festivals, and invited the most expert artists of Hellas to participate in them.

From Memphis he embarked on the westernmost branch of the Nile for Kanopus, whence he sailed westerly along the shore, to view the famous Homeric island of Pharos and Lake Mareia or Mareotis. There he decided to erect on the land by Pharos, between the sea and the lake, a new city, to be called Alexandria after his own name, and to make it, instead of Memphis, the citadel of the country. The site chosen for this purpose was airy and healthful, and at the same time advantageous for commerce. Here, then, the seemingly omnipotent hand of Alexander, which at the same time fought and led, destroyed and created, placed the corner-stone of that Alexandria which not long after was destined to become the most splendid and populous city of the East, and which was for many centuries the center of the world's commerce, and the cradle of a splendid Hellenism. Even after its fall from this great eminence it never ceased to prosper, and to

this day it is one of the greatest commercial ports of the Mediterranean.

Alexander next proceeded through the desert to the temple of Zeus Ammon, situated in Libya. On entering the temple, the prophet cried, "Hail, O son!" as if he had been intrusted by Zeus with this greeting. This event, and the fact that he was then assured of obtaining supremacy over the world, caused some to blame him for wishing, like another Herakles or Perseus, to trace his birth to Zeus. But that he himself so believed, or went so far as to demand that the Greeks themselves should call him son of Zeus, is highly improbable. At any rate, both Arrian and Plutarch assert that he only traced his birth to Zeus to astound the barbarians, but that he never seriously spoke about it to the Greeks, and occasionally even jested with them on the subject; because it is said that later, when wounded, he exclaimed, "My friends, this is blood, and not the ichor which blest immortals shed."*

Alexander spent more than four months in Egypt. In the spring of 331 B. C., having been reënforced by a new detachment of Greeks and Thracians, he departed from Memphis, where he had passed the last month of his stay in Egypt, to Phœnicia, in order to extend his conquests farther into Asia. Never forgetting his Hellenic life, he not only offered sacrifices to the gods in Phœnicia, but also instituted splendid processions and representations of tragedies, in which the most noted actors contested for the prize. After this, Alexander hastened toward the interior, crossing the Euphrates and the Tigris without opposition, except such as was offered by the depth of the water, the rapidity of the current, and the slippery footing.

* Plutarch, "Alexander":

Τοῦτο, ὦ φίλοι, τὸ βέον, αἷμα, καὶ οὐχ ἰχθυό,
οἶος πέρ τε βέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.

Battle of Gaugamela or Arbela.

Darius, however, was not far off, at the head of a much more numerous army than he had commanded at Issus. But his military incapacity was incorrigible ; and while he might have been able, with little exertion, to prevent Alexander from crossing this river, he made no more effort than at the passage of Mount Amanus and at the sieges of Tyre and Gaza. Persuaded that his opponent would accept no conditions of peace, he had decided again to try the fortune of arms, and to this end had collected an immense army near Arbela, on the plains eastward of the Tigris, "about the latitude of the modern town of Mosul." The multitude assembled there amounted, according to Arrian, to one million infantry and forty thousand cavalry. If Darius had again erred in not defending the banks of the Tigris, he at least chose a more suitable spot for the marshaling of his vast force than he had at Issus. Besides, he effected an improvement in his arms by making them much longer than formerly, and constructed two hundred war or scythed chariots,* capable of terrific execution because they could literally mow down an army. Darius had also at Arbela fifteen elephants ; and this is the first mention in history of the employment of elephants as auxiliaries in battle.

As soon as Darius was informed that Alexander had crossed the Tigris, leaving at Arbela the baggage and the treasure, he departed with his army to the country near Gaugamela, thirty miles to the west of Arbela, which, by reason of its level ground, was better suited to military operations. Alexander marched four whole days after crossing the Tigris,

* Each chariot had a pole projecting before the horses and terminating in a sharp point, together with three sword-blades stretching from the yoke on each side, and scythes also laterally from the naves of the wheels. (Curtius, iv, 9, 3 ; Diodorus, xvii, 53. See also note of Mützell upon this passage of Curtius, and Grote, vol. xi, part ii, chap. xciii.)

and had arrived within seven miles of the Persian army, when he first learned from prisoners how near he was to the enemy. He immediately halted, and, fortifying his camp by a ditch and stockade, remained there four days, for the soldiers to recover from the fatigue of the march. On the evening of the fourth day he moved forward, leaving in the camp under guard the baggage, the captives, and the disabled. At first he marched across the hills which separated him from the enemy, whom he hoped to attack about daybreak. He did not advance as rapidly as he had expected, so that toward morning, on reaching the heights, he saw that he was yet about three miles distant from the Persians. Keeping his phalanx in battle array, he held a council, composed of his principal officers, as to whether he should advance and commence the attack immediately. The greater part were inclined to this opinion, but Parmenio maintained that it would be unwise to do so, since they neither knew the physical configuration of the ground nor the disposition of the enemy's line, and he thought that both these should be ascertained before venturing battle.

Alexander, who had not heeded the advice of Parmenio either at the Granikus or at Tyre, now adopted this course, although many favored an immediate attack. This incident may show how much he respected the opinion of that veteran officer, and how well he was able, when necessary, to restrain his own fiery impulses. He ordered the army to remain there that day, yet still retained his battle array, and constructed a new intrenched camp, to which he transported the baggage and the captives from the former encampment. In the mean time, taking his light troops and the best of his cavalry, he spent the day in reconnoitering the position of the enemy, who made no attempt to molest him. Parmenio and others advised Alexander to make an attack by night; which, as Grote well remarks, promised some advantages, since Persian armies were notoriously unmanageable in the

dark,* and since their camp had no defense. But Alexander rejected the proposition, declaring that it was disgraceful to steal victory, and that he both could and would conquer Darius fairly and in open daylight. Then, addressing a few encouraging words to his officers, which met with an enthusiastic response, he dismissed them to their evening meal and repose.

On the next morning—it was October of 331 B. C.—he drew up his army, composed of forty thousand foot and seven thousand horse, in two lines. As in the two preceding battles, Alexander assumed the command of the right wing, confiding the left to Parmenio.

Having been informed by a deserter that there were planted in various parts of the ground long iron spikes to damage the Macedonian horse, Alexander diligently avoided these obstacles, and, leading the royal squadron on the extreme right, marched somewhat obliquely in that direction, keeping his right slightly in advance. As he approached the enemy, he saw that he was directly opposite Darius himself with the Persian left center, composed of the Persian guards, Indians, Albanians, and Karians. Alexander continued steadily advancing to the right, while Darius stretched his own front toward the left to oppose this movement. The Persian myriads were able to outflank the Macedonians on the left; but as Alexander in his course toward the right had advanced beyond the ground leveled by Darius for the operations of his chariots in front, the latter deemed it necessary to check any farther movement in that direction, and accordingly ordered one thousand Baktrian horse and the Scythians in front of the Persian left to make a circuit and attack the Macedonian right flank. Alexander sent against them his regiment of cavalry under Menidas, and the battle was now fairly begun. The Baktrian horse, seeing

* Xenophon, "Anabasis," iii, 4, 35: Πονηρὸν γὰρ νυκτὸς ἐστὶ στρατεύμα Περσικόν.

the Macedonians advancing, ceased their circuitous movement, and dashed against them with such terrific impetuosity as to compel them at first to retreat. Other detachments of Pæonians and Grecian cavalry speedily coming to the rescue, the Baktrians were driven back ; but the latter were in turn supported by the satrap Bessus with the main body of Baktrians and Scythians on Darius's left wing. Here the contest waxed hot, and not a few Greeks were slain ; but finally the latter succeeded by a more compact arrangement in driving back the less orderly enemy, and thus making an opening in their lines. While the contest was yet at its height, Darius had ordered his scythed chariots to charge, and his main line to follow them, hoping that the chariots would throw the phalanx into confusion, and that, if attacked while in disorder by the main army, it would be completely destroyed. But the chariots soon became of little service. The horses were frightened, stopped or wounded by the Macedonian archers and darters in front, some of whom, seizing the reins, pulled down the charioteers and killed the horses. Of the hundred chariots in Darius's front, many remained motionless or altogether useless, while others turned squarely round, "terrified by the projected pikes, or being scared by the noise of pike and shield struck together ; some, which reached the Macedonian line, were let through without doing mischief by the soldiers' opening their ranks ; a few only inflicted wounds or damage." *

Thus freed from apprehension of the chariots, Alexander ordered those divisions of his line which had as yet taken no part in the conflict to rush against the main force of the Persians, at the same time raising their war-song. Alexander himself, at the head of all the Companion-cavalry, charged at full speed against the Persian front, and the barbarians at once gave way. Then he pressed forward toward Darius himself, around whom a fierce cavalry battle now ensued.

* Arrian, iii, 13, 11.

The Persians were thrown into much disorder by this impetuous charge. At the same time the Macedonian phalanx, forming a compact body, severely harassed the enemy by its long extended pikes. Nevertheless, for some time the contest was close and obstinate, and neither party seemed disposed to give way, since the best troops of Darius's army—Greeks, Karians, Persian guards, royal kinsmen, etc.—were posted here. But the dastardly cowardice of Darius was destined again to render useless the courage of his army. From the moment he saw his opponent on the heights of Gaugamela, he was seized with consternation; his terror increased when he beheld the uselessness of his chariots. But when, finally, the Macedonians, after a deep silence, suddenly raising their war-cry, rushed on like a torrent, and began a severe hand-to-hand encounter, threatening the very chariot of the Persian monarch, the latter, seeing the unconquerable Alexander fighting his way toward him, was beyond himself with fright and ordered his charioteer to turn back, thus giving to his whole army the signal for flight.

Although the battle had but just commenced, the Persians were conquered. The flight of the king naturally caused the rout of the troops stationed about him. A few of the best and bravest, indeed, met their death before the king's chariot, and, falling in heaps one upon another, strove to stop the pursuit; for in the very pangs of death they clung to the Macedonians, and caught hold of their horses' legs as they lay upon the ground.* Not only were these the finest troops, but, as they composed the Persian center, their flight caused the army to be divided into two separate parts, both of which were thrown into great disorder and confusion. Their right wing was at the same time driven from the field by Aretas, so that nothing now prevented Alexander from pursuing most energetically the routed main division. Owing, however, to the obstacles in the way of this pursuit inevitably

* Plutarch, "Alexander."

created by so vast a multitude, and the clouds of dust raised by the swarms of men, horses, and chariots in rapid motion, the Macedonians could not distinguish in what direction the king had fled, and thus he escaped.

While Alexander was achieving so brilliant and complete a victory with his right and center, his left wing, commanded by Parmenio, was engaged in a terrific encounter with the right of the Persians under Mazæus. Even after the flight of Darius, Parmenio was so severely pressed, that he sent some horsemen to desire Alexander to come to his assistance. Alexander, though angry at being obliged to abandon the pursuit, pressed forward to succor his left, by the shortest course across the field of battle. The various divisions of the phalanx had already stopped short in the pursuit and hastened toward the same point. This irregular movement toward the left caused a gap between the divisions, into which a brigade of Indian and Persian cavalry darted, galloping through the Macedonian line to penetrate to the rear and attack the baggage.* At first the movement was successful, and it almost resulted, not only in despoiling the entire camp, but also in freeing the family of Darius. But, while engaged in plundering the baggage, the enemy were suddenly attacked by the Macedonian guard, and the entire body was either cut to pieces or put to flight.

Mazæus for some time continued the contest bravely; but when he saw the complete annihilation of the left wing, he understood that it would be impossible alone to maintain a useless combat, and turned to retreat before even the succors from Alexander had come to the assistance of Parmenio. While Alexander was hurrying forward he came face to face with some of the bravest Persian and Parthian cavalry, who were among the last to retreat from the center. A murderous encounter ensued, in which sixty Macedonian horsemen were killed and many more wounded. Alexander

* Arrian, iii, 14, 7; Grote, vol. ix, part ii, chap. xciii.

himself ran extreme personal danger. He finally conquered, though many of his brave opponents succeeded in escaping through the Macedonian lines. Having reached his left, and finding it not only freed from danger but absolutely victorious, Alexander resumed the pursuit, in which Parmenio now took part.

During this pursuit many of the enemy were killed and not a few captured. The wheels of the chariots were entangled among the dead bodies, and the horses, plunging among the heaps of the slain, bounded up and down, and no longer obeyed the hands of the charioteers. It was amid the darkness, the noises, the cries, and the dust that Darius escaped. Alexander pushed forward in all haste, and reached Arbela the next day, where he hoped to overtake Darius. In this he was disappointed, for the latter had not stopped one moment in that city, but continued his flight, leaving his chariot, shield, bow, and a rich booty in the hands of the conqueror. Parmenio had in the mean time occupied the camp of the barbarians near the field of battle, capturing the baggage, the elephants, and the camels.

It is impossible to state accurately the number of the killed or captured in this battle. Arrian mentions three hundred thousand barbarians killed and many more taken prisoners. Diodorus puts the slain at ninety thousand, and Curtius at forty thousand. On the part of the Greeks, Arrian mentions not more than one hundred killed, Curtius three hundred; and Diodorus estimates the slain at five hundred, besides a great number of wounded. The immense army of the Persians was either cut to pieces, captured, or dispersed, and no subsequent attempt was made to gather together a large regular force.

The defeat at Arbela was a death-blow to the Persian empire. It converted Alexander into the Great King, and Darius into a miserable fugitive, despised by his own subjects, and especially by those brave Persians who were per-

suaded that they had been defeated by the incapacity of their king, against whom they now formed a conspiracy, of which the direction was committed to the Baktrian satrap Bessus. What a contrast between the cowardice of Darius and the daring and genius of Alexander! No general perhaps ever conquered by the aid of such art and science as Alexander manifested in this battle. The marvelous combination of the various troops, and the wonderful foresight with which every squadron, every division, and in fact every individual was apprised beforehand of what each was expected to do, multiplied the forces of that small army and rendered victory unquestionable.

The critical character of the victory was made manifest by the capture of the two great capitals of the Persian empire, Babylon and Susa. Both surrendered without a struggle. The treasure seized at Babylon was enormous, and Alexander rewarded the bravery of his troops by donating to each Macedonian horseman six hundred drachmæ, to each foreign horseman five hundred, to each Macedonian soldier (infantry) two hundred, and to the foreign infantry a proportionate sum. Still greater was the treasure found at Susa. According to Arrian, it amounted to fifty thousand silver talents (equal to about \$57,500,000)—a sum which would seem incredible, if we did not find it (says Grote) greatly exceeded by what is subsequently reported about the treasures in Persepolis.

Alexander rested his army for more than thirty days at Babylon. Having nominated the various governors in the satrapies of Babylon, Armenia, Syria, and Phœnicia, he marched to Susa, where he was joined by a reënforcement of about fifteen thousand men, consisting of Macedonians, Greeks, and Thracians, sent by Antipater from Macedonia. The king effected some changes in the organization of his different divisions, and, having crossed the river Eulæus or Pasitigris, marched against Persia proper, captured the Susian

or Persian gates, and finally became master of Persepolis, "in which the Persian kings had accumulated their national edifices, their royal sepulchres, the inscriptions consecrated by religious or legendary sentiment, with many trophies and acquisitions arising out of their conquests." Both Diodorus and Curtius assert that the royal treasure seized by Alexander in Persepolis amounted to one hundred and twenty thousand talents in gold and silver (equal to \$138,000,000).

As it was now winter or very early spring (330-331 B. C.), the king allowed the major part of his army a period of repose in the vicinity of Persepolis, while he himself, with one division, pushed rapidly into the interior of Persis, and subdued its various satrapies. Then, leaving a guard of three thousand Macedonians at Persepolis, he set out with his whole army to follow Darius into Media.

CHAPTER VII.

ALEXANDER'S PROGRESS TO INDIA.

Revolution of King Agis.

SUCH were the results of the first four great campaigns of Alexander in Asia (from March, 334, to March, 330 B. C.). Hellenism, which ten years previously was mostly comprised between Thermopylæ and Cape Tænarus, now, spreading beyond its narrow limits, carried its victorious standards throughout Asia Minor, Phœnicia, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Assyria, Babylonia, Susiana, and Persis. The Hellenes who, ten years before, were engaged in the ignoble struggles at Delphi, now fought at Gaugamela and in the interior of Asia, for the supremacy of the world and for the famed treasures of Babylon, Susa, and Persepolis. And yet

there are those who maintain that the enterprise of Alexander was not purely Hellenic ; that Philip and Alexander subverted Hellenism, and did not open for it a new career of energy and glory ; that Hellas, against her own will, was forced to follow their standards. We do not deny that there was a party in Hellas protesting against Macedonian supremacy, and striving by all possible means to bring about its destruction, even at the expense of an alliance with Persia.

Sparta was during these years the center of this opposition ; and King Agis, having collected an army estimated at twenty-two thousand foot and two thousand horse, attempted about the middle of 330 B. C. to attack Megalopolis, which city, now as previously, was the stronghold of Macedonian influence in the peninsula, and was probably occupied by a Macedonian garrison. Antipater hastened into Hellas with an army of forty thousand foot, and in one decisive battle completely defeated the Lacedæmonians. Five thousand Spartans were slain, including Agis himself, "who, though covered with wounds, disdained to leave the field, and fell, resisting to the last." The loss of the victors is variously estimated at from one thousand to thirty-five hundred men slain, together with a great many wounded. Grote truly remarks that this was a greater loss than Alexander had sustained either at Issus or at Arbela ; a plain proof that Agis and his companions, however unfortunate in the result, had manifested courage worthy of the best days of Sparta.

The movement of Agis, however, did not represent the disposition of all Hellas. It only evinced the sentiment of national autonomy existing among the few—a sentiment which on former occasions had risen in much greater strength against the Athenian, Spartan, and Theban hegemonies. It only showed that there still existed a natural devotion to the old state of affairs—a feeling which we find everywhere

and always springing up in great political and social revolutions. But this sentiment was far from common to all the Hellenes. Demosthenes himself did not deem it wise for the present to rise against the Macedonian supremacy. He awaited more propitious circumstances, and occupied himself in the mean time (especially during 337–336 B. C.) in that famous contest with Æschines, the results of which were the two most splendid productions of these famous orators—the memorable accusation of Æschines against Ktesiphon for having proposed a crown to Demosthenes, and the reply of Demosthenes, known by way of eminence as the oration “On the Crown.” Both these orations are equally famous for the strength and beauty of their style; and if we compare them with the contemporaneous encyclopædical masterpieces of Aristotle, and the no less imperishable achievements which the same generation was witnessing in Asia, we may form a picture of the marvelous intellectual and practical power which then prevailed in the Hellenic nation.

New Victories and Projects of Alexander.

It has been said that Alexander quitted Persia proper in March, 330 B. C., in order to hasten to Ekbatana, the chief city of Media, in quest of Darius. But the latter was assassinated during his flight by a few eminent Persians, under command of Bessus, satrap of Bactria. Alexander caused the dead body of Darius to be buried with great pomp and ceremonial, in the royal sepulchres of Persis. During the same year he became master of Media, Parthia, Drangiana, Arachosia, Gedrosia, and the Paropamisadæ (the modern Seistan, and the western part of Afghanistan lying between Ghuzni on the north, Candahar or Kelat on the south, and Zurrah on the west). He founded three great cities in these countries, which he named after himself: Alexandria in Asia, the modern Herat, the inhabitants of which to this day preserve the memory of the founder; Alexandria in

Arachosia, the modern Candahar or Kelat ; and Alexandria ad Caucasum, apparently northeast of the town of Cabul. The first inhabitants of these cities were detachments, more or less numerous, of his own army, which he left there both as garrisons and colonies, and were organized on the basis of the Hellenic laws. Afterward, both Persians and other Asiatics were drawn to them by their prosperity, and the two elements, Greek and Persian, became intermingled.

Thus began the great work of unifying these two elements—a work which Alexander continued by the appointment both of Greeks and Persians to the higher offices of the empire ; by the introduction of Persian costumes into the court ; by the union of Persian and Hellenic festivities, which he never omitted to celebrate even in the distant lands of Asia ; and, above all, by the introduction of Persian warriors into his army, who, side by side with the Hellenes, aided in his great project of Hellenizing Asia. But the mixture of these two elements naturally caused much change in the austere and republican habits of Hellenic life. Thus, while these innovations were approved by some of his most devoted generals, Hephæstion, Kraterus, and Kœnus, they were bitterly opposed by others, especially by Philotas, son of Parmenio. This discord gave rise to many ruinous results, and first of all to the tragic death of Philotas and of Parmenio, which occurred in 330 B. C.

Death of Philotas and Parmenio.

Parmenio was already about seventy years of age, and could no longer be exposed to the repeated hardships of the war. He was appointed to the command of Ekbatana, in which city Alexander had laid up his treasures, having constituted it a sort of headquarters for his new expeditions in the East. Parmenio, because of his military experience and the great faith which Philip had reposed in him, was, next to Alexander, the most respected and most influential officer in

the Macedonian army. He had three sons, the youngest of whom, Hector, was drowned while bathing in the Nile; the second, Nikanor, who commanded the hypaspists, had recently died of disease; while the eldest, Philotas, the chief of the Companions, was in constant communication with the king, from whom alone he received his orders. Philotas was apprised that a certain soldier had formed a conspiracy against Alexander; but, not crediting the report, as it seems, he said nothing to Alexander. The matter, however, was made known to the king, who at once ordered the arrest of the soldier; but the latter ran himself through with his sword, and expired without making any declaration. Alexander with much astonishment asked Philotas why he had omitted to mention the conspiracy to him. Philotas replied that "the source from which it came was too contemptible to deserve any notice." Alexander, we are told, received or affected to receive the explanation, gave his hand to Philotas, invited him to supper, and talked to him with his usual familiarity.*

Philotas, unfortunately, had often boastingly attributed all the great actions of the war to himself and to his father. As for Alexander, he called him a boy, who by their means enjoyed the title of a conqueror, and at whose pretended divine paternity he had often sneered. We are also told that he affected a display of wealth, and a magnificence in his dress and table, unsuited to the condition of a subject. On account of this haughty demeanor, he had made many enemies, who had represented him in an invidious light to the king.† Kraterus and the other enemies of Philotas, availing themselves of all these circumstances, and especially of his unguarded language, reported to Alexander that the chief of the Companions, whom he so much esteemed, was the principal instigator of the plot against him. Alexander, who was of a most excitable temperament, and on the present

* Curtius.

† Plutarch, "Alexander."

occasion anxious to continue his march, had no time to examine calmly into these reports, and, above all, considered that he ought by all means to eradicate the cause of hate and jealousy in his army. He therefore hastily commanded the arrest, trial, and execution of Philotas. Not satisfied with this, he at the same time ordered the death of the brave old Parmenio—a man, says Plutarch, who had a share in most of Philip's conquests, and who was the principal if not the only one of the old counselors who favored Alexander's expedition into Asia.

This cruel conduct of Alexander has been justly condemned by history. It is true that the tortures inflicted upon Philotas wrung from him at last a confession implicating his father.* But this confession, even if it were true, can in no way justify the ferocious rancor of Alexander; and in fact no other proof exists against these two generals. If we take into consideration the eminent services which they had for so many years rendered to their country and their king, how is it possible not to condemn Alexander for not at least having instituted an accurate examination into these charges?

Death of Kleitus.

It was during 329–328 B. C. that Alexander conquered Bactria and Sogdiana, which provinces marked the utmost limits of his dominion on the north. He was, however, often obliged to return to these countries on account of widespread revolts among the inhabitants. In fact, these far-distant expeditions of Alexander, while no regular battle was fought, proved extremely laborious, both by reason of the steep and rugged nature of the country and the difficulty of subduing the inhabitants, who, avoiding close combat, fought only with missiles. Nothing, however, could stop the conqueror's advance. Here, on the river Jaxartes, he founded a new city,

* Curtius.

Alexandria ad Tanaidem, since the ancients knew the Jaxartes also by the name of Tanais. Here he captured Bessus, and tried and condemned him to death, because, after having slain his king and benefactor Darius, he assumed the ostentatious magnificence of a Persian monarch, and dared to contend with the victor of Gaugamela. But here again burst forth more strongly than ever the difficulties of assimilating and blending the Hellenic and Asiatic modes of life, resulting in the perpetration of many violent deeds.

While at Marakanda, the chief city of Sogdiana, Alexander offered a splendid sacrifice in honor of the Dioskuri; and during the banquet which followed, when wine, according to the Macedonian habit, had been abundantly drunk, certain intoxicated flatterers claimed that the deeds of Alexander were greater than those of Kastor and Pollux, and more renowned than the labors of Herakles; that "he had earned an apotheosis like that legendary hero, which nothing but envy could withhold from him"; and, in fine, that his recent victories cast into the shade the achievements of his father Philip. Kleitus, who had saved Alexander's life at the battle of the Granikus, and whose sister Lanike had been the nurse of Alexander in his childhood, could not bear the behavior of these parasites. He rebuked their insolent flattery "for making jest of the deeds of heroes"; but the wine seemed to have overpowered altogether the reserve of Kleitus, for he declared that "the exploits of Alexander, splendid as they were, had been accomplished not by himself alone, but by that unconquerable Macedonian force which he had found ready made to his hands, created and organized by Philip."

Remarks such as these, poured forth "in the coarse language of a half-intoxicated Macedonian veteran, provoked loud contradiction from many, and gave poignant offense to Alexander." The king, rising to his feet and looking black as night, exclaimed: "It is in this villainous manner, *coward,*

thou talkest of me in all companies, and stirrest the Macedonians to mutiny!" Kleitus, stung to the quick at this reproach, rejoined: "Yet it was this cowardice that saved you, *son of Jupiter*, when you were turning your back to the sword of Spithridates. It is by the blood of the Macedonians and their wounds that you are grown so great that you disdain to acknowledge Philip for your father, and will needs pass yourself for the son of Jupiter Ammon." Kleitus became still more insolent in his remarks. "Are these the rewards of our toils?" said he; "do we not envy those who did not live to see Macedonians bleed under Median rods, or sue to Persians for access to their king?" Alexander, beyond himself with rage, quick as thought snatched a pike from one of the soldiers, rushed upon Kleitus, and ran him through the body, exclaiming, "Go now to Philip and Parmenio!"

His repentance was no less speedy. Seeing his ancient comrade, the preserver of his life and the brother of his own nurse, dead by his hand, remorse seized upon him; he cried out, called himself unworthy of life, and, hastily drawing the spear out of the dead body, was applying it to his own throat, when the guards seized his hands, and carried him by force into his chamber. He passed that night and the next day in anguish inexpressible; and when he had wasted himself with tears and lamentations, he lay in speechless grief, uttering only now and then a groan.* Finally, his friends prevailed upon him to take food and return to activity.

Conquests on the Indus.

It was at Baktra that Alexander celebrated his marriage with the beautiful captive Roxana, daughter of the Baktrian chief Oxyartes. The nuptial festivities were conducted with Asiatic splendor, and Alexander now demanded that both

* Plutarch, "Alexander."

Hellenes and Persians should prostrate themselves before him and worship him as the Great King. This gave rise to bitter dissensions. This method of salutation was misunderstood; for while among the Asiatics it was simply an honor paid to a king, among the Greeks it was considered an act of respect due to a god alone. Most of the Hellenes sat unmoved, and refused to bow before "a mortal." Few declared their repugnance more openly than Kallisthenes, nephew of Aristotle. Alexander did not dare at first to punish Kallisthenes; but when an opportunity presented itself he caused his death on the ground of treacherous designs.

These successive revolts, plots, and murders did not hinder Alexander from carrying out his great project of reforming Asia. It is also worthy of note that, while he never ceased to delight himself with reading the Iliad, which he had always with him, he often wrote to Hellas for the works of Philistus, the tragedies of Euripides, Sophokles, and Æschylus, as well as the dithyrambs of Telestes and Philoxenus. In the midst of so many terrific combats he seemed always to feel the necessity of refreshing himself from the springs of Hellenic poetry and history.

Early in 327 B. C. Alexander began his march from Baktra for the conquest of the lands bordering on the Indus. In the spring of 326 he crossed that river, and then the Hydaspes (Jelum), on the other side of which he routed and captured the Indian prince Porus. He also founded in this vicinity two new cities—Nikæa, on the eastern bank of the Hydaspes, and Bukephalia, on the western, the latter so named in commemoration of his favorite horse Bukephalus, who died here of age and fatigue. Next he conducted his army onward in an easterly direction, crossed the river Akesines (Chenaub), then the Hydraotes (Ravee), after which he marched toward the Hyphasis (Sutlej), the last of the rivers in the Punjab, seemingly at a point below its confluence with the Beas. But while he was preparing to cross

this stream, and had already given the necessary instructions, for the first time his army, officers as well as soldiers, manifested symptoms of displeasure and weariness on account of the endless marches of the king. Alexander strove to revive in them that spirit and promptitude which he had hitherto found not disproportionate to his own ; but in this he was unsuccessful. However, he persisted in his determination, and we are told that he offered the sacrifice customary at the passage of a river. The victims were inauspicious ; “he bowed to the will of the gods, and gave orders for return, to the unanimous and unbounded delight of his army.”

First, however, he ordered the army to erect twelve altars of extraordinary height and dimensions on the western bank of the Hyphasis, to mark the farthest boundary of his expeditions in the East. He offered to the gods sacrifices of thanks and instituted games. Then, about the end of August, 326 B. C., he retreated from the Hyphasis, and returned first to Nikæa, where he employed himself in ascertaining the lower course of the Indus. In the early part of November he sailed slowly down the river, to the confluence of the Hydaspes with the Akesines, with the Hydraotes, and with the Hyphasis—all pouring in one united stream into the Indus. It was at the junction of the Akesines (Punjnud) with the Indus that Alexander founded a new Hellenic city, named after him, which he hoped would become great and prosperous, and would eventually command the navigation of that great river system. It was about February, 325 B. C., that he marched out of Alexandria ad Indum toward Susa. He appointed Pytho satrap of the entire land about the lower Indus, and gave him an army of ten thousand men. Alexander was continually reënforced by new detachments from Europe, and thus he could well afford to leave so large a force with Pytho. At the end of July he reached Pattala, where the delta of the Indus divided. He ordered Hephæstion to fortify a part of it, and erected military and naval

posts, thus giving a new impetus to the prosperity of the country. Alexander now decided to conduct the army by land, and directed Nearchus to assume command of the fleet, and to explore the passage of the ocean from the mouth of the Indus to that of the Euphrates, thus hoping to render possible the execution of his great projects concerning the commercial union of India with the West.

CHAPTER VIII.

LAST DAYS OF ALEXANDER.

The Return from India.

IN August, 325, the king began his journey westward through the territories of the Arabitæ and the Oritæ. Next he invaded the country of the Ichthyophagi or fish-eaters; and then advancing toward the interior, he encountered a sandy and trackless desert, "with short supplies of food, and still shorter supplies of water, under a burning sun." It was amid these terrible privations that the army wandered out of its way and suffered heavy losses in men, horses, and baggage-cattle. At last, in the beginning of December, the troops approached Karmania, where Nearchus had also arrived in safety, having brought the fleet around from the mouth of the Indus to the harbor called Harmozeia (Ormuz), not far from the entrance of the Persian Gulf. The fleet was commanded to continue its voyage by the gulf until it should reach the Pasitigris, and then sail through this river to Susa. Hephæstion was intrusted with the conduct of the larger portion of the army from Karmania into Persis; while the king went by the shortest road to Persepolis, and thence to Susa, where he arrived in February, 324 B. C.

Alexander spent some months in Susa and Susiana. It was the first time since his accession to the throne that he had been so long free from every warlike movement. But cares no less laborious and oppressive occupied him in the government of this vast kingdom, and the complete amalgamation of the Hellenic and Asiatic modes of life. During the long interval (more than five years) which had elapsed since he marched from Hyrkania, the satraps whom he had appointed in the various provinces of his empire had been left much to themselves. Hence it may easily be understood what anarchy and recklessness of management prevailed throughout middle and western Asia. These satraps practiced every kind of oppression and abuse, plundered the temples, robbed citizens of their possessions, and many of them, deeming themselves entirely independent, levied their own mercenary forces. The sudden presence of Alexander dissolved these dreams like the fall of a thunderbolt. Some succeeded in escaping, while others were captured and put to death.

Alexander's Innovations—Height of his Power.

Alexander now deemed it most expeditious for the realization of his great projects to unite the Hellenes in marriage with Persian maidens. Accordingly, he instituted a sort of national Græco-Asiatic marriage at Susa. He had already married the captive Roxana in Baktria, but now he took two additional wives—Statira, daughter of Darius, and Parysatis, daughter of the preceding king Artaxerxes Ochus. At the same time, by advice and presents, he persuaded eighty of his principal friends and officers "to marry, according to Persian rites, wives selected from the noblest Persian families, providing dowries for all of them." He also generously rewarded all the Macedonians who followed their example. These marriages were celebrated with splendid feasts, during which the Hellenic and Asiatic customs were somewhat

strangely blended. The aversion of the army, however, for these Asiatic marriages and for this change in their ancestral traditions, could not easily be overcome. Alexander strove by all possible means to soften this aversion, and to this end he paid the debts of his soldiers, amounting, according to some, to ten thousand talents—according to Arrian, to not less than twenty thousand.

In the mean time Alexander did not cease following up the realization of his great plan. He mustered a new force of thirty thousand young Asiatics from the remotest provinces of his empire, and, having armed and drilled them after the Macedonian fashion, had them placed in his army. We are also told that he incorporated many native Persians, both officers and soldiers, into the Companion-cavalry, the most honorable service in the army.

These innovations grieved the Macedonians, who supposed that Alexander was giving the preference to barbarians, and was, moreover, despising them and their customs. But their grief broke out into open discontent when the king, either trusting to his admirably organized new force, or wishing to retire those who were unfit for service from age or wounds, announced that he intended to send them home, after having abundantly rewarded them for their many and splendid services. A general dissatisfaction was manifested throughout the army, and they asked that all the veterans be dismissed—advising the king by way of taunt to make his future conquests along with his father Ammon and his beautiful foreign youths. Alexander, by boldly punishing some, blaming others, and rewarding a few of the officers, reduced the army again to obedience. When the soldiers came to themselves, they rushed to the gates of the palace, threw down their arms, and begged with tears and groans for Alexander's pardon. The king was moved to tears, and, having announced a full reconciliation, celebrated a costly sacrifice, coupled with a multitudinous banquet of

mixed Macedonians and Persians. After this he selected ten thousand of the oldest and most infirm among the soldiers, and, having generously rewarded them, sent them under command of Kraterus back to Macedonia.

In August, 324 B. C., Alexander paid a visit to Ekbatana, where he again instituted magnificent festivities and games, while maturing his plans for new expeditions. But here he suffered a severe loss. Hephæstion, the general whom above all, like another Patroklos, this young Achilles loved, falling sick on account of the many excesses in which all had of late indulged, died at Ekbatana. The grief the king felt at his loss was beyond description, and it wounded him the more severely, since he himself had of late years left the path of virtue and rectitude, and had given himself up to pleasures which, combined with his intense application to schemes of war and conquest, could not but entail disastrous consequences, however vigorous his system. Thus oppressed both in mind and body, he went in the midst of winter to Babylon, which he intended to make the capital of his empire, at the same time beginning to make preparations for entering Arabia. On his way he received conclusive evidence of the awe which his name inspired throughout the world. There came to him envoys from the most distant regions—from Libya, from Carthage, from Sicily and Sardinia, from the Illyrians and Thracians, from the Lucanians, Bruttians, and Tuscans in Italy—nay, even (some affirm) from the Romans, as yet a people of moderate power.* But there were "other names yet more surprising": Æthiopians from the extreme south, beyond Egypt; Scythians from the north, beyond the Danube; Iberians and Gauls from the far west, beyond the Mediterranean Sea. Legates also came from Hellas, partly "to tender congratulations upon his matchless successes," partly to consult with him concerning the internal affairs of various Hellenic cities.

* See note in Grote, vol. xii, part ii, chap. xciv.

These legates approached him with wreaths on their heads, "tendering golden crowns to him, as if they were coming into the presence of a god."* Alexander at once ordered that all the statues which Xerxes had carried away from Hellas, and which were set up in Babylon, Susa, and other Asiatic cities, should be returned to the legates. The proofs, says Grote, which Alexander received, even from distant tribes with names and costumes unknown to him, of fear for his enmity and anxiety for his favor, were such as had never been shown to any historical person, and sufficient entirely to satisfy his superhuman arrogance.

Death of Alexander.

But while on this pinnacle of glory and power, suddenly dark omens and prophecies, declared by many wise men to be coming from sacrifices and the stars, crowded upon Alexander as he approached Babylon. The Chaldæan priests especially exhorted him not to go into that city, but to remain outside of the gates. Disregarding these omens, he entered the capital, and began energetically the completion of his great military preparations. But his final hour was fast approaching. The unlimited indulgence of his passions, had assumed in him the colossal expanse of the conquests he had achieved, and the wise men of Babylon had no need to consult their astronomical and magic science in order to understand that no human body could remain proof against such abuses. His sentiments and passions were naturally noble, but by reason of their intensity were often terrific. Who would condemn his love for Hephæstion? But is it possible that we should not be astonished at the sight of the stupendous grief which seized upon Alexander at the death of that general, when he found his best consolation, to use an expression of Plutarch, in fighting and man-fighting, and

* Arrian, vii, 19, 1; vii, 23, 3.

when he finally sacrificed the male population of a whole tribe, the Kossæi (dwelling between Media and Persis), to what he termed the manes of Hephæstion? The very obsequies of his friend were monstrous. He refused all ease, and even food, for two days; he cut his hair close, and ordered that all the horses and mules should be shorn, that they might have their share in the mourning, and with the same view struck off the battlements of the walls belonging to the neighboring cities. He ordered that a vast funeral pile should be erected at Babylon, at a cost reported as sixty million drachmæ, heaped upon it images and other ornaments of gold and ivory, and sacrificed to Hephæstion as to a god.

Such was the moral insanity, as it were, which had taken possession of Alexander; for it appears that man never steps beyond certain limits of greatness and glory without subsequent retribution. If we also take into consideration the excessive labors which he had undergone during the last ten years of his life, the unmeasured indulgence of his passions, and the mental strain of brooding over the government of his boundless empire, we may easily understand that he was prepared, both morally and physically, for some terrible crisis. Indeed, as soon as he had celebrated the obsequies of Hephæstion, he again sank into a deep and boisterous revelry, which terminated in an attack of fever. The disease from the first was pronounced incurable. But his colossal intemperance aggravated it; for as soon as the fever, during its early stages, showed any signs of abatement, he sought wine wherewith to satisfy his unquenchable thirst, so that every hope of saving him was soon abandoned. The army now yearned to see him for the last time. The gates of the palace were thrown open, and the various divisions passed in military order before the man who had so often led them to victory. The king was silent, though he knew perfectly well what was passing, and strove to welcome his

soldiers, both by moving his head and by the expression of his eyes, which still depicted the sentiments of his inner nature. The last words which he spoke before expiring are said to have been, on being asked to whom he bequeathed his kingdom, "*To the strongest*"; and, taking the signet-ring from his finger, he handed it to Perdikkas. He died in the afternoon—June, 323 B. C.—after a life of thirty-two years and eight months, and a reign of twelve years and eight months.

The death of Alexander in the very acme of his youth and greatness caused a deep impression throughout the known world—so deep, indeed, that at first the event was not credited. When the first report of it was brought to Athens, the orator Demades exclaimed, "It can not be true: if Alexander were dead, the whole habitable world would have smelt of his carcass."* The whole empire was indeed shaken, and the fate of the greatest political edifice yet constructed now remained uncertain and perilous. Alexander had subdued the great king, who even to the time when the former crossed the Hellespont was, and had long been, the type of worldly power and felicity; he had become master of his countless treasures and vast territories, and had ruled over the great peninsula lying between the Ister and Cape Malea, and over all the islands between Hellas and Asia. He had accomplished all this within twelve years, when but thirty-two years old, at an age when the Athenian citizen was hardly deemed worthy of the office of strategos, and the Roman not sufficiently mature for the office of consul; at an age when Julius Cæsar was yet unknown, and Napoleon was but beginning his military career. Again, the world, which did not realize the attacks his vigorous frame had suffered, and that no one performs great exploits in early manhood unless by sacrificing and impairing his subsequent life—the world,

* Οὐ τέθνηκεν Ἀλέξανδρος, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὧς ἐ γὰρ ἂν ἡ οἰκουμένη τοῦ νεκροῦ. Plutarch, "Phokion."

which saw Alexander achieve such unprecedented glory within twelve years, having at his disposal both the splendid civilization of Hellas and the countless treasures of Asia while still in the plenitude of health, vigor, and aspirations—believed that Alexander would have been satisfied with nothing less than the conquest of the whole known earth. Three centuries later the famous Roman historian Livy examined with much accuracy the results of the contest which Alexander, had he lived, would have undertaken against the Romans. Plutarch also, in his treatise concerning the fortune of the Romans, enumerates as a piece of good luck for them the fact that the early death of Alexander had prevented him from attacking them. But to this day the most prominent historians assert that, had he lived, he would have wielded his scepter over the entire human race as then known.

Some have wished to compare him with Cæsar or Napoleon. But Napoleon was banished from his country after he was put down by his enemies. He did not even rule over the whole of Europe, and toward the end of his career he saw others divide his empire piecemeal. Cæsar not only conquered very few countries in comparison with Alexander, but his death also made little impression on the fortunes of the Roman empire, because men were at once found capable of continuing and completing his work. But the empire of Alexander was so vast, and so closely linked with his own incomparable genius, that his loss was irreparable. The nations that were not as yet subdued deemed themselves freed from the greatest of dangers, while those that had been conquered saw their fetters suddenly broken; yet for many centuries they underwent constant changes—unions and divisions of empire, languages, tribes, religions—all of which had their beginning and cause in the first and great undertaking of Alexander.

As a conqueror, accordingly, both by reason of the ex-

tent of his conquests and the influence which they had on the fortunes both of his contemporaries and successors, Alexander has not his equal in the history of humanity. As a warrior, as well by his daring and organizing mind as his strategical genius, he is said to have united all the advantages which Homer attributes to the impetuous Ares and to the wise Athene, and again is declared to have been without a parallel in the history of antiquity.

Conclusion.

Through Alexander and his successors, Hellenic art and learning, which began gradually to fade in Hellas, continued to prosper and to bloom in Pergamus, Ephesus, Antiochia, Sidon, Gaza, Tarsus, Alexandria—in fact, throughout Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Certainly, those lands brought forth no masterpieces of poetry, history, and philosophy equal to those of pure Hellenism; yet many precious works were produced for the preservation, explanation, and development of these masterpieces. Again, Hellenic art created here works not inferior to those of the former, while the positive sciences, mathematics, astronomy, and physics, received here an impetus incomparably greater than in the first Hellenism.

Hellenism, therefore, was not only spread, but to a certain extent materially improved. Incredible as it may seem, yet it is true that the Hellenic language prevailed in many of these far-distant Asiatic countries. On the south of Egypt, in Æthiopia itself, the Hellenic tongue thereafter became the recognized language of the empire. This language was imprinted on the coins of Baktriana; Hellenic artists gorgeously decorated the courts of the kings of Armenia and Parthia; Artavasdes, king of the Armenians, composed tragedies and wrote in the Hellenic tongue; and, in fine, the children of the Persians, Susians, and Gedrosians sang the tragedies of Euripides and Sophokles. By the incessant energies of the Hellenic cities founded by Alexander and his successors, the

Hellenic tongue became the language of the government, of letters, of commerce—in a word, the organ of all higher and nobler relations. The Hellenic religion also was spread in the East, and a certain identification of the Hellenic with the ancestral gods of Egypt and Asia took place. It was by this union that the particular, the local individualities of these divinities disappeared, and the mind of the people gradually became prepared for a more general conception of one divinity. Hence, when, three centuries later, the word of God was first preached in Asia, it found those nations ready to accept the idea of one only true God; and since they spoke one language, the spread of the gospel was wonderfully facilitated. The fact, too, that this language was the most artistic and most finished of all, rendered it especially adapted to explain and develop the lofty truths of the Christian religion.

We have thus briefly sketched the career of Alexander. Certainly he was not faultless, particularly toward the end of his life, when the indulgence of his fervent passions exceeded all human bounds. Nevertheless, he proved himself not only the greatest of conquerors, but the most admired and beloved of commanders. The Hellenization of Asia, which he inaugurated, will always be regarded as the noblest achievement of his short but glorious career.

PART NINTH.

THE SUCCESSORS.

CHAPTER I.

REGENCY OF PERDIKKAS.

Settlement of the Empire.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT died in Babylon in June, 323 B. C. His death, which soon after moved far-distant lands, above all astounded the great city in which it had occurred. Terrible confusion prevailed throughout that eventful night. The army and the people rushed frantic with grief into the palace, in order to assure themselves of the truth. Fear of the future soon succeeded to their sorrow; no one knew what would occur, now that the mighty hand which held that wonderful structure had disappeared. The soldiers mistrusted the natives, the natives the soldiers, and the generals one another. All passed the night in arms, apprehensive of revolt, murder, or plunder.

Early in the morning the highest commanders—seven in number—held a council to determine what was to be done. It was forthwith decided to invite to the conference the other generals and captains of the army, that the whole affair might be discussed in common with them. The arms, crown, and royal tunic of the deceased were placed on the empty throne. Perdikkas first of all arose, and, after laying

there also the signet-ring which the king had given him, reminded the convention of the danger of the empire, and the necessity of choosing a successor. He maintained that the Macedonian order of succession should be strictly followed, and that in case Queen Roxana, who was soon to become a mother, should give birth to a son, to him the crown must be surrendered ; but in the mean time it was imperative to appoint a regent, and to this election he earnestly called the attention of the assembly.

Much animated discussion followed the address of Perdikkas. Roxana, they said, was a barbarian—a captive ; the crown ought not to be surrendered to a foreigner. Neither Roxana nor Barsine, by whom Alexander had already a son named Herakles, had any right to Macedonian rule. The mere mention of a foreign name would create a disturbance ; the Macedonians would shout, hiss, and strike their spears on their shields, and the authority of the generals would be disregarded.

In the mean time the army, independently of the proceedings in the palace, chose by acclamation Arridæus, an illegitimate brother of Alexander, to the throne, having surnamed him Philip, a name ever dear to all Macedonians. The soldiers with fixed arms broke into the assembly, declaring that a king had been elected, and that the first word of disapproval would be followed by death. Perdikkas with a few of the generals succeeded in escaping to the royal chamber, where lay the body of Alexander. They were joined by about six hundred prominent officers, and by the division of the young Asiatic troops under command of Ptolemy. The Macedonian phalanx, however, under Meleagrus (one of the seven prominent generals of the army) and Arridæus, soon broke in upon them. Perdikkas with a thundering voice cried out, "Stand by me, those ready to defend the dead body of the king." A savage struggle ensued, during which many were killed and wounded, until finally the voice of authority

was again heard, and both parties resolved to lay aside their arms and to try to reach an honorable solution.

The large number of the Macedonian soldiers who stoutly claimed that Arridæus had the sole right to the throne, caused Perdikkas for the time being to yield. Hence an apparent reconciliation was agreed upon ; but it was only apparent. The haughty Perdikkas was not satisfied with this state of affairs ; the phalanx which dared to raise arms against the voice of authority must be punished ; the audacious generals, among whom Meleagrus was the foremost, must be severely dealt with. To this end, Perdikkas ordered a general purification of the army, on account of the civil strife which had recently taken place. The purification, according to the Macedonian custom, was held in the following manner : A dog was cut in two ; its divided parts were placed on an open field at a considerable distance one from the other, and between them the whole army marched in military order, followed by a sham battle between the infantry and cavalry.

When the two bodies faced each other—the horsemen and elephants under command of the king and Perdikkas (who had in the mean time succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of Arridæus), and the infantry under command of Meleagrus—suddenly a report spread throughout the phalanx that something unusual was going to take place. As the horsemen came forth, Perdikkas, riding in advance with a chosen few, declared to the army that the purification was not complete, unless the traitors who had dared to raise arms against their generals were forthwith surrendered to justice. At the same time he intimated that unless this was done he would at once order the cavalry to charge, which would have caused the destruction of the entire phalanx. The infantry were thunderstruck ; but no delay was allowed. Perdikkas was not only ready for action, but no infantry could offer effective resistance in an open field against a well-drilled

cavalry force. Three hundred Macedonian soldiers were arrested, and at once cast among the elephants, by which they were torn to pieces. While this terrible sacrifice was going on, Meleagrus durst not leave his rank in the phalanx ; but when the army returned to the city, knowing that his life was in imminent danger, he sought refuge in a temple. Both the king and Perdikkas declared that by this precipitate flight he had shown how guilty he was, and ordered that he should be executed in his place of refuge.

By this daring act Perdikkas inaugurated his rule. He understood, however, that as long as the king was surrounded by so many noble and veteran generals, several of whom had as good claim to power and command as himself, his influence would not be so predominant as he wished. He therefore persuaded the king that the interests of the empire demanded that the affairs of the various satrapies should be diligently examined, and new governors—men of ability and fidelity—be appointed, especially in the distant provinces. The king readily assented to this proposition, and those of the generals whom Perdikkas had reason to fear or to mistrust were appointed to distant satrapies.

It was decided that Perdikkas should remain by the king, as the general-in-chief of the royal army. He was also to carry the royal signet, and transmit to all the officers of the empire, both civil and military, the king's orders. The former office of Perdikkas, that of chiliarch or commander of the Companions or royal guards, was bestowed upon Seleukus, son of Antiochus, who had already greatly distinguished himself for bravery and wisdom in the wars of Alexander, and whom we shall find later as the founder of the great and powerful empire of the Seleukidæ. Kassander, son of Antipater, succeeded Seleukus in the command of the royal native troops. It is not known whether any other changes were made in the general Macedonian staff, but the affairs of the satrapies were arranged as follows :

Ptolemy, son of Lagus, one of the bravest, wisest, and most distinguished generals of Alexander, was appointed satrap of Egypt; among the best provinces of the empire, on account of its position, general prosperity, and the wonderfully increased resources of its capital, Alexandria. Ptolemy possessed in many respects the peculiar nature of Philip. He knew how to avail himself especially of circumstances, seeking such advantages only as opportunities would safely allow. This moderation does not certainly bring forth conquerors like Alexander, yet it produces founders of more lasting institutions.

Laomedon, son of Larichus, a Mitylenæan, was appointed satrap of Syria, lying between the river Euphrates and the sea-coast, and containing the Phœnician cities. This was one of the richest satrapies in the empire, and the fact that it was granted to a Greek shows the complete equality which both Philip and Alexander had established among Greeks and Macedonians.

Philotas, a taxiarch,* was made satrap of Kilikia, which, although not distinguished either by its extent or fertility, yet in a military point of view was of considerable importance, since it united western Asia with the East.

Nearchus, the famous admiral, received the satrapy of Pamphylia; but, preferring for the present the command of the Macedonian fleet, he intrusted the rule of his province during his absence to Antigonus, son of Philip. Antigonus was eminently a man of action, and one of the most distinguished generals of his time. He was appointed in 333 B. C. satrap of Phrygia, a most difficult province to rule, on account of the semi-independent, mountainous, and buccaneering tribes which surrounded it. Perdikkas, knowing the ambition and energy of this young satrap, employed him in many difficult and dangerous projects far distant from the seat of government.

* A term used of all officers under the strategus.

Eumenes, a Kardian, was made satrap of Paphlagonia and of Great Kappadokia. He enjoyed much influence in the court, and was distinguished for learning, wisdom, and bravery. Perdikkas, knowing well his many eminent qualities, and considering him a dangerous person to have near the king, had him sent to these distant provinces, where he was sure he would soon find himself at war with the surrounding nations.

Similar changes were made in the satrapies of Karia, Lydia, and Phrygia, as well as in some of the European provinces. Porus and Taxiles continued, as heretofore, to rule their provinces beyond the Indus, which had now become almost independent of Macedonian sway.

These measures seemed to indicate that the great realm of Alexander was destined to continue in the hands of the conquerors. But the ferocious passions and prejudices which were current both in the court and the provinces were more powerful than the influence or wisdom of the man who undertook to sustain the towering edifice of Alexander. About that time Queen Roxana bore a son, whom the army with boundless joy greeted as their king. The queen, being envious of Statira, whom Alexander had married at Susa, craftily induced her to come to Babylon, and killed both her and her young sister Drypetes, the widow of Hephæstion, and, with the connivance of Perdikkas, had their bodies cast into a well. Thus was inaugurated that series of murders which was destined later to wipe out the entire race of Alexander. Not long after both the northeastern and southwestern sections of the empire revolted almost at the same time, and thus was begun that succession of revolts which hastened its disintegration. It was only during the celebration of the obsequies of Alexander that the Macedonian army, for the last time, kept united in peace; the various satraps who had now departed to their respective provinces were no longer to meet except as enemies on the field of battle.

Indeed, as soon as the death of Alexander became known, the military colonies of the northeastern provinces conspired against Macedonian rule. The Greeks in these regions resolved to return home, and to this end formed an army of twenty thousand infantry and three thousand horse under Philo. Python, satrap of Media, was ordered to march against them; and after a terrific battle, during which the army of Philo was nearly annihilated, the movement was abandoned. But almost at the same time a great revolt broke out at Athens.

The Lamian War.

When the first report of the death of Alexander was announced in the assembly of the people at Athens, the orator Demades, rising, uttered the famous words, already mentioned: "It can not be true: if Alexander were dead, the whole habitable world would have smelt of his carcass." But other orators, ascending the bema, declared that the report was authentic, and that the time had at last come to shake off the yoke of tyranny. Phokion, now advanced in years, strove to pacify the multitude, representing that it was the part of wisdom not to precipitate the movement, but to wait until confirmatory reports should reach the assembly. But the alluring name of liberty and recollections of former glory and supremacy finally overcame the wisdom of the few.

Demosthenes was not then at Athens. Falsely accused of receiving bribes from Harpalus, satrap of Babylonia and Syria—who, alarmed at the prospect of being punished by Alexander for his ostentatious prodigality, had fled from Asia into Hellas—Demosthenes was condemned to pay fifty talents to the state. Unable to discharge this large fine, he was cast into prison; but after some days he found means of escape, and fled to Trœzen in the Peloponnesus, where he passed some months as a dispirited and sorrowing exile, until the death of Alexander.* Such was the reward which Demos-

* Plutarch, "Demosthenes," 26; Grote, vol. xii, part ii, chap. xcv.

thenes, unquestionably the greatest orator and one of the most eminent citizens in Athenian antiquity, received, when more than sixty years old, in return for his many brilliant services in behalf of his country.

Nine months after the verdict of the dikastery against Demosthenes, Alexander died. Presently the Athenians and other Greeks rose against the Macedonian dynasty; and the struggle was called the Lamian war, because it was principally fought around Lamia. Leosthenes was appointed general, and was ordered to muster, besides the forces at his command, an army of eight thousand mercenaries. The Ætolians, Akarnanians, Achæans, Arkadians, and Corinthians eagerly entered into the league with Athens for expelling the Macedonians from Hellas. Leosthenes, at the head of a much greater army than the thirteen thousand infantry and the six hundred cavalry which Antipater led against him, occupied Thermopylæ. In the battle which ensued the Macedonians were completely defeated, and Antipater was forced to flee to the fortified town of Lamia, near the river Spercheius, beyond the southern border of Thessaly. Leosthenes immediately began the siege of Lamia; but, in inspecting the blockading trenches, he was wounded on the head by a large stone projected from one of the catapults on the city walls, and expired in two days. A funeral oration in his honor, as well as in that of the other combatants who had fallen, was pronounced at Athens by Hyperides.*

The Ætolians, the most powerful contingent of the army, had even during the lifetime of Leosthenes obtained leave to go home, "from some domestic urgency, real or pretended." Others soon followed their example, so that the army was considerably diminished, though still remaining large enough

* Diodorus, xviii, 12, 13; Grote, vol. xii, part ii, chap. xcv. A fine fragment of the *Δῶλος Ἐπιτάφιος* by Hyperides is preserved in Stobæus, tit. 124, vol. iii, p. 618. A large additional portion of this oration has recently been found in Egypt on papyrus.

to keep back the Macedonian forces. The death of Leosthenes was the severest loss the cause of Hellas had sustained. For the last generation Athens had produced several excellent orators, but during all that time none of her citizens before Leosthenes had displayed "military genius and ardor, along with Panhellenic purposes." It is generally conceded that his death alone appears to have saved Antipater from captivity; for it is certain that he solicited peace, but was required by the besiegers to surrender at discretion—with which condition he refused to comply.

The death of this eminent general was accordingly a hard blow to the cause of Hellenic liberty. The hope with which the energy, the Panhellenic patriotism, and above all the splendid victory of Leosthenes, had animated the courage of all Athenians, now followed their general to his grave. Phokion, the only one left at Athens who could perhaps have successfully replaced him, declined the command of the army. Anticipating the final act of the tragedy, he refused to embark in so hazardous an undertaking. Antiphilus was accordingly chosen commander—"a man," says Diodorus, "distinguished for bravery and military wisdom," yet no match for the dangers which threatened the very existence of the city.

Antipater, as it appears, had sought aid from the very beginning of the contest. Kraterus, however, was still away in the distant lands of Asia, while Lysimachus, satrap of Thrace, was engaged in severe strife with the king of the Odrysians. Thus the cause of Panhellenic liberty seemed, on the whole, prosperous. But presently Leonnatus, satrap of the Asiatic territory bordering on the Hellespont, came to the aid of Antipater with an army of twenty thousand soldiers and twenty-five hundred cavalry. Antiphilus at once raised the siege of Lamia, moved off by rapid marches, attacked Leonnatus apart from Antipater, and gained a splendid victory, in which Leonnatus himself was slain. This important suc-

cess was achieved especially through the assistance of the Thessalian cavalry, which had espoused the cause of the Hellenes.

The victory, however, did not greatly help the Hellenic cause. The Macedonian infantry had not suffered much loss; and Antipater hastened from Lamia, took command of the defeated army, withdrew his forces to high ground out of reach of the cavalry, and there awaited the arrival of Kraterus.

Meanwhile the Athenians were repeatedly defeated by the Macedonians on the sea. A descent was made at Rhamnus, on the eastern side of Attica, where the Athenians were defeated and the land plundered. Fear seized upon Athens, and Phokion hastened to arouse the citizens against the invaders. But these men no longer knew what was a soldier's duty, and all claimed the supreme command. One counseled him to secure such an eminence, another to send his cavalry to such a post, and a third pointed out a place for a camp. "By Herakles!" said Phokion, "how many generals we have, and how few soldiers."

Plutarch informs us that when Phokion had drawn up his army, one of the infantry advanced before the ranks; but when he saw an enemy stepping out to meet him his heart failed him, and he drew back to his post. Wherefore Phokion said, "Young man, are not you ashamed to desert your station twice in one day—that in which I had placed you, and that in which you had placed yourself?" Finally, by the energy and incessant struggles of that wise general, the enemy were forced to retreat from Attic soil.

During the ensuing summer Kraterus passed over from Asia into Macedonia with a numerous army, and Antipater found himself at the head of a powerful force—forty thousand heavy infantry, five thousand cavalry, and three thousand archers and slingers. The Hellenic army consisted of twenty-five thousand infantry and thirty-five hundred cavalry—the latter, Thessalians "of admirable efficiency." A great battle

was fought near Krannon in Thessaly, in which the bravery of the Greeks had to yield to the superior number of the Macedonians. The combined Hellenic army was dispersed, the Thessalian towns were captured, and most of the Grecian cities, alarmed, sent envoys to entreat peace from Antipater, who granted lenient terms to each. The Athenians and Ætolians alone continued the struggle, knowing well that peace would be refused them. Antipater lost no time in following up the retreating Athenians as far as Bœotia, where he took quarters at the Macedonian post in the Kadmeia, "once the Hellenic Thebes," within two days' march of Athens. When this news reached the city of Athens, the people were greatly alarmed and dispirited. Demosthenes, who had been recently recalled to Athens amid the enthusiastic plaudits of the people, fled the city, together with the principal anti-Macedonian orators, Hyperides, Eukrates, Aristonikus, and Himeræus. The Athenians, greatly terrified at the situation, dispatched Phokion—the only man, says Plutarch, they could trust—to Antipater, who then lay with his army at Thebes, preparing to enter Attica.

The first requisition which Phokion submitted to the victorious Macedonian was that the army should not invade Attica, but that peace might be concluded at once in Bœotia. Kraterus said it was an unjust demand; but Antipater, taking him by the hand, said, "Let us oblige Phokion so far." * He could not, however, prevail upon Antipater to acquiesce in anything short of "the surrender of Athens at discretion—the same terms as Leosthenes had required from Antipater himself at Lamia."

When Phokion returned to Athens with this answer, the people, having no alternative except to yield to the imperious demands of the conqueror, asked Phokion, together with Xenokrates the philosopher, to return to Thebes and ascertain the terms of peace. The virtue and reputation of Xeno-

* Plutarch, "Phokion."

krates, says Plutarch, were so great and illustrious that the Athenians thought there could be nothing in human nature so insolent, savage, and ferocious as not to feel some impressions of respect and reverence at the sight of him, and it was supposed that he might thus be efficacious in mitigating the wrath of the conqueror. It happened otherwise, however; for he was harshly received, and almost put to silence, by Antipater. Plutarch attributes this treatment to the extreme brutality of the victor and to his antipathy to virtue; but we are inclined to believe, with Grote, that one reason of this may be the fact that Xenokrates had been to a certain extent the rival of Aristotle, the personal friend of Antipater. It must be added, however, to the honor of the Greek philosopher, that he maintained a higher and more independent tone than either of the other envoys.

Antipater declared that he was ready to grant the Athenians peace and consider them as his friends, on condition that they should deliver to him Demosthenes, Hyperides, and at least two other anti-Macedonian orators; that they should abandon their democratical constitution, and disfranchise all their poorer citizens; receive a Macedonian garrison in Munychia; pay the expenses of the war; free the islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Skyros from Athenian dominion; dispossess the Athenian colonists in Samos, and transfer the island to the Samian exiles and natives. Plutarch informs us that the Athenian deputies heard these terms with satisfaction, as lenient and reasonable. Xenokrates only entered against them "the strongest protest which the occasion admitted." "Antipater," he said, "deals favorably with us, if he considers us as his slaves; but harshly, if he looks upon us as freemen."

Thus in September, 322 B. C., the Athenians were obliged to receive a Macedonian garrison, commanded by Menyllus, a man of great moderation, and the friend of Phokion. Nine thousand "qualified citizens" only were found at Athens

possessing property to the amount of two thousand drachmæ. All those below this prescribed qualification were deprived of the rights of citizenship, and were deported out of Attica, some to Thrace, some to the Illyrian or Italian coast, some to Libya or the Kyrenaic territory.

It has been stated that the distinguished anti-Macedonian orators had already fled—Demosthenes, Hyperides, Aris-tonikus, and Himeræus. The three last having taken refuge in Ægina, and Demosthenes in Kalauria, all of them were “out of the reach of an Athenian sentence, but not beyond that of the Macedonian sword.” Antipater sent a company of soldiers, called in the language of the time the Exile-Hunters, about the country to capture them. Hyperides, Aris-tonikus, and Himeræus were seized in Ægina, and marched off to Kleonæ in Argolis, where Antipater remained. All were put to death by his order ; and Hyperides is said to have first had his tongue cut out.

Death of Demosthenes.

Demosthenes, anticipating his arrest, had sought refuge in the temple of Poseidon in Kalauria, hoping that the “Exile-Hunters” would abstain from laying violent hands upon him in that venerable sanctuary. Soon after, Archias, the chief of the band, came to the temple and endeavored to persuade the great orator to quit the sanctuary and go with him to Antipater, assuring him that he had no harsh measures to expect. Demosthenes, however, well aware of the fate which awaited him, fixed his eyes on the speaker, and said, without rising from his seat, “Neither your actions moved me formerly, nor do your promises move me now.”* Archias began then to threaten ; upon which Demosthenes said, “Before you acted a part ; now you speak as from the Macedonian tripod. Only wait a while till I have sent my

* Archias, the chief of the Exile-Hunters, is said to have been once a tragic actor.

last orders to my family." So saying, he retired into the inner part of the temple; and, taking some paper as if he meant to write, he put the pen to his mouth, and bit it for a considerable time, as he was wont to do when thoughtful about his composition; after which he covered his head and let it sink into a reclining posture. The soldiers who stood at the door, apprehending that he took this method to put off the fatal stroke, laughed at him and called him a coward. Archias, then approaching, desired him to rise, and began to repeat the promises of making his peace with Antipater. Demosthenes, who by this time felt the poison beginning to take effect, uncovered his face, and, looking upon Archias—"Now," said he, "you may act the part of Kreon* in the play as soon as you please, and cast out this carcass of mine unburied. For my part, O gracious Poseidon! I quit thy temple with my breath within me. But Antipater and the Macedonians would not have scrupled to profane it with murder." By this time he could scarcely stand, and therefore desired them to support him. But in attempting to walk out he fell by the altar, and expired with a groan.

Thus perished Demosthenes, an incomparable orator, but unfortunately an advocate of erroneous political doctrines. His orations were the veritable funeral elegies of old Athens. This city, which produced the rarest fruits of art and thought, has justly obtained such funeral melody, and Demosthenes perhaps became so great an orator by being unfortunate in his political career. Eloquence often embellishes both victories and disasters; but eloquence in behalf of misfortunes will always be more efficacious than all the most splendid panegyrics of glory and triumph.

* Alluding to that passage in the "Antigone" of Sophokles where Kreon forbids the body of Polynikes to be buried.

CHAPTER II.

THE STRUGGLE FOR SUPREMACY.

Proceedings of Perdikkas.

ANTIPATER now became all-powerful in Europe, and to this end took care to draw to himself the brave and good Kraterus, a most distinguished general, whom Alexander not less than the people and the army had loved and honored. He bestowed upon Kraterus great honors, and cemented his alliance with him by giving to him his beautiful and accomplished daughter Phila in marriage.

The two generals resolved (about the end of 322 B. C.) to pass across the Corinthian Gulf and attack the Ætoli-ans, the only Greeks remaining unsubdued. Diodorus informs us that it was the purpose of Antipater not merely to conquer this brave and warlike people, but to transport them *en masse* into Asia, and march them up to the interior deserts of the empire. After having suffered terrific hardships and undergone untold dangers, the Macedonians were about to compel the sturdy Ætoli-ans to surrender, in spite of bravery and endurance, when suddenly Antigonus, satrap of Greater Phrygia, came to the Macedonian camp and communicated such news to Antipater that the latter at once concluded peace with the Ætoli-ans—postponing till a future period his design of deporting that people—and hastened to cross into Asia.

Perdikkas, as has been said, had ordered Antigonus to assist Eumenes in the pacification of his satrapy. The former, however, not deeming it best for his own interests, refused to obey. Perdikkas, the royal intendant, wishing to secure and enlarge the rule of his faithful Eumenes, hastened to his assistance with the central army of the empire, gained

a great victory over his enemy Ariarathes, and delivered Kappadokia to his friend. At the same time he ordered Antigonus to appear before him and explain his disobedience, threatening to invade his satrapy in case he should dare to offer resistance. But Antigonus was not the man to obey such peremptory orders. Accompanied by his son Demetrius and the most faithful of his friends, he fled to Antipater, whose assistance he hoped to obtain in the struggle against his powerful opponent.

Not long before, Antipater, desirous of entering into close alliance with Perdikkas, had sent over to Asia Nikæa, another of his daughters, to become the wife of the royal intendant. But Queen Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, hating Antipater as she alone in the savageness of her soul knew how to hate, sent her own daughter Kleopatra, the widow of Alexander, king of Epirus, to become the wife of Perdikkas. This last offer of marriage was most pleasing to the royal intendant, since it brought him into close union with the royal family of Macedonia. Deeming it, however, hazardous to provoke openly and immediately the wrath of Antipater, especially since he had already pledged himself to his daughter, he resolved to accept Nikæa for the moment, but fully determined, as soon as he had secured his hold in Asia, to send her away, take Kleopatra, and overthrow Antipater. Apprised of these plots and dangers in time, Antipater immediately abandoned the Ætolian war, appointed Polysperchon, one of Alexander's veteran officers, to be chief administrator in Macedonia during his absence, and hastened to Asia, in the spring of 321 B. C., with Kraterus, his ablest friend and coadjutor.

In the mean time, Kynane, daughter of Philip and widow of his nephew Amyntas, a daring and ambitious woman, had brought into Asia her daughter Eurydike for the purpose of making her the wife of King Philip Arridæus. Being averse to the marriage, Perdikkas contrived means to put

Kynane to death ; but, presently yielding to the indignation excited among the soldiers by this deed, he was forced not only to spare the life of Eurydike, but even to permit her marriage with King Arridæus. This union was calculated to thwart the plans and check the aspirations of Perdikkas, because Eurydike was not less ambitious than her mother, and, being the wife of the king, she had the means to arouse his suspicions. At the same time, Ptolemy, satrap of Egypt, broke with Perdikkas and joined himself with Antipater and Kraterus. Ptolemy was a dangerous and powerful opponent, not only on account of his personal qualifications, but also because he ruled over a rich region, which at this time he had considerably enlarged by the addition of Kyrene, a Hellenic colony.

Perdikkas, thus threatened from the south and the west, resolved in the beginning of 321 B. C. to march in person against Ptolemy in Egypt, leaving his faithful Eumenes with a powerful army to maintain his cause in Kappadokia and Asia Minor.

Combination against Eumenes.

The difficulties which Eumenes had to encounter were greater than his newly acquired authority. Being a Greek, he was continually embarrassed by the discontents of his own Macedonian soldiers, and menaced in every way by the treacherous jealousy of his officers. He had to fight against Antipater and Kraterus, men whom the entire Macedonian army loved and respected. Indeed, the situation was so precarious that Alketas, brother of Perdikkas, abandoned the cause as hopeless, alleging that his Macedonian soldiers had refused to wage war against those two eminent friends of Philip and Alexander. Again, many other satraps secretly favored the enemy. Most men would have been utterly discouraged by these obstacles, and have followed the example of Alketas ; but now it became manifest why

Alexander so much esteemed Eumenes, not only as his chief secretary, but also as a general.

Eumenes, seeing that he had to oppose the well-trained Macedonian divisions of Antipater and Kraterus with Asiatic troops only, marched off to his faithful Kappadokia, preferring to risk a battle there rather than in the countries bordering on the Hellespont. The two Macedonian generals had already passed into Asia and approached Greater Phrygia, when Eumenes, becoming aware of the treacherous plans of Neoptolemus, satrap of Armenia, attacked him without delay, utterly defeated him, and compelled even the Macedonian phalanx to lay down their arms and swear allegiance to Perdikkas.

A little before this battle, both Antipater and Kraterus had sent ambassadors to Eumenes with favorable propositions of peace on condition that he should abandon the royal intendant. But the faithful Kardian, though an old friend of Kraterus, refused to betray Perdikkas, declaring that he should support his injured friend while he had an hour to live, and would rather sacrifice life itself than his honor. Meanwhile Neoptolemus arrived, gave an account of the battle he had lost, and requested assistance of both, but particularly of Kraterus. He assured them that, if they would attack Eumenes without delay, they would gain an easy victory; for the Macedonians, he said, had so extraordinary an attachment for Kraterus, that if they saw but the crest of his helmet, or heard one accent of his tongue, they would immediately run to him with their swords in their hands.* The two generals were prevailed upon not

* Plutarch informs us that the reputation of Kraterus was very great among the Macedonians, and, after the death of Alexander, most of them wished to be under his command. They remembered the risks he had run of embroiling himself with Alexander for their sakes; how he had combated the inclination for Persian fashions which insensibly grew upon the king, and supported the customs of his country against the insults of barbaric pomp and luxury.

less by the arguments of Neoptolemus than by the fact that they deemed it unwise to march forward while Eumenes threatened their rear. It was therefore decided that Antipater with a small part of the army should continue his march to Kilikia, while Kraterus with a force consisting of two thousand infantry and two thousand horse—all Macedonians—should hasten, with Neoptolemus, against Eumenes.

Eumenes was not unprepared for action. He was fully aware of the expedition, and knew well that the name alone of Kraterus was sufficient to cause his utter ruin. Accordingly, he propagated the report that Neoptolemus and Pigris, both of whom had been recently defeated, were advancing again with some Kappadokian and Paphlagonian horse. Thus, when the two armies came in view, not one of the soldiers of Eumenes, nor even his principal officers and captains, knew with what adversary they had to contend.

In the morning of the battle, Kraterus, calling an assembly of his soldiers, exhorted them to behave like brave men; promising at the same time an easy victory, because the Macedonians, he said, now in the ranks of that traitor yonder, would not continue in strife against their compatriots and ancient leader. But the words were hardly finished when the cavalry of Eumenes was seen dashing across the plain, singing a pæan of victory. Kraterus was surprised, and expressed his resentment in strong terms against Neoptolemus, who, he thought, had deceived him with a pretense that the Macedonians would change sides. However, he exhorted his officers to meet the foe without fear, and rushed forward to the encounter. The battle was desperate from the beginning; the spears were soon broken, and a bloody contest with the sword ensued. The behavior of Kraterus did no dishonor to Alexander. He was in the thickest of the battle, and many fell under his well-directed blows; but finally he received a side-thrust from a Thracian, which brought him to the ground. His horsemen passed over him

without knowing him ; but Gorgias, one of Eumenes's officers, recognized him, and leaping from his horse guarded his body. It was then, however, too late ; he was at the last extremity and in the agonies of death.*

The Macedonians, deprived of their leader, quickly retreated before the victorious Asiatics, and betook themselves to their phalanx, when the combat was renewed in all its former fury. The Macedonian infantry was now under the direction of Neoptolemus. The most violent hatred had long subsisted between him and Eumenes, and this day, says Plutarch, added stings to it. They knew not one another in the first two encounters ; but in the third they did, and rushed forward impetuously with swords drawn and loud shouts. The shock of their horses as they dashed against one another resembled that of two galleys. The fierce antagonists quitted the bridles and laid hold on each other, each striving to tear off the helmet or the breastplate of his enemy. While thus engaged their horses went from under them, and as they fell to the ground they continued fighting, until finally Neoptolemus received a wound in the neck, grew faint, and stretched himself upon the ground. When Eumenes, with all the eagerness of inveterate enmity, hastened to strip Neoptolemus of his arms, loading his worthy antagonist with reproaches, the latter succeeded, even in the last agonies of death, in wounding his enemy under the cuirass. But the stroke of the dying man is feeble, and Neoptolemus, while gasping for breath, saw with unspeakable hatred and wrath his implacable enemy victorious at his side. When he had despoiled his adversary, Eumenes, weak as he was with the wounds he had received in his legs and arms, mounted his horse and made up to his left wing, which he supposed might still be engaged with the enemy. Here for the first time he was informed of the fate of Kraterus, and at once hastened to him. Finding his breath and senses

* Plutarch.

not quite gone, he alighted from his horse, wept over him, and did his utmost to restore the dying man ; and when this proved to be impossible, he caused his dead body to be honorably shrouded and transmitted to Macedonia for burial.

After the defeat and death of both the generals, the phalanx was compelled to seek peace from Eumenes. The Macedonians later violated the terms, and again joined themselves with Antipater ; yet Eumenes not only remained master of Asia Minor, but also achieved great renown for having gained the palm both of capacity and courage. The victory of Eumenes showed what the Asiatics could do when well commanded, and at the same time it bore witness that the Macedonian Hellenism did not win its laurels through the Macedonians only, but also through the bravery and intelligence of the Hellenes. Eumenes succeeded in moving to insurrection the Ætoliens, who afterward became masters of almost all Thessaly. Thus the affairs of the royal intendant, both in Europe and Asia, appeared in excellent condition, when suddenly his own haughtiness and incapacity destroyed the advantages achieved by the wonderful skill of Eumenes.

Death of Perdikkas.

It has been stated that Perdikkas in the spring of 321 B. C. had marched against Ptolemy in Egypt. Reaching Damascus, he sought, according to the Macedonian customs, the condemnation of Ptolemy by the army, alleging that he was a violator of the obedience due to the kings. But the army, which both loved and respected the old comrade of Alexander, declared him innocent of all crime. Perdikkas endeavored to subdue the spirit of antagonism so forcibly manifested in his own army by the punishment of a few soldiers, and then directed the army to continue on its march. He was, however, so overbearing and tyrannical that many of his officers joined Ptolemy, whose conciliatory behavior gained their good will.

Perdikkas, however, still arrogant, ordered his army to cross the Nile, but was driven back with great loss. His own army therefore mutinied, and the most daring of his officers seized him and put him to death.

CHAPTER III.

ANTIPATER AND POLYSPERCHON.

Affairs in Europe and Asia.

THUS perished the man who first of all sought to preserve the union of the vast empire of Alexander the Great. On the day following Ptolemy repaired to the army, and, having assured the assembled generals of his devotion to the Macedonian cause and of his allegiance to the chosen rulers, peace and friendship again reigned among all. But matters began to assume a threatening aspect when it came to be decided who should be elected as successor to Perdikkas. Antipater was finally invested with the guardianship of the persons of the kings, and with the sort of ministerial supremacy previously held by Perdikkas.

The first act of the new regent, as we should call him to-day, was a second distribution of the satrapies of the empire—somewhat modified, yet coinciding in the main with that which had been drawn up shortly after the death of Alexander. To Ptolemy were assured Egypt and Libya, and to Antigonos, Greater Phrygia, Lykia, and Pamphylia.

But many and powerful were the men who were dissatisfied with the new regulations—prominent among whom were Eumenes and Alketas, brother of Perdikkas. Hostilities broke out afresh both in Europe and Asia. The regent hastened to Europe with a great part of the Macedonian army

and many war-elephants, the first that were seen in Europe ; while Antigonus was placed in command of the principal army in Asia, to crush Eumenes and the other chief adherents of Perdikkas, most of whom had been condemned to death by a vote of the Macedonian army.

The great struggle, however, did not begin till about the middle of 320 B. C., when Antigonus first of all marched against Eumenes. The latter was defeated* through the treachery of one of his officers, who deserted to the enemy in the thickest of the battle ; but, though Eumenes was forced to flee, he succeeded in arresting the traitor and hanged him on the spot. Plutarch informs us that in his flight he took a different course from the pursuers, and, returning to the field of battle, buried his dead—a daring act, which elicited the astonishment of Antigonus himself at his firmness and intrepidity. Eumenes, being closely pursued and finding his plans for mustering a new force thwarted by the incessant vigilance of his opponent, was compelled to retire to the fortress of Nora, on the confines of Lykaonia and Kappadokia, with only five hundred horse and two hundred foot.

Antigonus was now master of nearly all Asia. He knew, however, that his position was not secure while the unconquered and inventive Eumenes remained in his lofty citadel. He accordingly invited him to a conference. Eumenes insisted that Antigonus should send hostages if he wanted to treat with him in person. Antigonus, he said, had many friends and generals to take his place, in case of accident to himself ; but the troops he had the care of had none to command or to protect them after him. Antigonus responded that he should be addressed in a manner befitting “a greater man.” “I shall never,” said Eumenes, “think any man greater than myself while I am master of my sword.” At last Antigonus sent his nephew Ptolemy into the fort as a

* The battle was fought in the territory of the Orkynians in Kappadokia, and Eumenes is said to have lost eight thousand men.

hostage, and then Eumenes came out to him. The negotiations ended in nothing. Eumenes insisted on having the government of his provinces confirmed to him, and considerable rewards for his services besides; claims which Antigonus was unwilling to grant at the expense of his own power.

Reconciliation becoming impossible, Antigonus drew a line of circumvallation around Nora, and, having left a sufficient number of troops to carry on the siege, he hastened, at the head of forty thousand infantry, seven thousand horse, and seventy elephants, from north to south, sweeping away his opponents and striking terror and dismay among all who favored the cause of Perdikkas. He returned as a mighty conqueror to Phrygia, at the head of his victorious army, dreaming of supplanting the king, seizing the crown, and proclaiming himself the successor of Alexander, when in the beginning of 319 B. C. he received information calculated to promote his inordinate ambition.

Death of Antipater and Demades.

The news received was nothing less than the death of Antipater, who, being advanced in years, fell sick and presently died. One of his latest acts was to put to death the Athenian orator Demades. The Athenians were continually importuning Phokion to persuade Antipater to withdraw the Macedonian garrison from Munychia. Finding that Phokion would not meddle with this affair, they applied to Demades, who readily undertook it. In consequence of this, he and his son took a journey to Macedonia. It should seem, says Plutarch, that his evil genius led him thither; for he arrived just at the time when Antipater was in his last sickness, and when his son Kassander, now absolute master of everything, had intercepted a letter written by Demades to Antigonus in Asia, inviting him to come over and seize Hellas and Macedonia, which, he said, hung only upon an old and rotten warp—meaning Antipater. This letter gave great offense to An-

tipater, and still greater to Kassander, who caused Demades and his son to be seized. First he killed the son before his eyes, and so near that the blood spouted upon him and stained his bosom ; and then he slew the father himself, with bitter invective against his ingratitude.

Antipater, a little before his death, had appointed Polysperchon, one of Alexander's veteran officers, as chief administrator, with full powers on behalf of the imperial dynasty ; while he assigned to his own son Kassander only the second place, as chiliarch or general of the body-guard.

Polysperchon—Death of Phokion.

This was the intelligence which reached the ears of Antigonus—an event destined to cause new and fearful disturbances, during which the relatives of Alexander the Great were to be sacrificed, the union of the empire to be destroyed, and new royal dynasties to spring up on the ruins of the old.

Kassander, far from satisfied with the appointment received from his father, decided to overthrow Polysperchon and seize the supreme power. Immediately after the death of Antipater, but before it became publicly known, Kassander dispatched Nikanor with pretended orders from Antipater to supersede Menyllus in the government of Munychia. This scheme was carried into execution. At the same time he sent confidential adherents to the Hellespont and other places in furtherance of his schemes ; and he lost no time in communicating with Antigonus in Asia and with Ptolemy in Egypt, whom he knew to be ready to assist in everything tending to overthrow the central authority.

Polysperchon and his friends were not blind to the difficulties of their position. The principal officers in Macedonia having been convened to deliberate, it was resolved “to invite Olympias out of Epirus, that she might assume the tutelage of her grandson Alexander (son of Roxana) ; to place the Asiatic interests of the dynasty in the hands of Eumenes,

appointing him to the supreme command ; and to combat Kassander in Europe, by assuring to themselves the good will and support of the Greeks. This last object was to be obtained by granting to the Hellenes general enfranchisement, and by subverting the Antipatrian oligarchies and military governments now paramount throughout the cities."

These measures tended of course to destroy the influence of Kassander in Hellas. But, on the other hand, they were naturally destined to create a general and fearful anarchy on account of the changes and retaliations called forth. If we take into consideration that shortly afterward Hellas became the field of contest between the two Macedonian generals, we may form an idea of the misfortunes that country suffered toward the end of 319 and the beginning of 318 B. C. The Athenians not long after asked Nikanor to evacuate Munychia. He not only refused to do so, but, knowing that his friend Kassander was on his way to Athens, hastened to occupy both the walls and the harbor of the Peiræus. For this the Athenians blamed Phokion, accusing him of being privy to that event and concealing it out of friendship to Nikanor.

At that juncture arrived Alexander, the son of Polysperchon, with an army to assist the city against Nikanor. Many Athenian exiles, slaves, and runaways, as well as foreigners and such as had been stigmatized as infamous, entered the city with Alexander, resorted to the assembly of the people, and began to decide on the course the city ought to pursue in the present exigency. The magistrates of the city, among whom was Phokion, repaired to Alexander and assured him of their devotion to the interests of Polysperchon, but at the same time implored him to occupy the harbors and prevent any possible attack of Kassander by way of the sea, and take active measures against so strange and disorderly an assembly. Alexander encamped near the Peiræus, and had repeated interviews with Nikanor. Great was the mistrust created

among the Athenians, and especially the exiles who accompanied Alexander's army, by these parleys. Fearing lest the two Macedonian generals might form an alliance and subvert the hardly recovered liberty of the people, they passed a vote to depose those who had held office under the Antipatrian oligarchy, and who still continued to hold it. Immediately the orator Agnonides singled out Phokion, and accused him of treason; which so much alarmed Kallimedon and Charikles, Phokion's son-in-law, that they fled out of the city. Phokion and such of his friends as did not forsake him repaired to Alexander's camp, throwing themselves upon his protection on the faith of the recent understanding. Alexander not only received them courteously, but gave them letters to his father Polysperchon, requesting "safety and protection for them, as men who had embraced his cause, and who were still eager to do all in their power to support him."*

The Athenian democracy, just reconstituted, which had passed the recent condemnatory votes, was disquieted at the news that Alexander had espoused the cause of Phokion, and had recommended the like policy to his father. On the proposition of Agnonides and Arcestratus, they sent deputies to Polysperchon, with an accusation against Phokion.

The two deputations came up to Polysperchon simultaneously—an event which was very unfortunate for Phokion. Had he seen Polysperchon and presented the letter of Alexander before the Athenian accusers arrived, he might probably have obtained a more favorable reception. But as the arrival of the two parties was nearly synchronous, Polysperchon heard both of them at the same audience, before King Philip Arridæus on his throne. When the accusers found themselves face to face with Phokion and his party, their reciprocal invectives at first filled the place with noise and

* Diodorus, xviii, 66: . . . τ' ακείνου πεφρονηκότες, και νῦν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι πάντα συμπράξειν. This application of Phokion to Alexander, and the letters obtained to Polysperchon, are not mentioned by Plutarch.

tumult ; until Agnonides himself, chief of the Athenian deputation, pressed forward and said, "Pack us all into one cage and send us back to Athens, to receive judgment from the Athenians." The king laughed at this observation ; but the Macedonians and the strangers who were drawn thither by curiosity were desirous of hearing the cause, and therefore made signs to the deputies to argue the matter there. However, the debate was far from being conducted with impartiality. Polysperchon heard Phokion's defense with impatience, interrupted him several times, and so disgusted him that he at length struck the ground with his stick and held his peace. Hegemon, another of the accused, was yet more harshly treated. When he appealed to Polysperchon himself, as having personally been cognizant of his (the speaker's) good disposition toward the Athenian people, the latter exclaimed, "Do you come here to slander me before the king?" Upon this the king started up, and was going to run Hegemon through with his spear ; but Polysperchon prevented him, and the council broke up immediately.* The sentence could not be doubtful. Phokion and his companions were delivered over as prisoners to the Athenian deputation, together with a letter from the king, intimating that in his conviction they were traitors, but that he left them to be judged by the Athenians, now restored to freedom and autonomy.

It was early in March, 318 B. C., that the prisoners were carried in carts, strongly guarded, along the Kerameikus, through sympathizing friends and an embittered multitude, until they reached the theatre wherein the assembly was to be convened. A melancholy scene ! The men who shortly before had held the fortunes of the city in their hands, the men who had many a time risked life on the field of battle, the men whose glorious achievements had gained for them a Panhellenic reputation—these men, among whom was the noble and virtuous old Phokion, now stood in fetters before

* Plutarch, "Phokion." See also Grote, vol. xii, chap. xcvi.

a tribunal composed of their most rancorous enemies, the citizens just returned from exile or deportation. From this assembly, says Plutarch, neither slaves, nor foreigners, nor persons stigmatized as infamous were excluded; the tribunal and the theatre were open to all.

The best of the citizens, when they saw Phokion, appeared greatly dejected, and, covering their faces with their mantles, began to weep. One, however, had the courage to say, "Since the king leaves the determination of so important a matter to the people, it would be proper to command all slaves and strangers to depart." But the populace cried out, "It would be much more proper to stone all the favorers of oligarchy, all the enemies of the people!" After the accusation was concluded, Phokion was called on for his defense; but he found it impossible to obtain a hearing. At last, silence being made, he said, "Do you design to take away my life justly or unjustly?" When some answered, "Justly," he said, "How can you know whether it will be justly, if you do not hear me first?" Attempting several times to speak, he was as often cried down; until at length he gave up the case in despair, and, advancing some paces forward, exclaimed: "Citizens of Athens, I acknowledge I have done you injustice, and for my faults in the administration adjudge myself guilty of death; but why will you put these men to death, who have never injured you?" "Because they are your friends," was the exclamation of those around; upon which he drew back, and resigned himself quietly to his fate.

Agnonides then read a decree, to the effect that the assembled people should decide by show of hands whether the persons now arraigned were guilty or not; and that if declared guilty, they should be put to death. A few persons cried out for an additional clause for putting Phokion to the torture before execution, and insisted that the rack and its managers should be sent for immediately; but this savage proposition, utterly at variance with Athenian law in respect

to citizens, was repudiated not less by Agnonides than by the Macedonian officer Kleitus. There was, however, hardly one negative when the sentence of death was proposed. Nearly every hand in the assembly was held up in condemnation; each man even rose from his seat to make the effect more imposing; and some went so far as to put on wreaths in token of triumph. To many of them doubtless, remarks Grote, the gratification of this intense and unanimous vindictive impulse—in their view not merely legitimate, but patriotic—must have been among the happiest moments of life.

After the assembly was dismissed, the five condemned persons, Phokion, Nikokles, Thudippus, Hegemon, and Pythokles, were consigned to the supreme magistrates of police, called the Eleven, and led to prison for the purpose of having the customary dose of poison administered. The embraces of their friends and relatives melted them to tears, and they all went on bewailing their fate, except Phokion. His countenance, during the passage from the theatre to the prison, was the same as when the people sent him out to command their armies; and the beholders could not but admire his invincible firmness and magnanimity. Some of his enemies, indeed, reviled him as he went along, and it is said that one man planted himself in front, and spat upon Phokion; who turned to the public officers and exclaimed, "Will no one correct this fellow's rudeness?" This was the only emotion which he manifested amid "the wailings of his friends, the broken spirit of his four comrades, and the fierce demonstrations of antipathy from his fellow citizens generally." One ray of comfort presented itself as he entered the prison. It was the 19th of the month Munychion (April), the day on which the Athenian horsemen or knights (the richest class in the city, men for the most part of oligarchical sentiments) celebrated their festal procession with wreaths on their heads in honor of Zeus. As the cavalcade passed by, several of these horsemen halted on their way,

took off their wreaths, and wept as they looked through the gratings of the prison.

When asked whether he had anything to tell his son Phokus, Phokion replied, "I tell him emphatically not to hold an evil memory of the Athenians." The draught of hemlock was then administered to all five—to Phokion last. Having been condemned for treason, the bodies were not allowed to remain in Attica, but were carried into the Megarid by a hired agent named Konopion, and then burnt by fire obtained at Megara. The wife of Phokion poured libations and marked the spot by a small mound of earth; she also collected the bones and brought them back to Athens in her bosom, during the secrecy of night. She buried them near her own domestic hearth with this address: "Ye guardians of this place, to you I commit the remains of this good man. Do you restore them to the sepulchre of his ancestors, when the Athenians shall once more listen to the dictates of wisdom."

The trial and death of these men, and especially of Phokion—then more than eighty years old, personally brave, mild, and superior to all pecuniary temptation—is one of the saddest incidents in Hellenic history, and one especially to be regretted, since it occurred amid the general paralysis and decline of the Athenians. The death of these oligarchs—which Grote, notwithstanding actual historic events, seeks to justify, alleging that "the facts of the past supplied ample warrant"—neither secured liberty for the Athenians, nor did it aid Polysperchon much in satisfying his inordinate ambition. A few days later Kassander—the cause of whose delay is unexplained—reached the Peiræus, with thirty-five ships and four thousand hoplites. Polysperchon at once entered Attica, leading an army of thirty thousand Macedonian hoplites, four thousand allies, one thousand horse, and sixty-five elephants, which then for the first time trod the soil of European Hellas. Unable to reduce the walls of

the harbor, he left his son Alexander with a small force of cavalry, to watch the movements of the enemy ; while himself with the remaining army hastened to the Peloponnesus to enlist a new force of allies and restore the democratic form of government. He failed in his plans, and was driven from Megalopolis, with the loss of many of his elephants. At the same time ominous news reached him from all sides. Eumenes, whom he had left with a large force in Kilikia, instead of attacking Antigonus in Asia Minor, and thus preventing him from carrying out his plans in Europe, had already gone to Phœnicia and Syria ; his admiral, Kleitus, was defeated in the Propontis, with the loss of his whole fleet, by Nikanor (whom Kassander had sent from the Peiræus) and Antigonus ; many cities in Hellas had abandoned his cause, and the Athenians themselves, who shortly before were so enthusiastic in his behalf, were constrained to listen to the partisans of Kassander. The Athenians, unable to capture the Peiræus, agreed that "they should become friends and allies of Kassander ; that they should have full enjoyment of their city, with the port of Peiræus, their ships, and revenues ; that the exiles and deported citizens should be readmitted ; that the political franchise should for the future be enjoyed by all citizens who possessed one thousand drachmæ of property and upward ; that Kassander should hold Munychia with a governor and garrison, until the war against Polysperchon was brought to a close ; and that he (Kassander) should also name some one Athenian citizen, in whose hands the supreme government of the city should be vested." Kassander named Demetrius the Phalerean (i. e., an Athenian of the deme Phalerum), one of the colleagues of Phokion, who had gone into voluntary exile since the death of Antipater, but had recently returned.

Polysperchon, finding himself threatened by so many dangers, decided to abandon the siege of Megalopolis and return to Macedonia, both in order to prevent Antigonus

from crossing into Europe, and to muster if possible new auxiliaries. But other disastrous news reached him on his way to Macedonia. King Philip Arridæus and his ambitious wife Eurydike, alarmed and indignant at the restoration of Olympias which Polysperchon was projecting, solicited aid from Kassander, appointed him royal intendant, and ordered Polysperchon to place the force of Macedonia at his disposal. Polysperchon, driven to despair, entered into alliance with the Epirotic prince Æakides, and, assisted by Olympias, who had with her Roxana and her child, the widow and son of Alexander the Great, succeeded in entering Macedonia, apparently in the autumn of 317 B. C. Philip Arridæus and Eurydike sought to oppose Olympias; but the Macedonian soldiers, we are told, were so overawed by her name and the recollection of Alexander the Great, that they refused to fight, and thus gave her an easy victory. Philip and Eurydike became her prisoners. The former she caused to be slain; to the latter she offered only an option between the sword, the halter, and poison.

Unfortunately, this queen, already an old woman, still clung to the natural savageness of her soul. She next proceeded to satiate her revenge against the family of Antipater. One hundred leading Macedonians, friends of Kassander, were put to death by her orders, together with his brother Nikanor; while the sepulchre of his deceased brother Iollas, accused of having poisoned Alexander the Great, was broken up.* Many leading Macedonians, formerly her warm adherents, were so much disgusted by these murders that they abandoned her cause; and Kassander, availing himself of this public opinion, entered Macedonia. Olympias, having no army sufficient to meet him in the field, was forced to shut herself up in the maritime fortress of Pydna, with Roxana, the child of Alexander, and Thessa-

* Diodorus, xix, 11; Justin, x, 14, 4; Pausanias, i, 11, 4; Grote, vol. xii, chap. xevi.

lonike, daughter of her late husband Philip, son of Amyntas. Æakides hastened to relieve her ; but his army, which had already suffered severe hardships without any positive advantage, revolted, drove away the king, and joined the forces of Kassander. Pydna, abandoned to her own resources, still held out, on account of the heroic endurance of the fearless Olympias ; but finally, in the ensuing spring (316 B. C.), she was forced by intolerable famine to surrender. Kassander put to death Olympias, who is said to have died with a courage worthy of her rank and domineering character ; confined Roxana with the child Alexander in the fortress of Amphipolis ; compelled Polysperchon to seek refuge among the Ætolians ; took Thessalonike to wife ; and wielded such an autocratic power in Macedonia, that he even founded on the isthmus of the peninsula of Pallene, and near the site where Potidæa had stood, the new city of Kassandreia, which to this day bears his name.

CHAPTER IV.

ANTIGONUS AND EUMENES.

The Struggle for Supremacy.

IN the spring of 318 B. C., while Antigonus was engaged in the western part of Asia Minor and Eumenes was in Kilia, Python, who during the first distribution of the satrapies had received Lesser Media, sought to become master of the northern provinces ; and accordingly, having invaded Parthia, he killed its satrap Philip, and established in his stead his own brother Eudemus. Hereupon the satraps of the northern provinces united, and, having defeated Python about the autumn of that year, compelled him to seek refuge

with Seleukus in Babylonia. In the mean time Eumenes mustered a large force, but was not yet a match for Antigonus. The latter, not deeming it wise to cross into Europe and leave behind him such a formidable foe, dispatched his fleet to the coast of Kilikia, while he himself, at the head of twenty thousand hoplites and four thousand horse, hastened in pursuit of Eumenes. As soon as the forces of Antigonus reached Kilikia, the Phœnicians abandoned Eumenes and joined themselves to his opponent.

The affairs of Eumenes were now in a desperate condition. Deprived of his fleet, he was cut off from every communication with Europe. But the Kardian was full of devices, and was destined to hold for a long time the royal flag intrusted to his keeping. Leaving western Asia, he pushed his way eastward, and spent the winter at Babylon. He succeeded by his tireless energy in persuading many governors of provinces to come to his assistance, and, having collected a great part of his soldiers who had dispersed themselves after his defeat, and were straggling about the country, he inspired them with his own spirit and determination.

In May, 317 B. C., Antigonus, leading a large force, suddenly approached and encamped over against Eumenes. Marching during the warm season through the plains of Susiana, he suffered severe losses, and while attempting to cross the river Koprates was attacked by Eumenes, sustained a total defeat, lost about eight thousand men, and was forced to undertake a long retreat as far as Media, during which he encountered untold hardships.

Eumenes wished to follow up at once the steps of the retreating Antigonus, capture Asia Minor, and then fall upon his remaining enemies. The satraps opposed this daring project, maintaining that it was best not to attack Antigonus in the mountainous regions of Media, but to retreat to the satrapy of Peukestas in Persis. This opinion finally

prevailed, and the army retired to Persepolis, where Peukestatas, having feasted them in a sumptuous manner and given each man a sheep for sacrifice, hoped to be intrusted with the command. In the autumn news suddenly came that Antigonus was marching against them. Almost at the same time Eumenes fell sick with a raging fever, and had to be carried in a litter. The army had not gone far before the enemy made their appearance, for they had passed the intermediate hill, and were now descending into the plain. The luster of their golden armor glittering in the sun as they marched down the hill, the elephants with the towers on their backs, and the purple vests which the cavalry wore when they were advancing to the combat, struck the troops that were to oppose them with such surprise that the front halted and called out for Eumenes, declaring that they would not move a step farther if he was not in command. Eumenes no sooner heard this than he advanced with the utmost expedition, hastening the slaves who carried the litter. He likewise opened the curtains, and stretched out his hand in token of his joy. On the first sight of the general of their heart, the troops saluted him in the Macedonian language, clanked their arms, and with loud shouts challenged the enemy to advance, thinking themselves invincible while he was at their head.*

Antigonus, having learned from some prisoners that Eumenes was so extremely ill that he was forced to be carried in a litter, concluded that he should find no great difficulty in beating the other generals, and therefore hastened to the attack. But when he came to reconnoitre the enemy's army, and saw in what excellent order it was drawn up, he stood still some time in silent admiration. At last, spying the litter carried about from one wing to the other, he laughed out aloud, as his manner was, and said to his friends, "Yon litter is the thing that pitches the battle against us." He de-

* Plutarch, "Eumenes."

cided, however, to retreat immediately to his intrenchments. A few days after this Eumenes, having received intelligence that Antigonus intended to decamp in the night, sought to cut off his retreat, and a sharp action ensued. The contest was indecisive, the victory having been won and lost several times, until finally both antagonists were compelled to leave the field of battle. Antigonus retreated by forced marches to his faithful Media; and Eumenes, unable to follow in pursuit, remained in the rich district of Gabiene.

The danger once past, the officers, in appearance, gave Eumenes a kind reception; but it was not difficult to discover the envy and jealousy they had in their hearts, and how much they disliked to act under him. The army surrendered itself to riotous living, and not a few of its divisions scattered about the country at a distance of six days one from the other. As soon as Antigonus learned this, he resolved to avail himself of the foolishness of his opponents, and fall upon them suddenly in the midst of winter. Media, where he was encamped, was distant from Gabiene, by the usual way, about twenty-five days' march. Antigonus, however, took the shortest road across a large, treeless, waterless, uninhabited plain—a veritable desert—intending to strike the enemy while thus dispersed. Orders were at once issued to the army to prepare provisions for ten days, to take ten thousand bags of water, and to be ready to march “without losing a moment's time.” Antigonus, wishing to keep his expedition as secret as possible, directed his soldiers to burn no fires during the night. However, as soon as he had entered the desolate region, his troops were attacked by such violent winds and severe frosts* that it was difficult for them to proceed, so that they found it necessary to light many fires. The barbarians who inhabited the mountains that overlooked the plain, wondering what that blazing light in the midst of the desert could mean, sent some per-

* It was about the middle of December, 317 B. C.

sons upon dromedaries to Peukestas and Eumenes with an account of it.

Peukestas, distracted with terror, prepared for flight; many other satraps advocated this course, declaring that the enemy would undoubtedly come within four days, while they could scarcely collect their forces within six. But Eumenes dispelled their fears and uneasiness by promising so to impede the enemy's march that they would arrive three days later than they were expected. All bowed before the incomparable genius of the Greek who promised to extricate them from this impending danger. Time was not to be lost. Orders were at once forwarded to the absent satraps to hasten their forces, while Eumenes set out to seek a lofty piece of ground, which might attract the attention of the troops marching below. Having found one that answered his purpose, he measured it and caused a number of fires to be lighted at proper intervals, so as to resemble a camp. When Antigonus beheld these fires upon the heights, he was in the utmost distress, thinking that the enemy had been apprised of his intention some time before, and were come to meet him. Not choosing therefore, with troops so harassed and fatigued, to fight with those that were perfectly fresh, he left the short road and led his men through the town and villages, giving them time to refresh themselves. But when he discovered that that great camp, which had a periphery of seventy stadia, gave no signs of life, that no parties came out to harass him in his march, that no troops whatever had been seen by the neighboring inhabitants, but only fires upon the hills, "he perceived that Eumenes had outdone him in point of generalship";* and this incensed him so much that he advanced with a resolution to try his strength in a pitched battle.

Meantime the various forces of Eumenes came pouring in on all sides. The elephants alone were still absent, and

* . . . *ἤσθετο κατεστρατηγημένος ὑπὸ Εὐμένους.*

Antigonus, learning that they were not far distant, decided to attack them suddenly and seize upon that excellent means of defense of his opponent. But nothing could deceive the sleepless Eumenes. Suspecting the plans of Antigonus, he dispatched fifteen hundred horsemen and three thousand foot-soldiers to the assistance of his elephants. The enemy had already seized upon them, and were making off with their booty, when suddenly the force of Eumenes fell upon them, dispersed them, rescued the elephants, and brought them safe to the camp.

Thus, by the wisdom and foresight of that illustrious Greek, the army was freed from certain destruction, the mistakes of the other generals were repaired, the scattered forces were collected anew, and the elephants were rescued. All admired the great leader, and all desired him to take the sole command—all except the generals, who, exasperated with envy at being obliged to obey “a foreigner,” as they called him, formed a plot against his life. Antigones and Teutamus, the generals of the Argyraspides, were the chiefs of the conspiracy. They agreed, however, “to make use of him in the ensuing battle,”* and to assassinate him immediately after. Eumenes discovered their nefarious plans, but he was not afraid. Retiring to his tent, he told his friends that he lived among a herd of savage beasts, and immediately wrote his will, destroyed all his papers, lest after his death charges and impeachments should arise against the persons who wrote them, and decided to fight the battle, hoping that in case of victory he would be able to frustrate the plans of the ungrateful generals.

Finally, the two armies were drawn up. That of Antigonus was composed of 22,000 foot-soldiers, 9,000 horsemen, and 65 elephants; that of Eumenes, of 36,700 infantry, 6,500 cavalry, and 114 elephants. The surpassing strength of the latter was manifest; besides, he had with him the Argyras-

* Plutarch, “Eumenes,” xvi, 25: ἀποχρήσασθαι πρὸς τὴν μάχην αὐτῶ.

pides, or the old veterans who had served under Philip and Alexander, and were considered wellnigh unconquerable. Everything, therefore, indicated a splendid victory. But the weak and dastardly behavior of the other generals was destined to annul these bright expectations. As soon as the battle began, Peukestas deserted his post with a large body of horse; the remaining cavalry, thus diminished in numbers, was severely pressed. The Argyraspides, indeed, were victorious, for they fell furiously upon the infantry, and routed them with heavy loss. But Antigonus was a man endowed with excellent presence of mind on the most trying occasions. Availing himself of the treachery of Peukestas, he advanced unperceived to the rear of the army of Eumenes, rushed into his camp, and became master of the rich baggage as well as of the women and children of the soldiers and of the Argyraspides.* Eumenes vainly sent for Peukestas, beseeching him to help him, and assuring him that the victory was half won; the latter continued his retreat, declaring that the day was irreparably lost. Finally the Argyraspides and the other detachments of the army were also compelled to leave the field of battle, openly declaring that the cowardice of Peukestas was the cause of all this misfortune.

Eumenes now justly informed his soldiers that if the battle should be renewed on the next day, as Antigonus had lost most of his infantry, his destruction would be certain. But the plans of the satraps were different, and the Argyraspides wished especially to recover their wives and children. Finally, yielding to the persistent demands of Teutamus, they sent ambassadors to Antigonus desiring him to restore their property. He told them he would not only return the Argyraspides their effects, but would treat them in all respects with the greatest kindness, provided they would put Eumenes in his hands. The Argyraspides

* *Argyraspides* literally means the *silver-shields*.

agreed to deliver up their brave leader alive to his enemies. Peukestas with his Persians deserted to Antigonus ; and the other satraps either imitated his example or escaped to their own satrapies. But, as it generally happens, the traitors first of all received punishment for their wickedness. Many were put to death, and the Argyraspides themselves, who thus disgraced their white hair, not long after repented of their cowardice.

Antigonus for a long time hesitated what should be done with Eumenes. He could not bear to have him brought into his presence, because of the former friendly relations that had existed between them. The brave Nearchus and the young Demetrius, son of Antigonus, who began in this expedition his famous military career, strove by all means to save his life. But many sought persistently his death ; even his ancient comrades clamored for his blood ; and Antigonus was finally compelled to order the execution of his illustrious captive. Thus the Kardian Eumenes ended his energetic and ever-stirring career when hardly forty-five years old. He was without question the greatest general that came out of the school of Alexander. If he failed, it was because he wished to continue faithful to the royal flag—to the union of the empire, which, having been represented by two unscrupulously ambitious women, Eurydike and Olympias, by the over-credulous Philip Arridæus, and by the young Alexander, could no longer be preserved ; especially since Antigonus, assisted by many powerful satraps, sought its overthrow. Again, Eumenes failed because, being a Greek, he was envied by the Macedonian generals. Indeed, during the time of Alexander and shortly after his death, the Macedonians were forced to an equality of rights with the Greeks ; but ever since the weight of that strong arm disappeared, jealousy and envy had sprung up between the two. If Eumenes was the most unfortunate of the so-called successors, none certainly left a purer and more glorious record

than he. He is, therefore, one of the three foremost champions of that period whom Plutarch placed among the great men of antiquity, and whose lives will instruct and move the world as long as men esteem virtue and intelligence.

CHAPTER V.

ANTIGONUS AND HIS SON DEMETRIUS.

The War against Antigonus.

ANTIGONUS, becoming thus strangely master of the entire army of upper Asia, departed about the middle of January, 316 B. C., for Media, where he put to death his ancient friend and co-worker Python, alleging that he was plotting against him. He appointed new satraps to the various districts of the empire, and surrendered to Sibyrtilus, the ruler of the far-distant Arachosia, the Argyraspides—whom he detested for their cowardice and treachery—with instructions to take every method to destroy them, so that not one of them might return to Macedonia, or set his eyes upon the Hellenic sea.* Such was the punishment imposed upon the faithless soldiers of Eumenes.† Thus, while the relatives of Alexander the Great, Eurydike, Arridæus, and Olympias, were successively murdered in Europe, their last ministers, Eumenes, Python, Peukestas, and the Argyraspides, were fast disappearing in Asia. As usually happens, the destruction of the principal actors brought about at the same time the abrogation of the acts themselves. Antigonus next advanced into Susiana, captured the treasures left there, ap-

* Plutarch.

† Compare Diodorus: Αἱ γὰρ ἀσεβεῖς χρεῖαι, τοῖς μὲν δυνάσταις διὰ τὴν ἔξουσίαν γίνονται λυσιτελεῖς, τοῖς δ' ὑπακούουσιν ἰδιώταις μεγάλων κακῶν ὡς ἐπίπαν αἴτια καθίστανται.

pointed one Aspidas satrap of the province instead of Seleukus, marched on to Babylonia, and then hastened to the western districts, where he anticipated new struggles. Reaching Mallus about the middle of November, he remained there for the winter.

Antigonus was now unquestionably the most powerful of the successors of Alexander the Great. As master of Asia, he ruled over those vast and rich lands that extended from India to the Mediterranean Sea. He had already given splendid proofs of his military ability and success ; although nearly seventy years old, and blind in one eye, he still preserved the vigor of his forces, and seemed inspired with more life and activity in proportion as dangers increased. His resources were inexhaustible, because, besides the countless treasures captured at Ekbatana and Susa, the tribute alone paid to him yearly from the lands over which he held sway amounted to eleven hundred talents. Besides, he was fortunate in being assisted by a son, the famous Demetrius, who, though possessed of a very passionate nature, yet from early youth displayed wonderful military ability. Above all, the prominent representatives of the royal family had disappeared, and there remained only the youthful Alexander, Herakles, the illegitimate son of Alexander the Great, who had no lawful claim whatever to the sovereignty, and two daughters of Philip, Kleopatra, who lived at Sardis, and Thessalonike, whom Kassander had recently married—none of whom were sufficiently strong to assert their rights to the throne.

Thus Antigonus seemed indeed destined to become vicar and master of the entire Alexandrian kingdom, and to restore the unity of the empire. But not only was this union not realized, but even the great realm which Antigonus had established in Asia was doomed to inevitable destruction. The generals who possessed the various satrapies of the empire could not bear his supremacy, and accordingly entered

into a convention, which gradually ripened into an active alliance against him.

The principal organ of this movement was Seleukus, who, having escaped to Ptolemy of Egypt, first of all persuaded the latter to form an alliance—which Kassander of Macedonia and Lysimachus of Thrace readily joined—against the formidable power of Antigonus. The war lasted for four years, and was carried on in Asia, Europe, and Africa. Its fortunes were various, but the result was not decisive; neither the general of Asia could subdue his opponents, nor the latter the general of Asia. It was therefore deemed useless to continue the war, and in 311 B. C. a compact was made between Antigonus on one side, and Kassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus on the other, whereby “the supreme command in Europe was guaranteed to Kassander, until the maturity of Alexander, son of Roxana; Thrace being at the same time assured to Lysimachus, Egypt to Ptolemy, and the whole of Asia to Antigonus. It was at the same time covenanted by all that the Hellenic cities should be free.”

Evidently this peace contained the seeds of new disputes and increasing jealousies. The first act of Kassander was to cause the death of Roxana and her child in the fortress of Amphipolis, where they had been confined; and thus disappeared for ever the only link which apparently maintained the union of the empire, and a ready career now lay open to the ambition of the successors. Again, the name of Seleukus was not even mentioned in the peace, while it was well known at the time it was concluded that he had firmly established his rule over the eastern satrapies of Asia. For ten whole years he was occupied in strengthening his supremacy, and finally in 311 he proclaimed himself the absolute ruler of eastern Asia, and compelled Antigonus himself to acknowledge his dominion over these countries. The troops also of Antigonus, notwithstanding the treaty, still remained in Hellas, under command of his nephew Ptolemy. Ptolemy

of Egypt, therefore, accusing Antigonus of having contravened the treaty by garrisoning various Hellenic cities, renewed the war and the triple alliance against him.

In the mean time Ptolemy, the nephew of Antigonus, becoming dissatisfied with his uncle, went over to Kassander, hoping to obtain through his assistance the rule of the Peloponnesus. But the old Polysperchon—who had hitherto maintained a local dominion over various parts of the Peloponnesus, with a military force distributed in Messene and other towns—suddenly raised the royal flag in behalf of Herakles, son of Alexander by Barsine, now eighteen years of age, whom he had brought over to Hellas from Pergamus in Asia. Polysperchon invaded Macedonia with a large force, but was finally persuaded by numerous presents to espouse the cause of Kassander, and, having assassinated the young prince Herakles, withdrew his army toward the Peloponnesus. Upon this Ptolemy, the nephew of Antigonus, fled to Ptolemy, son of Lagus, who happened to be then in Kos, but was assassinated by the latter, who at once laid siege to Halikarnassus. Demetrius hastened to the assistance of the city, and Ptolemy was forced to retreat to Myndos. The assassination of Ptolemy, nephew of Antigonus, was speedily followed by that of Kleopatra, sister of Alexander the Great, and daughter of Philip and Olympias. She was living at Sardis, and was preparing to quit that place in order to become the wife of Ptolemy in Egypt, when she was killed by the satrap of Sardis, who received his orders from Antigonus.

Condition of Hellas.

For more than ten years, therefore, Antigonus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Kassander successively promised to leave the Greeks independent, free, and unguarded; but the latter never ceased to be guarded, taxed, and ruled by Macedonian despots. We may, indeed, say that the cities of Hellas never

before had suffered so much as during the time when such great promises were made about their liberty. The Ætoli-ans alone still possessed their independence. Rough, courageous, warlike, and fond of freedom, they continued fighting against the Macedonian rule; so that later they were the mainspring of the last serious attempt which the ancient Hellenic world made for the recovery of a true political autonomy.

The condition of Sparta was indeed lamentable during those years. The ancient laws were still in existence, but the ancient spirit had entirely disappeared; a most audacious wickedness prevailed; the number of citizens had dwindled down to a few hundred; the territory under its sway was limited to Laconia alone; the laws of Lycurgus, which were supposed to be in force, were simply a pretense; and a moral degradation—the more debasing since there existed no trace of science or of art, which so much consoles nations politically declined—was prevalent throughout the state.

Athens, as always, presented a different aspect from that of Sparta. It was certainly not the old aspect; depravity moral and political was here also apparent, but life was not at least deprived of a certain grace and prosperity. For ten whole years (from the end of 318 B. C.) the city was governed by Demetrius the Phalerean, who had been vested with the command by his friend Kassander. Demetrius, both by his education, mode of life, and character, may be regarded as a type of the entire city. Born of an obscure family, he nevertheless obtained a good education, especially in the sciences and politics; for he is said to have had for teacher Theophrastus, the most famous of the pupils of Aristotle. Unfortunately, he was one of those who, though they may be well instructed, yet lack the virtues which tend to ennoble life. While poor, he lived on truly Spartan diet, for his food is said to have been mainly composed

of olives and cheese; but as soon as he was vested with the government of the city, he assumed a style so sumptuous and arrogant, that it nearly used up the yearly income of the city, amounting to about twelve hundred talents. At the same time he enacted laws against "extravagance in living"; but no one obeyed them, and the life of the city was a faithful representation of that of the magistrate himself. The people listened to Theophrastus and the Megarian Stilpon, not to be taught the true and healthy principles of philosophy, but in order to admire the splendor of their discourses, and to meet in those crowded audiences the hetærae, who attended the lectures magnificently and shamefully attired. The city indeed was replete with musicians, painters, and sculptors; but religion, patriotism, virtue, and morality were things of the past. The men lived in order to laugh, play, and amuse themselves, having for their guide the very protector of their city, Demetrius the Phalerean, who seemed born to rule such citizens, just as the latter seemed created to be the subjects of such a magistrate.

It is true that under his government the material prosperity of the city greatly increased; for a numerous concourse of foreigners flocked thither on account of its advantages in education, art, and commerce. The shops especially of the artisans were filled with orders; to Demetrius alone were erected within sixty days, by vote of the people, three hundred and sixty statues; provisions also were abundant and cheap. But if in commerce, arts, and letters the city still recalled the days of old, her political claim had entirely disappeared.

Athens freed by Demetrius Poliorketes.

The autonomy of the Hellenic cities was guaranteed by the peace of 311 B. C., but the Macedonian garrison had not as yet left Munychia. Later, by the stipulation entered into in 308 between Ptolemy Lagus and Kassander, the latter

again remained absolute ruler of the city, when suddenly the following great change took place.

Antigonus, learning that Ptolemy, after seizing certain cities in Hellas, had departed, leaving the others to the discretion of Kassander, decided to assume himself the task of liberating them ; or, in other words, he sought to establish his own supremacy in Hellas, in preference to that of Kassander or Ptolemy. Accordingly, he dispatched thither his son Demetrius, who sailed in the spring of 307 B. C. with a strong force. Demetrius, son of Antigonus, was certainly the most brilliant of the successors of Alexander the Great, and the best representative of those various elements by the blending of which a new world was prepared in history, composed of the amalgamation of the Hellenic and the Eastern life. He combined the resoluteness of the Macedonian soldier with the intelligence and grace of the Attic Greek ; the prodigality and dissoluteness of an Asiatic sultan with such an astonishing daring and inconstancy that his principal aim in life seemed to be to throw away opportunities rather than to use them for any great object. His beauty and mien, says Plutarch, were so inimitable that no statuary or painter could carve in marble or fix on canvas his likeness. His countenance, with its blended grace and dignity, was at once amiable and awful ; and the unsubdued and eager air of youth was blended with the majesty of the hero and the king. There was the same happy mixture in his behavior, which inspired in his associates and followers both admiration and respect. In his hours of leisure he was a most agreeable companion ; at his table, and at every species of entertainment, of all princes the most delicate ; yet, when business called, nothing could exceed his activity, diligence, and dispatch.

Demetrius became deeply attached to the city of Athens—the greatness, intelligence, grace, art, philosophy, and glorious past of which he always loved and admired. His as-

pirations centered themselves in the wish to be proclaimed the "Liberator" and "Savior" of Athens; to be represented as such in the market-place, temples, and porticoes of that glorious city; and to see the people extolling his appearance, applauding his speeches, and blessing his name. Antigonus was a much more positive man; he knew that the issue was not the freedom, but the sovereignty of Hellas—whether himself or Kassander should rule it. Knowing, however, the sympathy of his son, whom he devotedly loved, he flattered that sentiment as much as possible; and when one of his friends advised Antigonus, if he took Athens, to keep it, as the key to Hellas, he would not listen to him, asserting that the best and surest of all keys was the friendship of the people, and that Athens was the watch-tower of the world, whence the torch of his glory would blaze over the earth.*

Such was the man who in May of 307 B. C. sailed from Ephesus against Hellas with a formidable armament, consisting of two hundred and fifty ships, five thousand talents of silver, and a large number of engines for besieging fortified places. Athens was at that time commanded by Demetrius the Phalerean. What a difference between these two men! The one represented ancient Hellenism in its ruinous decline; the other, the Macedonian Hellenism in its youthful organization. The one had still a certain learning, intelligence, grace, and charm; the other, besides these advantages, possessed the intrepidity and daring which seemed to have wholly abandoned the ancient metropolis of the nation. In fact, the antithesis in the character of the two men became manifest as soon as they met. Demetrius, suddenly appearing at the Peiræus,† declared that his father Antigonus, in a happy hour he hoped for Athens, had sent him to reinstate the people in their liberties by expelling the garrison, and

* Plutarch.

† The town had no information of his approach.

to restore their laws and ancient form of government.* Without loss of time, he seized upon the Peiræus; while Demetrius the Phalerean, though having many followers in the city, though sustained by a strong Macedonian garrison at Munychia, and though he could have received effective aid from Kassander, did not for a moment attempt resistance, but provided only for his own safety. Abandoning his friends to the discretion of the enemy, and worst of all to the enraged multitude, he hastened to make his submission to Demetrius, son of Antigonus, who received him kindly and sent him with a strong convoy to Thebes (which had been rebuilt by Kassander), agreeably to his request. From Thebes the Phalerean went to Macedonia, where he remained until the death of Kassander, after which he sailed to Ptolemy in Egypt.

The Athenians in the city declared in favor of Demetrius, son of Antigonus, who assured them that, however desirous he might be to see their city, he would deny himself that pleasure until he should have besieged and captured Munychia, as well as Megara, with their Kassandrian garrisons. In a short time he accomplished both these objects, after which he entered the city in great pomp and followed by the whole multitude. Having called an assembly of the people, he declared from the bema that he reëstablished the commonwealth in its ancient form; that he would himself endeavor to reinstate her in her ancient renown; that it was necessary to construct a large navy; that he would ask his father to send timber enough to build one hundred galleys, and moreover to restore to the Athenians the island of Imbros; but he strongly advised them to send ambassadors to Antigonus, and promised them, in the name of his father, one hundred and fifty thousand measures of wheat.

Unfortunately, Athens was no longer capable of availing herself of the restoration of democracy and autonomy. Instead

* Plutarch.

of applying herself to the development and rearrangement of the public revenues and forces, she wasted her time in persecuting the fallen oligarchs, and in conferring honors upon "Demetrius the Liberator." The people certainly can not be blamed for the honors granted to Demetrius, but these honors were rendered obnoxious through the extravagant homage decreed him. The servile demagogues of the time vied with one another in devising new methods of flattery by which to attract the good will and bounty of the invader. At the proposition of the old Stratokles (who had been one of the accusers of Demosthenes), the Athenians voted to erect golden statues to both Antigonus and Demetrius; to offer them crowns worth two hundred talents; to raise altars to them, worshipping them as gods; to add two new tribes to the existing ten, to be called Antigonis and Demetrias; to weave the portraits and exploits of Antigonus and Demetrius, along with those of Zeus and Athene, into the magnificent and voluminous robe periodically carried in procession, as an offering at the Panathenaic festival; and to choose annually a high priest of these gods and saviors (Antigonus and Demetrius), after whom each alternate year was to be named, instead of being called after the first of the nine archons, as had hitherto been the custom. Several similar decrees were passed, and we are told that temples or altars were voted to Phila-Aphrodite, in honor of Phila, wife of Demetrius; and a like compliment was subsequently paid to his two mistresses, Læna and Lamia. Altars are said to have been also dedicated to Adeimantus and others of his convivial companions or flatterers.

No other people were found capable of such vile adulation. Nor is it strange that the Athenians abased themselves to such an extent before this brilliant youth—to whom they owed at least their alleged liberty—when it is considered that shortly before they had set up three hundred and sixty statues to the blind tool of Kassander, the stupid and worth-

less Demetrius the Phalerean. It seems that the more learned and intelligent a people once have been, the more abject they are apt to become in their servility and adulation when the epoch of national decline arrives.

After the capture of Athens, Demetrius, contrary to expectation, took no steps to overthrow the power of Kassander or of Ptolemy in the rest of Hellas. He spent many months in idleness in that city, surrounded by flatterers, abandoning himself to symposia, to pseudo-philosophers, and to the reckless women in whose society he delighted. He roused to a still higher pitch the enthusiasm of the Athenians by marrying the beautiful Eurydike, the widow of Opheltas, king of Kyrene, who after her husband's death had returned to Athens, her native city. This marriage was deemed a great event, not only on account of the magnificence with which it was celebrated, but because Eurydike was a descendant of the ancient Miltiades. Thus the union of the greatest of the present leaders with the descendant of one of the proudest heroic families of the city seemed to unite its glorious past with a new era of power in the present. But suddenly, toward the end of 307 B. C., this dream of honors, feasts, and symposia was cut short, because Demetrius was summoned by Antigonus in all haste to Asia.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXPLOITS OF DEMETRIUS.

Defeat of Ptolemy—Capture of Kyprus.

THE growing power of Antigonus, and the fact that he aspired to become master of the entire Alexandrian empire, caused much uneasiness and dissatisfaction among the sa-

traps, who began to fear his overwhelming preponderance throughout Asia. Ptolemy of Egypt, especially, either because he was more energetic than the others or because he ran greater risk, had been for some time actively preparing for war, and had amassed large forces in Kyprus. It was this that caused Antigonos to recall Demetrius to the East.

Demetrius hastened at once to Karia and Kilikia, and, having gathered a powerful army, sailed in the beginning of 306 B. C. to Kyprus with fifteen thousand hoplites, four hundred cavalry, one hundred and ten triremes, and the necessary transport-vessels. He landed on the northeastern coast of the island, captured two of its cities, Urania and Karpasia, and then marched against the capital, Salamis. There he had an engagement with Menelaus, brother of Ptolemy, whom he completely routed and forced back into the city. Now for the first time he had occasion to display his wonderful genius for the construction and invention of new and fearful engines for laying sieges, whence he was ever afterward distinguished by the name Poliorketes or the City-taker. He brought from Asia workmen, iron, and wood, with which he constructed machines of every kind for throwing stones and other missiles; he built battering-rams for storming walls, and tortoises or pent-houses, formed of shields overlapping each other as in a tortoise's back (like the Roman *testudo*), for protecting his soldiers against the darts and arrows of the enemy. The walls could not long withstand the storm and shock of these terrific engines; they had begun already to crumble, and the city was in imminent danger of being captured, when Menelaus succeeded in burning in one night most of the machines.

Demetrius was not disheartened; he persisted in his undertaking, and both the siege and defense were carried on with the utmost fury, when a report was spread about that Ptolemy himself had arrived in Kition with a large body of troops for the assistance of Menelaus. Ptolemy had with him

a force of ten thousand foot-soldiers, one hundred and forty triremes, and five hundred transport-vessels. He hoped that by attacking Demetrius in front while his rear was threatened by Menelaus, his utter destruction would inevitably result. Menelaus had also a fleet of sixty triremes, which Ptolemy commanded to be sent to him at once in order to render his force still more formidable. But Demetrius would neither await his opponent in Salamis nor permit the departure of the sixty ships. Having left a part of his force to watch Menelaus, and stationed his entire cavalry on the sea-coast, he embarked the best of his troops in his vessels, leaving ten only to prevent the egress of the sixty—for that number was amply sufficient to block up the mouth of the harbor—and hastened with the remainder to attack his opponent.

The situation of Demetrius was precarious; his forces were not only less numerous than those of Ptolemy—consisting, according to Diodorus, our best authority, of not more than one hundred and eight vessels—but the fleet of his antagonist was considered wellnigh unconquerable, and no one as yet had dared to contend with him on the sea. The approaching battle, therefore, attracted the attention not only of the parties concerned, but of all other princes; for, besides the uncertainty of the event, so much depended upon it that the conqueror would be, not master of Kyprus and Syria alone, but superior to all his rivals in power.

Demetrius had made his preparations during the evening and night before the battle, and early in the morning the fleet of the enemy appeared sailing in all haste toward Salamis, hoping to anticipate the egress of Demetrius. But the latter had foreseen the plans of Ptolemy, and had his fleet drawn up ready for action. He had stationed toward the left—his strongest wing, which he commanded in person—fifty-two of his largest ships, thirty of which were Athenian under Medius; in his center he had placed his smaller vessels, under Themison the Samian and Marsyas the histo-

rian ; and the remainder he had stationed on the right, under Hegesippus the Halikarnassian and Pleistias of Kos, the latter of whom held next to Demetrius the highest command in the fleet. Ptolemy ordered his transports to the rear, and drew up his triremes in a manner altogether different from that of his opponent. He strengthened especially his left wing, that he might thus defeat the right of Demetrius, force his vessels toward the open sea, where the Egyptian fleet could fight to better advantage, and clear the way to the harbor, where he intended to join the sixty ships of Menelaus.

The sacrifices having been performed on the deck of each vessel, Demetrius first raised a golden shield, the signal for action, which was immediately given in like manner by Ptolemy. Hereupon the trumpets sounded, the war-cry was raised, and the ships bore against one another with a terrific crash. Demetrius stood on the stern of his vessel, and took part in the thickest of the struggle. The enemy rushed in a body against him, showering their arrows upon him. Three of his body-guard lay dead at his feet, but he fearlessly stood at his post, drove back the right wing of the enemy, and bore down with such impetuosity upon their center that it was thrown into great confusion. Ptolemy was victorious over the right wing of Demetrius, and, having sunk and captured many vessels on that side, was turning against the remaining forces of his adversary when suddenly he beheld his left broken up and the center preparing for flight. He therefore abandoned all hope of success, and escaped with eight ships to Kition, and thence to Egypt.

The victory of Demetrius was complete. While he lost only twenty ships, he captured forty (according to Plutarch, seventy) with their crews ; and the rest, excepting the eight, were sunk in the engagement. Besides, Ptolemy's numerous train, his servants, friends, wives, arms, money, machines, and eight thousand soldiers that were stationed near the fleet

in transports, all fell into the hands of Demetrius. But how complete was the victory the results showed still more strongly; for Menelaus made no further resistance, but surrendered Salamis, with all the ships and the land forces, numbering twelve hundred horse and twelve thousand foot.

This victory, so great in itself, Demetrius rendered still more glorious by generosity and humanity, in giving the enemy's dead an honorable interment, and setting free many of the prominent prisoners, among whom were Menelaus and Leontiskus, son of Ptolemy. He sent to his faithful Athenians, whose ships had so much contributed to the victory, twelve hundred complete suits of armor from the spoils, and hastened to give an account of the victory to his father through Aristodemus the Milesian, one of his most faithful friends.

Plutarch informs us that when Aristodemus arrived on the coast of Syria from Cyprus, he would not suffer the ship to make land; but, ordering it to anchor at a distance, and all the company to remain in it, he took the boat and went on shore alone. He advanced toward the palace of Antigonus, who was waiting the issue of this battle with the greatest solicitude. As soon as he was informed that the messenger was coming, his anxiety increased to such a degree that he could scarce keep within his palace. He sent his officers and friends, one after another, to Aristodemus, to demand what intelligence he brought. But, instead of replying, he walked on in silence and with great solemnity. The king, by this time much alarmed, and having entirely lost his patience, rushed to the door to meet him. A great crowd gathered about Aristodemus, and people were running from all quarters to the palace. When near enough to be heard, he stretched out his hand, and cried aloud: "Hail to King Antigonus! We have totally beaten Ptolemy at sea; we are masters of Cyprus, and have made sixteen thousand eight hundred prisoners." Antigonus answered: "Hail to

you too, my good friend ! But I will punish you for torturing us so long ; you shall wait long for your reward." After this, he sent to his victorious son a diadem, and in the letter that accompanied it addressed him as king.

Antigonus, therefore, seemed to have attained the end which for so many years he had been pursuing. In western Asia and at Athens the people had enthusiastically proclaimed him king. Ptolemy, the most dangerous of his opponents, was completely defeated, and it was supposed that he would no longer delay in acknowledging Antigonus his master ; the other two dynasts in Europe, Kassander and Lysimachus, were certainly not a match for him ; while Seleukus, who had established a strong empire in the East, could not successfully cope with the united forces of the West. Such were the golden dreams of Antigonus. He forgot, however, that he was already little short of eighty, and that Fortune rarely bestows her best gifts at such an age ; that while he possessed wonderful experience, he had lost his incomparable daring, endurance, and energy ; that while he had a son who was young, ambitious, brave, and full of invention, yet this son, in his unsteady habits, debaucheries, and long carousals, had the peculiarities which tend to waste rather than to preserve and strengthen the advantages already possessed. Above all, he forgot that he had still to fight not against barbarians, but against armies as well drilled as his own, and commanded by generals who came from the same school as himself ; so that, had he not been blinded by ambition, he should have considered how to preserve his exalted position amid so many powerful enemies, rather than how to bring all under his absolute supremacy.

Ptolemy, for instance, master of a rich land, well governed and devoted to him, was far from giving up the cause as lost on account of his recent defeat. He had never, indeed, supposed that he could succeed to the empire of Alexander ;

but for the country allotted to him he was ready to fight with all his might, sustained by a strong and faithful army, which, far from being dispirited by its recent defeat, gave Ptolemy the title of king. Again, when Antigonus, assuming the diadem, had declared himself "the sole successor of Alexander the Great," he it remembered that in the same year the other successors caught eagerly at the opportunity to aggrandize themselves; for both Lysimachus in Thrace and Kassander in Macedonia took the diadem and proclaimed themselves kings; so that the year 306 B. C. is known in Hellenic history as "the year of kings." Seleukus also, who had worn the diadem for some time when he gave audience to the barbarians, began to wear it now before Macedonians and Greeks, and to number the years from the epoch when, returning from Egypt, he had recovered Babylon. Thus, instead of one king, we have already five, and Antigonus was forced more than ever before to sustain by arms his claims to supremacy.

Antigonus in Egypt.

Antigonus decided to march first of all against Ptolemy, whose subjection he deemed indispensable before attempting any measures against the other satraps. He accordingly summoned his son from Kyprus. In that luxurious island Demetrius seemed to have forgotten alike ambition and duty, amid feasts and symposia, and in the company of the famous courtesan Lamia, who, though much older than he, had effectually enslaved him by the peculiar charm of her address. As soon as he received the order of recall he hastened to his father, and, according to his custom, kissed him so cordially that the old man laughed and said, "Surely, my son, you think you are kissing Lamia." He did not cease even here to pass his time in protracted carousals; so that he often avoided his father, whom he devotedly loved. Once, when he had been spending many days with his friends over

the bottle, he excused himself on his return to court by saying that he had been hindered by a defluxion. "So I heard," said Antigonus; "but whether was the defluxion from Thasos or from Chios?"* With such mildness, Plutarch tells us, he treated his son's faults, out of regard to his brilliant performances; for in war no man, however naturally temperate, exceeded him in sobriety.

Preparations were finally completed about the beginning of autumn, 306 B. C.; and forthwith Antigonus marched against Ptolemy, leading his cavalry and infantry in person, while Demetrius with a powerful fleet attended him along the coast. The whole force amounted to eighty thousand foot, eight thousand horse, eighty-three war-elephants, one hundred and fifty triremes, and one hundred transports. Antigonus marched through the desert, and in November reached safely Pelusium, toward the eastern outlet of the Nile; but Demetrius encountered such a storm that he lost many of his ships, and ran the risk of being driven upon a dangerous shore. Ptolemy had, in the mean time, strongly fortified the coast and the banks of the river; so that the attacks both on land and sea, though bravely undertaken, completely failed of their object; and finally Antigonus, seeing the time passing, provisions failing, and the army disheartened, deemed it best to cease hostilities for the present and return to Syria.


This failure, amounting in fact to a complete defeat, showed the futility of the ambitious projects of Antigonus, especially since that general displayed few of the qualities of the Antigonus of old, the daring, inventive, and stubborn opponent of Eumenes. By his hurried retreat to Syria he not only abandoned his plans, but lost in a day the military reputation which he had won by so many bold and strenuous efforts.

* Both these islands are famous to this day for the excellence of their wine.

Siege of Rhodes.

About the middle of 305 B. C. we suddenly find Antigonus engaged in war with Rhodes. It is not definitely known what was the cause of this struggle. Perhaps he thought that, since he was master of Kyprus, he could by reducing Rhodes control the seas and inflict a severe wound upon the foreign commerce of Egypt. But while the hostilities against Egypt became thus entangled with new difficulties, uncertain as to their results, the war against Rhodes was in itself altogether unjust and uncalled for, directed as it was against a neutral commercial city, which had done everything to appease the haughty dynast.

The island of Rhodes was in a most flourishing condition at this time. The Rhodians were excellent sailors, and by their energy, law-abiding habits, and wise commercial regulations, they had achieved a great reputation throughout the mercantile world. They had besides enacted special laws for the abolition of piracy, and their flag afforded the safest protection on the sea. Adhering to a strict neutrality amid the constant wars waged around them, they afforded a secure retreat to foreign merchants and capitalists, many of whom settled in their island, either quietly to increase their resources or peacefully to enjoy the fruits of their labor. Many dynasts eagerly sought the friendship of the Rhodians, giving them presents and various privileges; but, equally friendly to all, they diligently avoided every kind of alliance tending to lead them into war. Their sympathy perhaps rather inclined to Ptolemy, because their principal commercial relations were with Egypt, and many Rhodians had great interests at stake in Alexandria and elsewhere. The produce of the south, which, on account of the war between Seleukus and Antigonus, could no longer be carried across Asia, was brought from Alexandria to Rhodes, and thence found its way to Hellas and other western countries. Besides, the du-



CITY OF RHODES



ties derived from the Egyptian commerce formed the main revenue of the island.

Such was the state of affairs when Antigonus, in the middle of 305, decided to attack the island, demanding that all traffic with Egypt be forthwith ended. The Rhodians strove to avert war, by voting to Antigonus and Demetrius statues and other such honors, justly claiming that the interests of the commercial world would suffer by the outbreak of hostilities. Their overtures were refused with contumely, and Demetrius sailed against the island with a force consisting of two hundred triremes, one hundred and seventy transport-vessels, forty thousand men, and a large train of war-engines; in addition to which a thousand private vessels followed the fleet for the purpose of enriching themselves from the expected booty. The Rhodians, greatly alarmed, yielded at once to the requirements of Demetrius, saying that they would fight with him against Ptolemy. But Demetrius in addition demanded a hundred of the most prominent citizens as hostages, and the admission of the fleet within their harbor. The Rhodians, deeming these fresh claims a scheme against the freedom of their city, resolved to undergo every danger rather than yield to the capricious demands of the youthful general, and most assiduously prepared for war. An enumeration being taken, it was found that six thousand citizens and a thousand strangers could bear arms. At the same time word was sent to Kassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus, seeking assistance as soon as possible.

Demetrius disembarked toward the north of the island, and began his works for laying siege with that wonderful art which became incomparable in antiquity. The city of Rhodes, built during the Peloponnesian war, possessed one of the finest and best harbors of all the Hellenic cities. It was built in the form of an egg, one end of which was formed by the citadel, the other by the great harbor. In the rear there was a small port, built for war purposes,

which could be entered through the harbor by means of a canal. The harbor was surrounded by earthworks, and the city itself by a strong wall with many towers. On the north and south of the city were *proasteia* or suburbs, which the Rhodians, for want of a suitable force to occupy them, were compelled to abandon to the enemy. Each of these suburbs had its own harbor, and the northernmost one Demetrius now occupied. His intention, however, was to take possession of the main harbor as soon as possible, hoping thus to cut off all communication with the sea and reduce the city by assault. He accordingly constructed two huge machines, each carried upon two transport-vessels joined together, and two ponderous towers, each of which also rested upon two ships and surpassed in height the towers of the harbor.

The Rhodians did not remain idle, but also placed machines upon their earthworks and transport-vessels. Before the second week had fairly set in Demetrius destroyed the machines of his opponents, shook the towers and walls, and occupied the fortifications near the harbor. Hereupon the Rhodians sallied forth with all their forces, drove back the enemy, and burned his transport-vessels. Demetrius procured new boats, pushed his way boldly into the harbor, placed ladders against the walls, pressed heavily upon the defenders, and at the same time ordered his land forces to the assault. A desperate struggle was for a long time waged; the assailants mounted upon the walls, and fiercely attacked the Rhodians; but the latter hurled down the soldiers of Demetrius from the battlements, and captured a few of their best officers. Seven days later Demetrius sailed again into the great harbor, sent his fire-ships into the port against those of the Rhodians, and by his ponderous machines severely shook the walls of the city and wounded a few of its brave defenders. The Rhodian sailors succeeded in extinguishing his fire-ships, and destroyed two of the engines; but, in attempting to board the third, which was

already carried farther into the rear, they lost their brave captain Exekestus and two of their own vessels. Demetrius within a few days constructed a machine three times greater than any thus far built, but a great storm suddenly destroyed both the machine and the ships that carried it. The Rhodians, availing themselves of this, opened their gates and captured a detachment of four hundred men which had been stationed on the earthworks at the entrance of the harbor.

The affairs of Demetrius were now in a precarious condition. He had not only lost his machines, but the Rhodians had shortly before received a reënforcement of five hundred men from Ptolemy and one hundred and fifty from their friends the Knosians; besides, winter had set in, and he was compelled to forego his attacks from the harbor. Being, however, young, ambitious, and full of contrivance, he persisted in his undertaking, and increased his means of attack, especially on land, by constructing the largest of his machines, called a *helepole*. The base was square; each of its sides at the bottom was fifty cubits wide, and it was a hundred feet high. The sides of the divisions gradually lessened, so that the top was much narrower than the bottom; while the inside was divided into several stories or rooms, one above another. The front, which was turned toward the enemy, had a window in each story, through which missile weapons of various kinds were thrown. It neither shook nor veered the least in its motion, but rolled on in a steady, upright position.

The Rhodians, fearing lest the wall might finally succumb to the repeated attacks of these immense machines, constructed within it another parallel wall, while nine of their triremes captured some of the transports of Demetrius carrying provisions and ammunition. The struggle proceeded, with various changes of fortune; but both parties on many occasions displayed sentiments of nobility and generosity, for

which this war became not less famous in history than for the perfection which the art of laying sieges reached during its course. A proposition was once made by certain Rhodians to destroy the statues of Demetrius and Antigonus; but it was rejected with indignation by the people, who refused to retract any of the honors once bestowed upon these kings. Demetrius proved himself equally magnanimous. In the northern suburb of the city, almost within his camp, the famous artist Protogenes of Kaunus was painting at that time the history of Ialysus,* to the completion of which work he is said to have devoted seven years. The Rhodians sent ambassadors asking Demetrius to spare the work, and he replied that he would sooner destroy the pictures of his own father than such a masterpiece. At the same time, calling the artist, he asked him how he dared prosecute his work with so much calmness amid the rage of war. "Because," he answered, "though Demetrius was at war with Rhodes, he did not suppose he was at war with the Arts." The king extended to him his protection, and we are told that he often visited the artist in his retreat, where Protogenes did not cease amid the clash of arms to occupy himself with his wonderful painting.

The Rhodians had about this time received an abundance of provisions from Ptolemy and Lysimachus; and being greatly elated, especially on account of the futile attempts of Demetrius to hinder these ships from entering the harbor, they took active measures to burn his machines. To this end they prepared many fire-ships, placed on the walls their war-engines, and, choosing a dark, moonless night, suddenly discharged a shower of firebrands against the machines of the enemy. The soldiers of Demetrius rushed forth to save the machines; but many perished in the attempt, while not a few

* Ialysus was one of the fabulous heroes, the son of Ochimus and grandson of Apollo; and there was a town in Rhodes called Ialysus, which probably had its name from him.

were seriously wounded. Upon this Demetrius ordered his entire army to hasten to the rescue of the engines, and finally succeeded with the utmost difficulty in saving them.

Many daring attempts were made by Demetrius to reduce the city, and once his troops entered it by means of a subterraneous passage he had constructed ; but the Rhodians after a severe struggle captured all who had forced their way in.

However dauntless the endurance and bravery of the Rhodians, however abundant their resources, it is probable that the determination of Demetrius, together with his ponderous machines, would have finally overcome the resistance of the citizens, had the interests of Antigonus allowed the continuation of the siege. But as Demetrius was devising new means of attack, Antigonus wrote to him to make terms with the Rhodians and hasten forthwith to Hellas. The Rhodians also began to grow weary of the war, and finally, at the intervention of the Athenians, peace was concluded on condition that "the island of Rhodes should remain autonomous and unguarded, and have its own revenue ; the Rhodians should assist Antigonus and Demetrius as allies, in all their wars except those with Ptolemy ; and a hundred hostages should be given to Demetrius—not, however, from those holding high political offices."

Thus was ended this famous siege. The Rhodians honored all the citizens who had distinguished themselves during the contest ; freed the slaves who had fought in defense of the city ; erected statues to Kassander and Lysimachus ; and especially carried their grateful devotion toward the king of Egypt so far as to erect a temple to him, called the Ptolemæum, and to worship him (under the sanction of the oracle of Ammon) as a god. They soon repaired the damage done to the city, and acquired greater influence than ever before, through having so bravely fought against the strongest of the dynasts.

Demetrius acquired also great renown, having assumed the name of Poliorketes, and gave fresh proofs of the nobleness of his character, not only during the siege, but also after it was ended ; for he left to the Rhodians, both as a memorial of his famous machines and of their wonderful courage, his ponderous helepoles, from the metal of which Chares of Lyndus constructed afterward the famous colossus of Rhodes. Demetrius failed in his attempt because he had not the political wisdom to accept the propositions the Rhodians submitted to him just before the commencement of the siege, when they declared themselves ready to fight even against Ptolemy. Besides, he lost a whole year at Rhodes, and rendered clear the fact that he was not able to rule the seas. He was now compelled to hasten to Athens, to which Kassander had laid siege.

Demetrius in Hellas.

Demetrius sailed to Hellas (304 B. C.), with a fleet of three hundred and thirty ships and a numerous body of land troops. He landed in Bœotia, and compelled Kassander not only to raise the siege of Athens, but even to retreat to Thessaly. Having formed an alliance with the Ætoliæ against both Kassander and Polysperchon, he returned from Leukas to Athens about the month of September, near the time of the Eleusinian mysteries. "He was welcomed by festive processions, hymns, pæans, choric dances, and bacchanalian odes of joyous congratulation. One of these hymns is preserved, as sung by a chorus of Ithyphallimasked revelers, with their heads and arms encircled by wreaths, clothed in white tunics, and in feminine garments reaching almost to their feet."

Plutarch says that the Athenians, though they had lavished honors upon Demetrius before in the most extravagant manner, yet contrived on this occasion to appear new in their flattery. They gave orders that he should lodge in the back part of the Parthenon ; which accordingly he did, and

Athene was said to have received him as her guest—a guest not very fit to come under her roof, or suitable to the purity of her temple, for his dissolute habits were notorious. A new edict was also passed, to the effect that the people of Athens had resolved that whatsoever thing Demetrius might command should be accounted holy in respect of the gods, and just in respect of men. To such meanness, remarks Plutarch, were the Athenians brought, when the garrison was removed out of their city, and they pretended to be a free people!

In the beginning of 303 Demetrius entered the Peloponnesus, declared again the liberty of the cities, and, having banished the Egyptian and Macedonian garrisons from Argos, Sikyon, Corinth, and other places, was almost everywhere worshiped as a god.

After this he called, as Philip and Alexander had done before, an assembly of the Greeks at the isthmus, and was proclaimed general of all Hellas in the war against Kassander. Finally, in April, 302, he returned again to Athens, where he was anxious to be initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries—not only into the lesser mysteries, but even into those called the greater. This was unlawful and unprecedented; for the lesser mysteries were celebrated in February and the greater in September, and none were admitted to the lesser till a year at least after they had attended the greater.* Pythodorus the torch-bearer was the only person

* The Eleusinian mysteries represented the carrying off of Persephone to the lower world by Hades or Pluto, the search for her by her mother Demeter, goddess of agriculture and of fertility in general, the discovery of Persephone's fate, and her return to the world of light for a portion of each year. They symbolized, at least in part, the processes of nature in the annual round of reproduction and decay, and through them, it is supposed, the immortality of the soul. They were said to have been instituted by Demeter herself, in a temple built according to her directions, in return for her hospitable reception by Keleos, king of Eleusis, while she was wandering in search of her daughter under the guise of a poor old woman.

who ventured to oppose the demand ; but his opposition was entirely ineffectual, for Stratokles procured a decree that the month Munychion (April) should be called and reputed the month Anthesterion (February), to give Demeter an opportunity for his first initiation ; after which Munychion was changed into Boëdromion (September). He was accordingly initiated at once, and received in immediate succession the preparatory and the final rites.

But worse abuses still were perpetrated by Demetrius, "the greatest of the gods," for he ordered the Athenians to raise in one day two hundred and fifty talents, and the sum was exacted with the greatest rigor. When the money was brought in, and he saw it all together, he ordered it to be given to the notorious Lamia and his other mistresses to buy soap ! Thus Demetrius spent his life amid scenes of untold debauchery, forgetting his lawful wives—both the Athenian Eurydike and the refined Phila, the daughter of Antipater, as well as the beautiful Deïdameia, the daughter of Æakus, king of Epirus ; forgetting also that such a life was wholly incompatible with the great designs which both his father and himself were intending to carry out.

In the summer of 302 Demetrius invaded Thessaly with an army of fifty-six thousand men, of whom twenty-five thousand were Grecian allies—so extensive was his sway at this time over the Hellenic cities. Kassander had no hopes of contending successfully with Demetrius, and sent ambassadors to Antigonus in Asia asking for a cessation of hostilities. But that haughty ruler replied that he knew only of one way to peace, an unconditional surrender. This arrogant and imperious answer, by which Antigonus declared himself the only successor of Alexander the Great, astonished not only Kassander but the other three dynasts. The danger seemed common to all, and at the request of Kassander a fourfold alliance was easily concluded between Ptolemy, Seleukus, Lysimachus, and Kassander. The allies de-

cided to attack Antigonus in Asia, the principal seat of his power. Thither Lysimachus hastened from Thrace, Seleukus from the far east, and Ptolemy from the south.

In the mean time Demetrius advanced into Thessaly, but Kassander skillfully avoided a general engagement, until Antigonus, finding himself threatened on all sides in Asia, was forced to recall his son about the end of 302. As soon as Demetrius sailed for Ephesus, Kassander sent his brother Pleistarchus into the principal theatre of war with a large army. At the same time the troops of Lysimachus and Seleukus were collected in Asia Minor against the combined forces of Antigonus and Demetrius; while Ptolemy was still slowly advancing through Syria. A great battle was fought in the spring of 300 B. C. near Ipsus in Phrygia, between Antigonus and Demetrius on one side and Lysimachus and Seleukus on the other, by which the fate of Asia was decided.

Battle of Ipsus—Death of Antigonus.

Antigonus had an army of more than seventy thousand foot and ten thousand horse; while the enemy's infantry consisted of sixty-four thousand men and their cavalry of ten thousand five hundred. Thus the forces on both sides were nearly equal. But Antigonus had only seventy-five elephants, while Seleukus brought with him nearly four hundred and eighty. Knowing, therefore, that a battle in the open field would place him at a disadvantage by reason of this formidable array of elephants, Antigonus should not have periled his cause by such an encounter. Had he succeeded in delaying the battle and gradually wasting the forces of his enemies, he might have emerged victorious from these difficulties; for their alliance was neither sincere nor stable, since Ptolemy did not enter into it with much zeal. Or had Antigonus abated a little of his pretensions, and restrained his ambition to govern the world, he could

have kept the preëminence among the successors of Alexander, not only for himself, but for his son after him. But, imperious by nature, and no less arrogant in his expressions than in his actions, he exasperated these powerful princes against him. He even boasted that he could break the present league, and disperse the united armies with as much ease as a boy does a flock of birds. This is especially strange, for he had presentiments of misfortune. In other engagements his spirits used to be high, his port lofty, his voice loud, and his language vaunting. Often in the heat of the action he would let fall some jocular expression to show his unconcern and his contempt of his adversary. But at this time he was observed to be thoughtful and silent; and one day he presented his son to the army, and recommended him as his successor. What appeared still more extraordinary was, that he took him aside into his tent, and discoursed with him there; for he never used to communicate his intentions to him in private, or to consult him in the least.

When the battle was begun, Demetrius, at the head of his best cavalry, fell upon Antiochus, the son of Seleukus, and fought so bravely that he put the enemy to flight. Forgetting, however, the lesson of wise pursuit so often taught by Alexander the Great, he followed after the fugitives, paying no regard to what was taking place in his rear. Seleukus, seeing his adversary's foot unsupported by cavalry, rode toward them leading his army and elephants, as if intending every moment to charge—designing by this manœuvre to terrify the soldiers, and to give them opportunity to change sides. The event answered his expectation. A great part separated from the main body, and voluntarily came over to him, while the rest were put to rout. Antigonus alone with a few about him continued the struggle; and as the enemy were bearing down upon him one of his friends said, "They are coming against you, sire." "What

other object can they have?" said Antigonus. "But Demetrius will come to my assistance." In this hope he continued to the last; but no succor arrived. The enemy pressed heavily upon him, discharging their missiles, until finally the brave old man fell under a shower of darts. His servants and his very friends forsook him; only Thorax of Larissa remained by the dead body.*

Thus Antigonus, at the age of eighty-one years, died on the field of battle. Demetrius returned slowly from the pursuit, but, seeing that the day was irretrievably lost, fled to Ephesus, and thence to Hellas, with five thousand foot and four thousand horse.

The victors buried Antigonus with royal honors, after which they divided his kingdom between Seleukus and Lysimachus. Ptolemy was left out, because he had contributed least of all to the success of the war. Kassander, owing to the position of his kingdom, could not receive any territorial aggrandizement from the Asiatic possessions of Antigonus; but Kilikia was granted to his brother Pleistarchus, since the latter fought personally in the battle. Syria and the most easterly parts of Asia Minor were given to Seleukus; while the western lands of that peninsula fell to Lysimachus.

The battle of Ipsus, fought twenty-two years after the death of Alexander, decided for a long time the fate both of Asia and of Africa. Ptolemy, Seleukus, and their successors, continued for at least three centuries to hold the scepter of their respective kingdoms. But the effects of the battle were speedily felt in Europe, and led there to still further political changes. Neither Lysimachus nor Kassander was destined to become the founder of a lasting dynasty.

* Plutarch, "Demetrius."

CHAPTER VII.

LAST DAYS OF ALEXANDER'S GENERALS.

Proceedings of Demetrius—Death of Kassander.

DEMETRIUS sailed for Athens, which he hoped to find ready to sustain him in his misfortunes ; for he had left with the Athenians many of his ships, his money, and his wife Deïdamia. He therefore pursued his voyage with all possible expedition ; but ambassadors from Athens met him near the Kyklades, and entreated him not to think of going thither, because the people had declared by an edict that they would receive no king into their city. This act of the Athenians enraged Demetrius even more than the great change of his affairs ; for to be deceived beyond all his expectations—to find that the affection of the Athenians, so great in appearance, was false and counterfeit—was a thing that cut him to the heart. Nevertheless, he was in no wise discouraged. Possessing many cities in the Peloponnesus and a powerful fleet, he forthwith sailed to the Chersonese, and by the ravages he committed distressed Lysimachus, as well as enriched and secured the fidelity of his own forces, which now began to gather strength and improve into a respectable army. Lysimachus had no fleet, and besides he feared lest Seleukus—who had already achieved a greater power than Antigonus—should deprive him of his possessions in Asia Minor ; and accordingly he deemed it wise to conclude an alliance with Ptolemy. The latter, displeased with Seleukus for having overlooked him during the dismemberment of the empire of Antigonus, and fearing the naval supremacy of Demetrius, at once accepted the overtures of Lysimachus ; and, as a further guarantee of the alliance, Lysimachus married the beautiful Arsinoë, daughter of

Ptolemy, while he had already for his wife the noble and refined Amastris, a Persian; but these Macedonian dynasts had no scruples against having two or more wives.

This alliance caused great uneasiness to Seleukus, who, seeing that he could obtain no assistance from Kassander, while Demetrius had the means to aid him much with his great fleet, sent proposals of marriage to Stratonike, daughter of Demetrius, and at the same time concluded an alliance with him. A connection with Seleukus, says Plutarch, was a happy and unexpected turn of fortune for Demetrius. He sailed at once with his daughter to Syria; and as soon as the alliance between Seleukus and Demetrius was made, the preëxisting alliance between Lysimachus and Ptolemy was immediately dissolved. Ptolemy, when espousing the cause of Lysimachus, did not suppose that Seleukus would so soon make terms with Demetrius. He was a cautious man, and was least of all disposed to incur the enmity of such powerful antagonists; he hastened therefore to conclude peace with them, which was easily accomplished, since it served the interests of Seleukus by causing the isolation of Lysimachus, and was also advantageous to Demetrius, who had no fleet to fear but the Egyptian. Matters having been thus accommodated, it was further agreed that Demetrius should marry Ptolemaïs, daughter of Ptolemy, and that the latter, to secure his rights on the sea, should receive a few hostages from Demetrius, among whom was the young Epirote prince Pyrrhus, who, far from his country, was serving in the army of Demetrius.

But this peace could not last. Demetrius felt that his kingdom was not secure. Kilikia and Phœnicia, lying on the borders of the broad empire of Seleukus, could not naturally remain long separated from his dominions. Seleukus had already demanded that Demetrius should surrender Kilikia to him for a sum of money, and on his refusal to do so angrily insisted on having Tyre and Sidon. Demetrius

also knew that Ptolemy was anxious for the possession of Kyprus; and he was indeed at a loss how to oppose such formidable antagonists. He accordingly decided in 298 B. C. again to seize Hellas, and to make that country his headquarters for defense against future attacks. The new intervention of Kassander in Hellenic affairs offered him a sufficient excuse for carrying out his plans.

Kassander, deeming Hellas an indispensable acquisition to his Macedonian empire, and seeing Demetrius occupied with other and more distant affairs, thought it an excellent opportunity to impose his rule again over Greece, and especially Athens. The Athenians, led by the brave and good Olympiodorus, and assisted by the Ætolians, frustrated the design of Kassander; but the king of Macedonia finally assisted Lachares, a demagogue, to seize the government, hoping to become the ruler of the city, through the assistance which Lachares would be forced to ask in order to maintain his power.

Demetrius, learning this, sailed first against the Peloponnesus, captured Messene and some other cities, and laid siege to Athens.

In the mean time Kassander suddenly died, about the end of 297 B. C., and his death brought with it unexpected consequences, since his sons showed themselves entirely incapable of continuing the work of their father.

Demetrius blockaded Athens by sea and land, until, the pressure of famine becoming intolerable, the people were obliged to open their gates to him. He again treated kindly the ungrateful city, but placed a garrison both in the Peiræus and at Munychia, and at the same time hastened to the conquest of Sparta. He soon, however, raised the siege of that city, because Ptolemy, Seleukus, and Lysimachus, having concluded an alliance against him, had dispossessed him of Kyprus, Kilikia, Phœnicia, and the sea-coast towns of Asia Minor. Before attacking them, Demetrius sought to strength-

en his supremacy in northern and middle Hellas, especially because new prospects were opened to him in Macedonia by the death of Kassander. Philip IV, eldest son of Kassander, succeeded his father, but had a short reign, for he died of sickness after something more than a year. Between the two remaining sons, Antipater and Alexander, a sanguinary hostility broke out. Antipater slew his mother Thessalonike, because he thought she was contriving means to give the sovereignty to his brother; and thus in 295 B. C. died by the hand of her own son the last member of the family of Philip and Alexander the Great. This violent act aroused the people against Antipater, who was forced to flee to his father-in-law Lysimachus, hoping that this king of Thrace would assist him in recovering the throne of Macedonia. Alexander called in the Greek princes to his assistance, Pyrrhus (who had in the mean time recovered his ancestral scepter) from Epirus, and Demetrius from the Peloponnesus. Pyrrhus marched into Macedonia and seized a considerable part of that country, while Demetrius, occupied with other matters, was more tardy in obeying the summons. But Antipater, having unsuccessfully plotted against his father-in-law in Thrace, was by his orders presently slain.

Alexander, having no longer need of foreign assistance, informed his allies that his affairs did not now require their presence. He effected an agreement with the Epirote king by granting him a considerable part of Macedonia, but sought to free himself from Demetrius by murdering him. Demetrius, informed of this, slew Alexander at Larissa, during an interview to which he had craftily invited him, and on the following day (294 B. C.) seized the Macedonian crown; "not without the assent of a considerable party, to whom the name and the deeds of Kassander and his sons were alike odious."

Death of Demetrius.

Thus sat on the bloody throne of Macedonia Demetrius Poliorketes, and for ever disappeared the race of murderers produced by the brave and good Antipater—i. e., his son Kassander, and the latter's sons Antipater and Alexander. Phila alone, out of the whole family, proved herself a woman of noble and exalted nature. Demetrius had often neglected her, but she never ceased to love him, and remained faithful to the last, notwithstanding his debaucheries; and for the sake of her son Antigonus Gonatas, she forgot the bitter treatment she suffered at the hands of her husband, and strove by all means to strengthen his rule over Macedonia, because the Macedonians submitted to Demetrius chiefly because he was the son-in-law of their beloved Antipater.

Demetrius was not satisfied with his new empire, although it was of considerable importance. He had indeed lost his possessions in Asia, but he held sway over Macedonia and Hellas—that is to say, over nearly all the kingdom which Philip, father of Alexander the Great, had only after many severe struggles and difficulties reduced to his authority. But Demetrius inherited the ambition of his father, despised Macedonia, was difficult of access, and not only refused to read the petitions of his subjects, but even cast them into the street, and at the same time oppressed the country by maintaining a sumptuous court, and preparing a large fleet and army with which to recover the Asiatic kingdom of his father. He became so obnoxious to his subjects by reason of these acts of tyranny, that in 289, when he was sick, Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, seized almost without a contest the country over which he ruled. Demetrius, as soon as he had recovered, drove him away, but still continued to oppress his subjects with his vast warlike preparations. He had already amassed a fleet of five hundred ships and one hundred and

twelve thousand men, intending to invade Asia, when all at once it became apparent how visionary were his plans and undertakings.

Seleukus, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus, deeming themselves equally threatened by his preparations, renewed the alliance against him, and likewise joined in an application to Pyrrhus, desiring him to fall upon Macedonia. Thus, while Demetrius was preparing for his voyage, he found himself encircled by hostile armies at home. Lysimachus invaded Macedonia from the north, Pyrrhus from the west, and Ptolemy sent his great fleet to draw Hellas off from its master. As soon as the enemy approached, the Macedonians, tired of fighting to maintain the luxury of Demetrius, deserted their king and forced him to save his life by flight. Thus, in 287 B. C., after seven years' rule in Macedonia, Demetrius again lost the kingdom, and departed, abandoned by all. Nothing could equal the sorrow of his noble wife Phila on this occasion. She could not bear to see her unfortunate husband once more a private man and an exile, and in her despair she took poison and died.

The Athenian Olympiodorus, availing himself of the flight of Demetrius, sought to free his country from foreign rule, and, attacking the Macedonian garrison, compelled it to surrender. Upon this, Demetrius repaired to Hellas, collected such of his friends and officers as he found there, and laid siege to Athens. The Athenians, however, met his attacks bravely, and forced him to abandon the attempt. Leaving his possessions in Hellas to his son Antigonus Gonatas, because he had himself neither time nor desire to waste his opportunities with small matters, he embarked his army, which consisted of eleven thousand foot, besides cavalry, and hastened to carry the war into Asia. Lysimachus, whose possessions he had invaded, was then in Macedonia; but his brave son Agathokles came against Demetrius with a great army. Agathokles avoided a pitched battle with his desper-

ate antagonist, but shut him off from the sea, deprived him of provisions, and by continually harassing him reduced him to severe straits. Demetrius had in a short time lost not less than eight thousand men, and was finally brought to such extremities that he wrote a letter to Seleukus containing a long and moving detail of his misfortunes, and concluding with strong entreaties that he would take compassion on a prince who was allied to him, and whose sufferings were such as even an enemy might be affected with.

Seleukus was touched with pity, and sent orders to his lieutenants to supply Demetrius with everything suitable to the state of a king, and his army with sufficient provisions. But soon after, either justly or unjustly, a mutual distrust arose between the two. Seleukus demanded hostages from Demetrius, which the latter refused to grant. Hostilities broke out anew, but Demetrius was easily defeated by the powerful dynast of the East. He then sought to put an end to his life, but was prevented by his friends, and finally surrendered himself again to Seleukus. The latter once more treated him kindly, granted him a city wherein to live, and supplied him with money and a table suitable to his rank, but kept him under a strong guard. Demetrius at first exercised himself in hunting and running; but he neglected these sports by degrees, and sank into indolence and inactivity. Afterward he took to drinking and play, until, after three years' confinement, he fell into a distemper occasioned by idleness and excess, which carried him off (283 B. C.), at the age of fifty-four.*

Death of Ptolemy and Lysimachus.

Shortly after the death of Demetrius, Lysimachus also came under the sway of Seleukus. Lysimachus had secured his dominion over Thrace by means of wise regulations and

* Plutarch, "Demetrius."

successful wars, and had besides recovered his Macedonian possessions from King Pyrrhus. But he was already old and feeble, and suffered toward the close of his life many family troubles. He had four wives, but was especially devoted to his third, Amastris, niece of King Darius Codomannus. His misfortunes arose after marrying his fourth wife, Arsinoë, daughter of Ptolemy, by whom he had three sons. Amastris, becoming dissatisfied, departed to her government of Herakleia in Pontus, where after a few years she was murdered by her two sons born by a former husband, Dionysius, dynast of Herakleia. Lysimachus, who preserved to the last his devotion to Amastris, punished the matricides with death, but was none the less deprived of his noblest and dearest wife; and, while up to that epoch he had committed no villainous acts, he was now driven by Arsinoë to the most atrocious deeds.

Agathokles, son of Lysimachus, was the successor to the throne in Thrace, and had some time before married Lysandra, daughter of Ptolemy and step-sister of Arsinoë. Lysandra had also a step-brother, Ptolemy, who on account of his violent temper was surnamed Keraunus (Thunderer). Arsinoë disliked both her step-sister and half-brother as well as Agathokles, because the sovereignty would have passed not to her own children, but to those of Lysandra; and further, we are told, because, having once expressed a violent passion for Agathokles, she was repulsed by him with contumely. Thus the fiercest passions, ambition, hate, and thwarted love, combined to arouse the nature of Arsinoë even to madness. She succeeded in persuading Ptolemy Keraunus to assist her in her murderous projects; and Ptolemy, although he detested Arsinoë, availed himself of this opportunity to cause the death of the man whom he justly considered the only obstacle in his way to the throne of Macedonia. They traduced Agathokles to his father, persuaded the weak old man that Agathokles, the best of his sons, had formed a se-

cret plot against his life, and finally obtained from Lysimachus an order authorizing his death.

The fate of this noble and excellent young man created a bitter animosity against Lysimachus. This was made still more violent by numerous other crimes to which he was incited by that execrable woman, especially in Asia Minor, where many of the friends of Agathokles resided, and which province the latter had ruled with great moderation shortly before his death. Lysandra, his half-brother Alexander, and a few intimate friends of the murdered prince sought the protection of Seleukus. They were cordially received by Seleukus, who considered this an excellent opportunity to add to his dominions the kingdom in Asia formerly granted to Lysimachus. This seemed all the easier on the death shortly afterward (283 B. C.) of the old king of Egypt, Ptolemy Soter (Savior), who, as it would seem, restrained while he lived the conquering aspirations of the Asiatic monarch.

Thus Lysimachus suddenly found himself threatened by Seleukus, and at the same time received positive assurance of the innocence of the son whose death he had so rashly ordered. He hastened to Asia, however, to meet his formidable antagonist in person. In a battle fought on the plain of Cyrus in Phrygia, on the Hellespont, in the summer of 281, Lysimachus was mortally wounded, and his army completely routed. The body of the king remained unobserved on the field of battle until, several days afterward, his son Alexander obtained permission to inter it in a befitting manner. Neither would it have been discovered had not a faithful dog preserved it from beasts and birds of prey. Alexander had the body transported to Lysimacheia in Thrace, where he caused a monument to be erected to the memory of his father, who perished at the age of eighty. Seleukus, shortly after the battle, crossed the Hellespont, and brought under his sway even the European possessions of his opponent.

Death of Seleukus.

Seleukus, however, did not long enjoy this high degree of prosperity. Ptolemy Keraunus, fearing the anger of Lysimachus, who had learned of the innocence of Agathokles, escaped to Seleukus. He was cordially welcomed, but the villain succeeded in estranging the army from Seleukus, and finally murdered him in 280 ; after which he hastened to Lysimacheia, proclaimed himself king of Thrace, and, entering Macedonia with an army, caused himself to be recognized also as ruler by the Macedonians. Thus perished the founder of the empire of the Seleukidæ, at the age of seventy-three. His son and successor Antiochus I wished at first to avenge the death of his father ; but, deeming Ptolemy II (Philadelphus) of Egypt sure to come to the aid of his brother Ptolemy Keraunus, and being prohibited by many native Asiatic rulers from leading an army across their territories, he chose to make peace and recognize Ptolemy Keraunus as king of Macedonia and Thrace.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE INVASIONS OF THE GAULS.

Death of Ptolemy Keraunus.

THE new king, who had through villainy seized upon the throne, sought by the most nefarious means to strengthen his position. It is not known what became of the widow of Agathokles and her children ; but Arsinoë, the wife of Lysimachus and half-sister of Ptolemy Keraunus, had escaped with her children to the well-fortified Kassandreia. Ptolemy, desiring to become master of this castle and of the children

of Lysimachus, proposed to his half-sister that she should become his wife, promising to hold the empire as the possession of her children, and only rule in common with them. Marriages of this sort between brothers and sisters are already often mentioned among the successors of Alexander. As soon as the marriage took place and Kassandreia fell into his power, he at once slew the children in her arms, and imprisoned Arsinoë herself in Samothrake, whence she escaped to Egypt, where she became the wife of her other brother Ptolemy II.

Thus the kingdom of Ptolemy Keraunus seemed everywhere secure. Ptolemy of Egypt was his ally ; Antiochus of Asia had made peace with him ; the children of Lysimachus were killed ; Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, had gone to Italy to assist the Tarentines against the Romans. Antigonus Gonatas, son of Demetrius Poliorketes, was indeed a dangerous opponent, but was for the present engaged in war with the Spartans.

Suddenly and unexpectedly a formidable enemy appeared in the so-called Kelts or Gauls. The Gauls were the oldest known inhabitants of the farthest western countries of Europe. Being a branch of the Indo-Germanic race, they came at some remote period from Asia. In the sixth century B. C. they began to move toward the east and the south ; a part of them settled in Spain, while another portion invaded upper Italy, southern Germany, Hungary, and thence in the fourth century B. C. found their way to the north of Hellas. In 335, when Alexander the Great marched against certain tribes bordering on the Danube, ambassadors of the Gauls came to him and made peace, which in 323 they renewed by a second embassy sent to him in Babylon. During the time of the successors new tribes of Gauls made frequent incursions into the northern provinces of Hellas ; but during the confusion caused by the death of Lysimachus and of Seleukus, the civil strifes in Hellas between the Spartans, Ætolians,

and Antigonus, and the departure of Pyrrhus for Italy, numberless hordes of Gallic barbarians made new and terrible inroads into various provinces on the north of Hellas. Ptolemy Keraunus seems to have despised the strength of these Gauls; but in a battle fought in November, 280, his force not being sufficiently large, the Macedonian army was wellnigh annihilated, and Ptolemy himself was slain.

Anarchy in Macedonia—Antigonus Gonatas King.

After the death of Ptolemy Keraunus the Gauls became masters of the open regions bordering on Macedonia, and ruthlessly ravaged the surrounding districts. Meleagrus, brother of Ptolemy, was declared king. Being unable to rescue the land from the barbarians, he was speedily deposed by the Macedonians, and one Antipater, an alleged relative of either Kassander or Lysimachus, was elected in his stead; but he was also dethroned in a few days. Hereupon Sosthenes, a Macedonian of noble rank, took command of the army, drove away the barbarians, but refused the crown, declaring himself amply satisfied to retain command of the army.

In the spring of 279 about two hundred thousand Gallic warriors, bringing with them according to custom their wives and children, and led by the ferocious Brennus, invaded Macedonia, laid waste the fields and orchards (for they were unable to capture the fortified cities), and continued on their march to the south through Thessaly. This news naturally alarmed Hellas, and especially the districts beyond the isthmus. Most of the cities were then autonomous, because Antigonus Gonatas at that time held only Eubœa. They therefore formed an alliance under the supreme command of the Athenians. The Gallic horde invaded Hellas, and marched straight against Delphi, which, though it had been pillaged seventy years before during the Phokian war, had in the mean time regained treasures of considerable value.

But in the neighborhood of Delphi the Gauls suffered a complete defeat, their chief Brennus was killed, and finally they were driven back through Thessaly and Macedonia to Thrace, being literally mowed down by the people through whose territories they passed.

Many other tribes of Gauls later collected in Thrace, and finally established a kingdom of their own called Tyle, which achieved considerable importance, and compelled even the powerful city of Byzantium to pay tribute to it. This kingdom, whose first king was Komontorius, lasted about sixty years, when it was overthrown by the Thracians. But the Gauls left many traces in the East.

Sosthenes, the brave general of Macedonia, died about the end of 279. Anarchy afterward prevailed throughout the land, until finally Antigonus Gonatas, availing himself of the internal discord, invaded Macedonia and seized upon his paternal kingdom (278 B. C.), which he and his descendants thereafter ruled. Afterward vast numbers of marauding Gauls passed into Asia, and finally settled in a large district bordering on the lands of Kappadokia, Paphlagonia, Bithynia, and Phrygia, which received from them the name of Galatia. Such was the end of these invasions of the Gauls—the first barbarians who visited the land of Hellas from the west and the north.

The last and final distribution of the dominions of Alexander was accomplished immediately after the accession of Antigonus Gonatas to the throne. That vast empire was now divided into three kingdoms—Egypt under the descendants of Ptolemy Soter, Asia under the Seleukidæ, and Macedonia under the Antigonids. The kingdom of Thrace, once so flourishing under Lysimachus, had disappeared with his successors; for the race of Lysimachus, as well as that of Kassander, was already extinct. Forty-five years had passed since the death of Alexander the Great—forty-five years of almost constant wars and strife; but it must not be sup-

posed that these repeated conflicts were caused merely by selfish passions and personal ambition, for the struggle was mainly carried on for the maintenance of the union of the empire. This was the object of Perdikkas, of Eumenes, and of Antigonus. Nor did the successors of Alexander ever forget another great object—that of strengthening and spreading Hellenism in the remotest lands of Asia and Libya. Thus these long strifes were not wholly individual and unproductive, and the successors of Alexander neither proved themselves worthless pupils of an incomparable teacher, nor inefficacious apostles and propagators of the noble Hellenic civilization. The commixture of Hellenism, which had now so greatly degenerated, with Asiatic customs and habits, and the unlimited and irresponsible power which these dynasts had often acquired, certainly produced a mode of life foreign to that of ancient Hellenism; but if Perdikkas, Pylippos, Kassander, Lysimachus, and Antigonus stained their hands with bloody deeds, yet Eumenes, Ptolemy, Seleukus, and Demetrius Poliorketes displayed virtues and a spirit of generosity which we rarely find excelled even in the history of the first Hellenism.

CHAPTER IX.

STATE OF THE HELLENIC WORLD.

Expedition of Pyrrhus of Epirus.

THE Epirots about this time rose into an importance which they never before enjoyed, and their king, Pyrrhus, was confessedly the most daring, most energetic, and most fortunate man of that epoch. Though descended from a race of kings, he may be considered the architect of his own

fortunes, and in the long trials of youth he had learned the art of drawing men to himself. It is no wonder that the multitude adored him, and in their enthusiasm for his warlike achievements gave him the name of the Eagle, in regard to which he said: "If I am an eagle, you have made me one; for it is upon your arms, upon your wings, that I have risen so high." He indeed was gifted with a nature imbued with the noblest and loftiest of sentiments.

Had Pyrrhus possessed stability of character, he would have made Epirus the mistress of Hellas, and have added to the glory gained by the Hellenic nation through the Macedonians the not less illustrious achievement of the growth and preservation of Hellenic autonomy on its ancient hearth. But, after securing his own dominion in Epirus, he was persuaded that neither to annoy others nor to be annoyed by them was a life insufferably languishing and tedious. Like Demetrius Poliorketes, whose spirit seemed transplanted into this young warrior, he was never satisfied with the present, "but pined in dull repose," and, led on by hope alone, plunged into many disastrous undertakings. It was this thoughtless spirit which finally induced him in 280 B. C. to undertake the great and destructive expedition against the Romans.

The Romans, who with the Hellenes belonged to the Græco-Latin branch of the Indo-Germanic race, began to change their mode of life early in the eighth century B. C., and, starting from their capital, Rome, within a short time reduced under their sway nearly all the neighboring states. They were asked by the Hellenic cities in southern Italy to aid them against Kleonymus, king of Sparta, and his native allies. The Romans hastened with avidity to southern Italy, forced Kleonymus to return to Sparta, and were thereafter deemed the protectors of the weak Hellenic cities, not a few of which even accepted Roman garrisons. Shortly after the Romans engaged in war with the Tarentines, and

the latter, not able to sustain the contest, sought the assistance of Pyrrhus, who readily espoused their cause and declared war against the Romans.

In the beginning of 280 B. C. Pyrrhus sailed for Italy with an army of twenty thousand foot and twenty elephants. The Romans received him with great firmness, and the success of the first battle, on the river Siris, remained long undecided. It is said that each army was broken and gave way seven times, and rallied as often; but finally the Romans were worsted, and Pyrrhus remained master of the field. In the following year another great battle was fought near Asculum, in which the Romans made prodigious efforts with their swords to break the enemy's infantry; not regarding themselves or the wounds they received from the Macedonian pikes, but only looking where they might strike and slay. After a long conflict, however, the Romans were forced to give way; and when they had all quitted the field, and Pyrrhus was congratulated on the victory, he exclaimed, "Such another victory, and we are undone." He therefore gladly availed himself of the proposition of the Syracusans to assist them against the Carthaginians (278 B. C.). He remained three years in Sicily, during which the Romans, taking advantage of his absence, subdued many warlike nations in Italy, and became the masters of numerous Hellenic cities. Consequently the allies of Pyrrhus begged him to return at once to their assistance. He complied, and reached Tarentum with an army of twenty-three thousand foot, mostly composed of inexperienced soldiers; for he had lost the greater part of the disciplined forces which he had brought with him, and nearly all his friends and officers. It is no wonder, therefore, that he was disastrously beaten by the Romans, and was forced in the following year to return to Epirus.

Hellenism in the West.

After the departure of Pyrrhus from Italy, the Romans subjugated not only the native tribes, but also all the Hellenic colonies. Ten years later began the first war between the Romans and Carthaginians, which was principally carried on in Sicily, and at the close of which, in 241 B. C., the entire island, with all its Hellenic colonies, passed under the Roman rule. The city of Syracuse alone, with a small adjoining district, preserved its independence under Hiero II, who, after many troubles and disturbances, had ascended the throne in 269. Syracuse also during the second Carthaginian war succumbed to the Romans.

Within the third century B. C., therefore, all the Hellenic cities in southern Italy and Sicily had lost their independence and fallen under the sway of Rome. Massalia alone (the modern Marseilles)—a city strong by position, founded by the Phokæans about 600 B. C. upon a promontory washed on three sides by the sea, well fortified, and possessing a convenient harbor securely closed against enemies*—maintained for some time still its liberty, and became a place of considerable importance in antiquity.

Massalia, however, by reason of its isolated situation on the south coast of France, could not have become the center of a great Hellenism, and was finally, about the middle of the first century B. C., captured by the Romans. But all those provinces situated on the west of Hellas, though they may have lost their autonomy, yet still preserved their Hellenic spirit. The Romans wellnigh Latinized all the nations which they conquered, but they never succeeded in overcoming Hellenism. For many centuries still, not only in Massalia but in many other parts of Gaul, flourished schools of Greek letters and art, which were deemed by the Romans equal in every respect to those at Athens. During the third

* Strabo.

century B. C. the Hellenic colonies in Sicily produced some of the most eminent men of antiquity. Archimedes, the greatest inventor and mathematician of the ancient world, was a Syracusan ; he was killed during the subjugation of his country in 212 B. C., after having for three years defended it by his genius and inventions. Theokritus, the most fascinating of bucolic poets, and in fact the creator of bucolic or pastoral poetry, was also a native of Syracuse, and flourished about 270 B. C. The celebrated historian Timæus was of Tauromenium in Sicily ; Diodorus, the historian, whom we have so often consulted in the preparation of this work, was born in the town of Argyrium in Sicily, and flourished during the first century B. C. In fine, the Hellenism of southern Italy and Sicily has imbedded itself so deeply into the soil, that neither Roman, Lombard, Arab, nor Norman has succeeded in wholly obliterating it. It is true, however, that from that period onward Hellenism in the West, having lost its independence, continued to defend rather than spread itself, to wither rather than to grow ; and its more energetic career was confined to the East, where it did not cease for many centuries to produce fruits destined to influence deeply the fortunes of the world.

Hellenism in the East.

The large number of cities which Alexander and his successors established in the East were the greatest and most energetic organs for the spread of Hellenism in Asia, and doubly contributed to its growth and strength. They were founded by Hellenes, and, though later many of the native inhabitants settled in them, the Hellenic population generally predominated, while it was always intellectually the stronger. Again, these cities were organized after the Hellenic idea of government ; for, if they did not have the complete political existence of the ancient Hellenic cities, they possessed their entire system of civil organization—the as-

sembly, the senate, the archons, the generals. Thus, not only were Hellenic blood and the Hellenic tongue, but the very Hellenic mode of government, disseminated throughout the East.*

We actually have the names of more than two hundred cities established by the successors alone in the vast empire of Asia,† and we regret that the scope of the present work does not admit some description of the more important of them, of their libraries, of the great men they produced, and the imperishable work they did for the civilization of Asia. The cities thus founded acquired a population of at least a million, and perhaps a million and a half, supposing the average population of an ancient Hellenic city to have been about five thousand. It was not only Hellas and Macedonia, but also the Greeks of southern Italy, Sicily, Asia Minor, and Africa, that contributed to the great work of colonizing and Hellenizing Asia. These cities, scattered as it were like islands in a vast sea, gradually drew the natives to themselves, by the superiority of their organization, the finish of their civilization, and especially by the language, which, constantly spreading, finally completely Hellenized the countries of Western Asia. This magnetic power of the Hellenic tongue is one of the most interesting phenomena in history. Like the golden arms of the Macedonians, which possessed at once intrinsic value and irresistible force, the most finished of languages was always the most powerful arm of Hellenism.

The amalgamation of the Hellenic and Egyptian religions also contributed much toward furthering this great work.

* Droysen, in his history of Alexander the Great, gives the names of about fifty cities as actually founded in the East by Alexander alone. He comes accordingly near to Plutarch, who states that seventy cities were founded by Alexander. But it is much to be doubted whether even the fifty cities mentioned by Droysen were actually *cities* or simply military posts. The number established by Alexander is not as accurately known to us as that by his successors.

† Including of course Egypt, India, Armenia, etc.

This union was inaugurated by the protection which Ptolemy and his successors granted to the temples, religious ceremonies, and sacred writings of the Egyptians, and culminated in the erection of a temple of Zeus in central Egypt. Wonderful indeed were also the exertions of the Ptolemies for the advancement of science, art, commerce, and industry. No new intellectual masterpieces were produced, but the old were collected, examined, explained, and systematically arranged. The Museum was the center of this new intellectual energy. This famous edifice was the work of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and presided as it were over the vast and stately palaces erected in Alexandria. It included a library and many other buildings devoted to the study of science, art, and literature; so that the entire edifice might be called to-day a university and academy of sciences. It contained besides gardens and courts devoted to teaching, because then as formerly instruction was not given in recitation-rooms, but by the free conversation of teachers and pupils walking up and down. The famous Alexandrian library, which this Museum contained, was first of all established by Ptolemy Lagus; was considerably increased by Philadelphus and his successors; but was destroyed by fire during the time of Julius Cæsar, about the middle of the first century B. C. The Ptolemies collected not only the writings of the Greeks, but those of other nations, so that this library was the common treasury of the entire world. Through the efforts also of Philadelphus was made the Hellenic version of the sacred books of the Hebrews (i. e., the Old Testament), known as the Septuagint. Then flourished Kallimachus, a native of Kyrene, one of the most celebrated of the Alexandrian grammarians, historians, and poets; Apollonius Rhodius, born at Alexandria, and well known through his poem, consisting of four books, on the expedition of the Argonauts; Aristophanes Byzantinus, one of the most eminent Greek grammarians, the librarian of the Alexandrian library, and the

founder of a school of grammar ; Aristarchus, the most celebrated critic in antiquity ; and many others.

Another edifice, but of an entirely different nature, famous for the facility it afforded to navigation and commerce, was a lighthouse, the first known in history, constructed on the island of Pharos, before the principal harbor of Alexandria. It was called from the island "tower of Pharos," or simply "Pharos"; wherefore a building of this kind is to this day called in many modern languages "Pharos." It was constructed of white stone upon a craggy rock, had a height of three hundred feet, and its light on the top could be seen at a distance of eight miles or more. The famous artisan Sostratus* of Knidus spent twelve years in its erection, and on account of its size and beauty it was so much admired that it was considered one of the seven wonders of the world.

Navigation and ship-building achieved their highest degree of perfection in ancient times under the Ptolemies. The kings of Egypt maintained two thousand transport-vessels, fifteen hundred triremes, and eight hundred other ships for their special use, most magnificently furnished, with prows and sterns shining with gold. The construction of these works of course presupposes an inexhaustible amount of money. The historian Appianus, who flourished in the beginning of the second century B. C., says that the treasures accumulated by the second of the Ptolemies amounted to 740,000 talents, i. e., 3,700,000,000 drachmæ. A few modern historians have deemed this sum wholly incredible as "a reserve fund"; but Appianus asserts that he obtained his information from the royal records.† The historian Josephus informs us that Egypt, besides Alexandria, had a population

* The following inscription on the Pharos is said to have immortalized the name of the artisan: Σώστρατος Κνίδιος Δεξιφάνους Θεοῖς Σωτήρησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν πλωϊζωμένων.

† Βασιλικῶν ἀναγραφῶν.

of 7,500,000 ; and it is to be remembered that in his time Egypt had sadly declined.

Macedonia and Hellas.

These are briefly the changes which Hellenism accomplished in the East after the third century B. C. ; but this vast external growth necessarily caused the early decline of Macedonia. That country was exhausted by the expedition of Alexander the Great, by the forty years' civil wars which followed, and in which nearly all the Macedonians capable of bearing arms served, by the many colonies which it established, and especially by the destructive Gallic invasions. To be sure, Macedonia was fortunate in possessing Antigonus Gonatas, a wise, good, moderate, and determined ruler ; but the material resources of Macedonia were already expended, its native population had greatly diminished, and its most fertile plains were occupied by Gauls and Illyrians. This decline was of course most keenly felt in the fortunes of the Hellenic nation. That nation had need of a ruler, and it had found him in Macedonia ; but this hegemony already became, if not impossible, at least weak. Perhaps it might have been met through the Epirotic rule of Pyrrhus, but he also had foolishly expended his forces in the expeditions against Italy and Sicily. He was indeed an excellent general, but wholly deficient in those political qualities through which mainly hegemonies are established and strengthened. Hellas remained again headless, if we may use the term, as after the death of Epaminondas and the fall of the Thebans.

It is true that about this time arose in Hellas two leagues, which seemed destined to save the Hellenic autonomy, as they were both based on the principle of an equality of political rights, for which we have in vain searched in the hegemony of Athens, Sparta, or Thebes ; but these leagues had certain fatal organic deficiencies. The Ætolians were

remarkable for their bodily strength, but were wholly without intellectual attainments. The Achæans had sounder ideas of political and social order, but were not distinguished for their military virtues. Above all, Macedonia had certainly grown weak, but not in a degree to abandon her claims to supremacy ; hence a constant civil strife arose between that country and the two leagues—an unproductive contest, because neither party overcame the other, while it exhausted even the last forces of the nation, and prepared it to become a prey to that ambitious Italian city which, after having subjugated the Hellenes in Italy and Sicily, was destined to reduce to her scepter successively those in Hellas, Asia, and Africa.

CHAPTER X.

THE ROMAN CONQUEST.

The Ætolian and Achæan Leagues.

PYRRHUS returned to Epirus in 274 B. C., but, instead of devoting his energies to the recuperation of his power at home, he forthwith engaged in new strifes in Macedonia, Sparta, and Argos, and was killed in a battle fought in 272 at the last-mentioned place. During the reign of his son and successor Alexander II, the star of the Æakids shone for a short time still, for that king became master of nearly all Macedonia ; but he was finally worsted, and lost even a considerable part of Epirus. Later, with the assistance of the Ætolians, he expelled the Macedonians ; but shortly after his death, about 242, Epirus passed into utter anarchy, and became as obscure as it had been before the time of Pyrrhus.

About this time the Achæan and Ætolian leagues attained considerable power in Hellas. The former drove

away from the Peloponnesus the king of Macedonia, Antigonus Gonatas, while the latter successfully opposed his intervention in the affairs of Hellas beyond the isthmus. Hence in 240 B. C., when Antigonus died, he possessed in Hellas proper only Eubœa and Attica ; the rest of the country had for the last time in antiquity achieved its independence through the efforts of these confederacies.

These leagues sought the same object of national union which Athens, Sparta, and Thebes had successively aimed at ; and though the doctrine of "equality of political rights," upon which these new confederacies were founded, was indeed much sounder than the domineering hegemony of the ancients, yet the principles advocated were often violated. Furthermore, republican principles alone do not suffice to maintain a state ; there is need of a powerful concentration and of an effective government, without which the privileges of freedom eventually are lost. Again, the Ætolians were certainly Greeks, but the lowest of all in civilization, possessing no inclination whatever, like the Macedonians, the Epirots, and the Thessalians, to familiarize themselves with the intellectual attainments of the nation. While they claimed to be the rulers of Hellas, they continued to reside in villages ; and while they were engaged in war with the Macedonians and Achæans, and had need of all their forces, large numbers of them went to serve as mercenaries in the armies of the Seleukidæ and the Ptolemies.

The Achæan league received its first impetus between the years 280 and 250 B. C., taking advantage of the difficulties of Antigonus, king of Macedonia, and of the wars of the Ætolians. In the fourth year of its existence Sikyon became included in the confederacy. Sikyon had been hitherto governed by tyrants appointed by the Macedonians ; but in the year 250 the Sikyonian Aratus drove away the tyrant Nikokles, and united his country to the Achæan league, that the recovered liberty might be maintained through its pro-

tection. Many other cities afterward imitated the example of Sikyon, so that the Achæan league soon acquired the influence in the Peloponnesus which the Ætolian had already obtained in the north of Hellas.

After the death of Antigonus Gonatas, his son Demetrius II, the least capable of the Antigonids, ruled for ten years in Macedonia, 240-230 B. C. We have called him "the least capable of the Antigonids," because he not only troubled very little the Achæans, but also accomplished nothing of importance in his constant wars against the Ætolians. After the death of Demetrius (230), his cousin Antigonus Doson succeeded to the throne, as the guardian of Philip, the young son of Demetrius. Doson was distinguished for his political and military talents; but, owing to the revolts which broke out in the north and south of his kingdom, he was forced to abandon his rule in the Peloponnesus, and the Macedonian garrisons were consequently removed from nearly all Hellas. Athens became at that time free, and, while refusing to join the Achæan league, she was well disposed toward it. But not long after a formidable opponent of the Achæans appeared in the Peloponnesus itself.

Agis and Kleomenes, Kings of Sparta.

An attempt was made about this time to revive the ancient political ascendancy of Sparta. King Agis IV, son of Eudamidas, thought that he could effect this by the reëstablishment of the laws of Lycurgus. To this end he deemed indispensable an equal division of property (which had never existed in Sparta), the abolition of all debts, and the redistribution of the land to the Spartans and to the Periœki; at the same time he declared himself ready to divide his great property in accordance with the principles advocated. Agis was sincere in his intentions, brave and virtuous, but inexperienced and incapable of grappling with the difficulties which his plans were sure to cause. The rich

heard with a shudder of the proposed spoliation of their property ; and with the assistance of the other king, Leonidas II, son of Kleonymus, and the connivance of Agesilaus, uncle of Agis, they frustrated his plans and killed him in 241 B. C., together with his mother and grandmother, who are said to have most heartily assisted him in the furtherance of his projects.

After his death, Leonidas gave in marriage the widow of Agis, famous for her beauty and virtue, to his son Kleomenes. Kleomenes III was certainly one of the most resplendent stars of the few which we find rapidly disappearing from the Hellenic firmament. He was a young man full of courage, lofty-minded, well versed in military tactics, and capable of drawing men to himself through his many virtues. Nature had not only endowed him with all the advantages through which men accomplish great deeds, but had besides given him all the virtues on account of which one is loved and esteemed. How great his devotion to his mother Kratesikleia, one of the grandest characters among the women of antiquity ! How deep his love for his wife Agiate ! How many sincere and true friends he had obtained ! The historian Polybius, who did not love Kleomenes, since he was an enemy to the Achæans, was forced to acknowledge his irresistible magnetism and grace. He calls him "the most virtuous of kings and the most affectionate and philanthropic of citizens" ; but at the same time he stigmatizes him as "the most bitter of tyrants." Why ? Because he was compelled to use force for the execution of his plans. What great change was ever effected without force ? Kleomenes was not a man, like Aratus, who by dark and mysterious ways sought the realization of his projects ; he was one of those who openly and with sword in hand march straight to the accomplishment of what they deem just. To be sure, after a long period of success, he finally failed ; but he failed because to accomplish great deeds there is need not only of

hands but of substance, which was now sadly wanting in Hellas.

The earlier career of Kleomenes is replete with success. He entered Arkadia, and occupied Mantinea, Tegea, and Orchomenus, cities belonging to the Ætolians, but indispensable to the king of Sparta. He repeatedly defeated Aratus, drove him from Elis, and later gained a great battle over him near Megalopolis. After obtaining these successes he deemed it best to make certain changes in the Spartan constitution, especially since, by the death of Archidamus, the other king, he remained alone on the throne. Having, by long and repeated marches throughout Arkadia, wearied the Spartans and Lacedæmonians in his army to such an extent that they themselves begged to be allowed to remain in Arkadia, he entered Sparta at the head of his remaining forces, mainly composed of mercenaries, put to death the ephors and those who hastened to their assistance, and on the following day, summoning an assembly, declared the alterations which he thought best to be made in the constitution, and explained the reasons that led him to the slaughter of so many citizens. The desired changes were effected, the most salutary of them being the enlistment as citizens of Sparta of the best of the Periœki, a measure which tended to effectually increase the population of the city. Then he again enlarged his dominion by capturing several other cities of the Achæans, and would have finally compelled them to unconditional surrender but for the determination and advice of their general Aratus, who, hoping for the assistance of Antigonus, king of Macedonia, succeeded in inducing his despairing countrymen to prolong the war. Finally, in the spring of 233 B. C., Antigonus entered Hellas, leading an army of about twenty-two thousand. Kleomenes defeated him near Lechæum. But in the mean time Argos revolted from Sparta, and Orchomenus, Tegea, and Mantinea soon followed its example; so that in the following year Kleomenes found him-

self surrounded by many implacable enemies, and was completely defeated by Antigonus and his numerous allies, in a great battle fought in Sellasia. Finding that he could accomplish nothing more in the Peloponnesus, which again fell under the Macedonian dynasty, Kleomenes sailed for Egypt ; and the incapable king of that country, Ptolemy IV, Philopator, reduced him to such despair that he put an end to his own life.

Antigonus abolished the innovations of his defeated opponent, reëstablished the office of the ephors, and then returned to Macedonia, where he died in the spring of 221, leaving the kingdom to his nephew Philip, son of Demetrius II.

Roman Successes.

During the reign of Philip V the Romans occupied the coasts of Illyria, having driven the Illyrians from Italy while attempting to plunder its eastern coasts. The Ætolian and Achæan leagues also showed their deference for the victorious nation in a manner which amply manifested their own weakness. But while such imminent danger threatened them from the west, a destructive civil war broke out in Hellas between the Ætolians and Achæans, the so-called "War of the Allies," which lasted from 220 to 217.

The Achæans, being hard pressed, sought the assistance of King Philip, who defeated the Ætolians and plundered their land. An excellent opportunity now presented itself for uniting the scattered forces of Hellas, under the supremacy of the Macedonians, against the enemy from the west ; but this project was frustrated through the thoughtlessness of Philip. The Romans were at that time engaged in the second Carthaginian war, and were sorely pressed by Hannibal, the illustrious general of the Carthaginians. Philip decided to enter into an alliance with him for the purpose of checking the daily increasing power of the Romans. The plan was not ill-advised, for there was sufficient ground

to believe that by such an alliance the destruction of Rome could be easily effected, had Philip hastened to the assistance of Hannibal without loss of time. But Philip consumed three whole years in vain negotiations, during which the Romans created new factions in Hellas; for they allied themselves with the Ætoliens, and incited a war against the Macedonians, which lasted from 211 to 204 B. C. In this contest the Achæans united with the king of Macedonia, while the Spartans and Attalus I, king of Pergamus, joined the Ætoliens. The Romans alone profited by this struggle; Philip was prevented from going into Italy, and the Hellenic forces were materially diminished. When finally peace was concluded, the Romans agreed to it; but they were fully determined, as soon as they had freed themselves from the Carthaginians, to turn their arms against the Greeks.

The Hellenes in the mean time did everything they could to encourage the intervention of the Romans. The Athenians flattered every new dynast; the Ætoliens were intent on plunder and devastation; Sparta was oppressed by selfish and designing men; the Achæan confederacy was under the control of the Macedonians, but their king did not cease to commit grave political errors. It is, however, remarkable that at the time the Achæan league had lost its political supremacy, it produced a most illustrious general, the brave Philopœmen, who not only possessed excellent military abilities, but a virtue worthy of the most glorious epoch of Hellas. But what was said about Kleomenes may be here repeated of Philopœmen. Circumstances frustrated all his efforts. Philopœmen was called the last of the Greeks, which in itself shows that he had no one to assist him in his plans and purposes.

Philip, who could alone have preserved the autonomy of Hellas by uniting the forces of the nation, on the contrary, as if determined to widen the chasm of destruction, declared war against the kings of Egypt and Pergamus, against the

Rhodians and Ætolians, and the cities in Asia Minor, and ravaged the country of the Athenians. It is true that he proved himself an able general, both on land and sea ; but at the same time the Rhodians, the Athenians, and the king of Pergamus sought the assistance of the Roman senate, and thus afforded that ambitious people an opportunity to declare war against Philip. The war lasted four years (200-197). During the first two the Romans met with many reverses ; hence they decided to weaken the strength of their opponent by detaching the Hellenic cities from the alliance of the king of Macedonia. They effected this by holding before their eyes the bait of liberty, which they knew well those cities could not long withstand. The Romans dispatched to Hellas in the third year of the war Titus Flamininus, a man thoroughly acquainted with Hellenic habits and customs, and uniting political with military ability. He succeeded in gaining over to the Romans the most powerful tribes of Hellas save the Akarnanians, who remained faithful to the alliance of Philip. The result of the war was now evident. Philip was completely defeated in 197, and was forced to recognize the autonomy of the Hellenic cities, surrender his fleet, give one of his sons as a hostage, and pay one thousand talents, one half immediately and the remaining five hundred within the space of ten years. The brave and faithful Akarnanians were also severely chastised for their allegiance to the Macedonian king ; for they were compelled to recognize the rule of the Romans.

The Romans next found occasion to mingle in the Hellenic affairs of Asia as well as those of Egypt. On the pretext of espousing again *the Hellenic cause*, they overthrew Antiochus III, king of Syria, and compelled him to evacuate Asia Minor, pay within twelve years twelve thousand talents, and surrender all his war-vessels, elephants, and certain Greek fugitives.

It is evident that Hellas itself was fated to a like treatment. It is true that, by the peace made in 197 with the king of Macedonia, the independence of the Hellenic cities was officially recognized; but the true meaning of that freedom soon became manifest, for Roman garrisons were placed in the conquered cities, and a Roman tribunal was established in Hellas, which judged all civil and private litigations, thus preparing the Hellenes for the Roman yoke.

After the departure of Flaminius, the Romans left Hellas in peace for some time, during which the Achæan league seemed to have regained new life. The Spartans united with it, and the Romans themselves surrendered to it the Messenians and Eleians, for having been the allies of the Ætolians and of Antiochus. In 190 B. C. the Achæan confederacy included the entire Peloponnesus, and thus was brought about what had never before existed, even during the most glorious epoch—the union of this peninsula under one government. But this good fortune was not destined to last; for the strength of any one portion of Hellas was not advantageous to the interests of the Romans, who shortly afterward incited revolutions, which materially weakened the power of the league. The Romans also engaged in war with Perseus, son of Philip V, completely defeated him, and kept him a prisoner in Rome four years, where he finally died in 179 B. C. Macedonia thereupon became a Roman province; and the Epirots, accused of having espoused the cause of Perseus, were severely dealt with, their country was pillaged by a ruthless Roman army, seventy of their cities were destroyed, and one hundred and fifty thousand of the people were reduced to slavery.

Affairs in Hellas proper were not in a better condition. Lykortas, father of the historian Polybius, had succeeded Philopœmen at his death, and was the recognized chief "of the better class of citizens." His opponents, however, traduced him and one thousand others to the Romans, alleging

that they had espoused strongly the interests of Perseus. The Romans compelled all the accused to go to Rome and plead their cause there. Polybius was among this number. They were detained for seventeen years in Italy, and only in 151 B. C., in response to the repeated demands of the Achæans, were the survivors finally permitted to return to their native land. This high-handed act of violence created a strong sentiment of hostility against the Romans. But what could Hellas do, divided as she was between those favoring the rule of the Romans and those foolishly opposing it? The Roman senate finally dispatched Mummius to Hellas, with instructions to put an end to the Achæan confederacy. Mummius was a rough man, and altogether a stranger to art and science. He defeated near the isthmus the general of the Achæans, captured Corinth without battle, put to death all her citizens, made slaves of the women and children, seized the most famous masterpieces of art, not because he placed any value on them, but solely in order to adorn his triumphal entry into Rome, and burned that splendid city, whose site for about one hundred years thereafter remained uninhabited. He next marched to the Peloponnesus, destroyed the walls of the cities that had taken part in the contest, disarmed the inhabitants, dissolved the councils of the Achæans, Phokians, and Bœotians, abolished the democratic constitutions, condemned the Bœotians and Eubœans to pay to Herakleia one hundred talents, and the Achæans to pay to Sparta two hundred, and finally required all the cities that had "formed a conspiracy" against Rome to pay a yearly tribute to that proud city. But Hellas was not yet converted into a Roman province. This occurred much later, during the reign of the first emperor Augustus. Besides, many of the heaviest conditions already mentioned were shortly after withdrawn, through the intercession of Polybius, and the Hellenic cities continued to have a nominal autonomy.

Thus ended the freedom which Flamininus had fifty years before so pompously declared in Corinth. The moral and material degradation which had come over Hellas had aided much in bringing about these results. Polybius, an eye-witness to the actual condition of affairs, considers the principal causes of the evil to have been the haughtiness, avarice, and laziness of the people. Such a thoughtlessness, confusion, and lack of spirit prevailed just before the capture of Corinth, that many, he says, lost their senses, many committed suicide, and all came to consider the Roman rule as a benefit—constantly repeating the proverbial saying, “Unless we had soon perished, we should not certainly have been saved.”

Polybius.

Polybius, from whom we derive our knowledge of these events, is perhaps the best historian that Hellas produced during the last period of her autonomy. He was born in Megalopolis in 205 B. C., and died in 123. Exercised from early youth in politics and war by his father Lykortas and by Philopœmen, he finally went in 168 to Italy as one of those accused of favoring the cause of Perseus. He studied the history and constitution of the Romans; and as that history was then closely linked with the fortunes of all the known world, he had unusual opportunities of becoming familiar with the whole contemporaneous history of that epoch. - He did not limit himself simply to a theoretical study, but, being both by nature and habit a practical man, and having also become acquainted with the famous Scipio Africanus the younger, he followed him in his principal expeditions, and did not cease thus to be taught by actual experience concerning the affairs of the city destined to become the mistress of the world. Possessing such an experience, he wrote “a world’s history” in forty books, from the beginning of the second Carthaginian war to the destruction of Corinth and Carthage. Unfortunately, only the first five are completely

preserved, with a few fragments of the others. But, though the work is thus mutilated, it is to this day considered one of the best productions of historic art. It has not indeed the grace of Herodotus, the dramatic passion of Thucydides, nor the Attic purity of the language of Xenophon; yet it possesses an excellence in which Polybius surpassed all his predecessors, and approached the best of modern historians—the accurate and clear exposition of facts, always showing their causes and results, thus rendering his history a most valuable work for every nation and age. Polybius especially makes known to us the affairs of the Achæan league. This league is certainly much indebted to him, for it was through him and through his own achievements that it gained a great name both in ancient and modern times.

Permanence of Hellenic Influence.

While Hellenism on this side of the Ægean spent its scanty resources in aimless civil wars, and finally succumbed to the Roman supremacy, in the East it continued its propagation and maintained its vigor. It did not, however, prevail even there without much bitter animosity. Its severest struggle was the one in Palestine against Judaism; for the greatest achievement of Hellenism in Asia was the Hellenic panoply which Christianity wore when it first preached the word of God in Judæa, and the Hellenization of that land most of all facilitated its work.

The Jews, owing to the strifes between the Seleukidæ and the Ptolemies concerning Palestine and Phœnicia, united now with Egypt and then again with Syria. In the mean time, Hellenism began to creep stealthily among the younger generation of the Jews, and a party arose favorably disposed to Hellenic customs and bitterly antagonistic to the adherents of the ancestral religion and traditions. Later, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, took upon himself the office of “high priest of the Jews,” and considered as rebels all abiding by

their ancient faith. At the same time, being in want of money to pay the tribute imposed by the Romans on his predecessor Antiochus III, he captured Jerusalem in 170 B. C., burned the sacred books, and sought to impose on the Jews the Hellenic religion and the Hellenic gods. This oppressive policy aroused a bitter opposition among the Jews; but they were finally overcome, and, though they afterward recovered their freedom, still they were Hellenized to such an extent that they were forced to borrow the Hellenic military organization, its internal administration, its diplomatic methods, and its monetary system; and we find that about the year 78 B. C. Judaism preserved nothing of its genuine ancient customs. Later still, Herod, king of Judæa, built at Jerusalem a palæstra, theatre, and amphitheatre; every four years he celebrated great games, and in a word assumed completely the Hellenic character.

The most powerful kingdom in the East at that time, however, was that of Pontus, ruled by the great Mithridates, who succeeded his father in 124, when yet a youth. Distinguished from early childhood by his great bodily and intellectual strength, he planned many a daring deed, and often obtained favorable opportunities for the execution of his projects. The Romans were then engaged in dangerous wars and civil strifes. Syria, Pergamus, Bithynia, and Kappadokia suffered much from the rapacity of their generals, while Armenia and Parthia dreaded their daily growing strength. Mithridates accordingly planned the formation of a new Asiatic empire, hoping that by availing himself of all the Hellenic discoveries and laws he might infuse fresh life into his barbarous subjects. He did not at once attack Rome, but sought first of all to subdue the nations living around the Euxine, as well as the Hellenic colonies on the coast. The Hellenes who inhabited the countries on the northern and eastern coast of the Euxine, since they suffered much from the marauding expeditions of the nations living in

southern Russia and the Caucasus, accepted readily the Hellenized rule of Mithridates ; so that this king in 111 B. C. added to his ancestral dominion in Asia Minor another empire, which extended from the eastern boundaries of Pontus around the Euxine to Thrace, and was called "a Bosphorinan empire," from the Kimmerian Bosphorus near which were situated its two principal cities, Pantikapæon and Phanagoreia, both Hellenic colonies. Next, he turned to the west and the south, to subdue Asia Minor. Hereupon began a long and ruinous contest with the Romans, which, after many interruptions, revolts, and reverses of fortune, was finally ended in 66 B. C. by the change of the kingdom of Pontus into a Roman province, and the limitation of its ancient kings to the Bosphorinan dominion.

Thus the Hellenic possessions one after another fell under Roman rule. But if Hellenism lost its political existence during the third and second centuries B. C., its national life was never overcome. If on the field of battle it had often been worsted by the Roman legions, on the field of social and intellectual energy it never ceased to be victorious. Romanism never achieved in the East the laurels of Hellenism ; it never penetrated into the heart of the people, it never communicated to them its laws, language, customs, and character. Only the government was Latin, and finally this also was Hellenized, and on the ruins of the Roman empire gradually arose another, within which subjects, laws, rulers, kings, and all spoke the Hellenic tongue.

It was through the institutions and laws of Alexander and his successors that the Hellenic tongue ultimately prevailed as the language of the government, letters, and commerce, and of all the loftiest and noblest social relations ; and for this reason it was chosen as the organ through which the gospel was preached, and the apostles and fathers of the church spoke and wrote.

Again, when the Hellenic religion was spread in the East,

there resulted a certain comparison and assimilation of the Hellenic gods with those of Asia and Egypt. Isis was likened to Demeter, Artemis, Aphrodite, Athene, Enyo, as well as to Hera ; Serapis again was likened to Zeus, Asklepius, Helius, Dionysus, and many others. Hence, a lofty and abstract conception arose in the minds and consciences of the multitude ; for, owing to the various peculiarities of these divinities, it became necessary to limit these gradually to a few. It was, for instance, said about Isis, that she was the mother of things, the mistress of the elements, the first daughter of the times, the highest of the gods, the queen of Hades, the first of the heavenly bodies, the only archetype of the gods—one divinity under various names and forms, and worshiped in various ways throughout the world. In regard to Serapis, it was said that heaven was his head, the sea his flesh, the earth his feet, and the sun his eye. Thus, by this union, began gradually to disappear the particular and topical peculiarities of the gods, and the minds of the masses became imbued with a more generous comprehension of divinity.

While we say that Hellenism produced these wonderful results, we do not certainly allege, as a few perverters of historic events have claimed, that it also produced Christianity. The truth disclosed by our Saviour is the work of Divine Providence, while Hellenism only aided this work by Hellenizing the multitudes, and thus preparing them for the acceptance and understanding of one only true God. Hellenism led the way, through the incomprehensible dictates of Providence. The genius of Alexander and his successors can not be denied ; but both evidently fulfilled a mission intrusted to them, for the fortunes of this historic drama can not otherwise be explained. Alexander died when he had hardly begun his work. Hence resulted terrific revolutions and clashing of affairs, individuals, countries, interests, and circumstances. In the midst of this fearful chaos, the

spread of Hellenism advances for many centuries. In the mean time Europe is divided from Asia and Egypt. Macedonia continues in hostile relations toward the empires which she created, and these in turn contend one against the other; the Ptolemies wage war against the Seleukidæ, and the latter against the dynasts of Asia Minor; some of these rulers are not even of Hellenic descent; the work of Alexander seems to have been submerged; but it continues to survive in the storm, and finally ends by Hellenizing the dynasts of Asia, who in their turn coöperate in the spread of Hellenism. How is it possible not to see the will of Providence in all these fortunes, and especially when we witness their results? For, indeed, how many difficulties and obstacles would Christianity have encountered without the assistance of Hellenism! The gospel would have been preached in the Hebrew; and not only was this tongue unknown to the many beyond Judæa, but in Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Asia Minor, Thrace, and Hellas, various dialects and tongues prevailed, into which the Word of God would have had to be as many times translated. Again, the gospel needed not merely to be preached, but also to be explained; it needed a language able to develop its lofty truths and thoughts—a tongue in every respect complete, finished, and philosophical. Hellenism, therefore, not only prepared the way for success, but it also furnished to the new religion the most artistic of linguistic organs that ever God imparted to man, and through its alliance with Christianity alone preserved its historic claim and the rank which to this day it holds in the East.

PART TENTH.

THE ROMAN SUPREMACY.

CHAPTER I.

AFFAIRS IN HELLAS.

The Mithridatic War.

It is generally stated by historians that Hellas fell under the Roman rule in 145 B. C., when Mummius captured Corinth. But, strictly speaking, Hellas became a Roman province only during the reign of Augustus. Julius Cæsar, who flourished about the middle of the first century B. C.—i. e., about a century after the conquest of Hellas—blames his opponent Pompey for having levied money from the Achæans, a people “exempt from tribute”; and Cicero also censures him for having laid violent hands on “free nations, Achaia, Thessaly, Athens, and all Greece.” It may, however, be justly said that Hellas long before the capture of Corinth existed simply as a silent character in the historic drama; for even the feeble signs of life which she gave at intervals only tended to destroy the last forces of an enervated body.

For about sixty years after 145 B. C. no important political event occurred in Hellas. The country no doubt prospered materially on account of the cessation of civil strifes, and Delos achieved a marked ascendancy, which, however, owing to the Mithridatic war, was of short duration. The

principal theatre of this contest was Hellas, for the war was transplanted thither by the daring king of Pontus, and the Romans were at first so severely pressed that it finally became necessary to send Sulla against him.

As the war required vast sums of money to sustain it, this general scrupled not to violate the holy treasures of Hellas, and took from Epidaurus, Olympia, and Delphi the most beautiful and precious of their gifts. The composition of his heart, says Plutarch, was insolence and cruelty; the sink of all the follies and vices of Mithridates. Poor Athens, which had refused to admit him within her walls, and had survived innumerable wars, perished at last by the hands of this monster. During the siege a bushel of wheat was sold for one hundred drachmæ. The people ate not only the herbs and roots that grew about the citadel, but sodden leather and oil-bags; while Sulla was indulging himself in riotous feasts and dancing, laughing at and mimicking his foes. At length the Athenians, unable longer to bear the terrors of hunger, gave an opportunity to the Romans to scale the wall near the Heptachalkos, and so the city was taken. Sulla leveled to the ground all that was between the Peiræan gate and that called the Sacred, and then entered the town at midnight. All the trumpets and horns sounded, and were answered by the shouts and clang of the soldiers as they rushed along the streets with drawn swords. The scene of slaughter and devastation which followed baffles description, until finally Sulla himself, becoming satiated with blood, was prevailed upon to put a stop to the carnage; and, in compliment to the ancient Athenians, he said he forgave the many for the sake of the few, the living for the dead.

After the capture of Athens, Mithridates deemed it best to put an end to the war; and accordingly, in 84 B. C., peace was concluded on the following conditions: Mithridates was to surrender Bithynia and Kappadokia to their former rulers, Paphlagonia and Asia Minor to the Romans.

He was to give the Romans two thousand talents to defray the expenses of the war, besides seventy armed galleys fully equipped. Sulla, on the other hand, was to secure Mithridates in the rest of his dominions, and procure him the title of friend and ally to the Romans.

Not only Hellas, but the Hellenic cities also in Asia Minor and elsewhere, suffered greatly from this war. Sulla imposed a fine upon Asia of twenty thousand talents. Besides this, the houses of private persons were ruined by the insolence and disorder of the soldiers he quartered upon them; for he commanded every householder to give the soldier who lodged with him sixteen drachmæ a day, and to provide a supper for him and as many friends as he chose to invite. A centurion was to have fifty drachmæ a day, and one dress to wear within doors and another in public. In fine, the devastation of the land and the slaughter of the inhabitants did their work so effectually, that one is led to believe the assertion of several modern historians that Asia never thereafter recovered from the Roman wounds.

The moral decay of the nation, which began long before, was now followed by a corresponding material ruin. True political life fast disappeared; the ancient masterpieces of literature, art, and science ceased to be produced; the walls, temples, and theatres were crumbling to ruins; and this process went on until Christianity, availing itself of the last remnants of the former life, and infusing into them new elements of vitality, organized the new Hellenic world. For this end the types of the old constitutions were used as the basis of the first Christian judicature; the language and rhetoric of Demosthenes gushed forth in the language and rhetoric of Chrysostom; the art of Iktinus, who built the Parthenon, was the model employed by Anthemius and Isidorus in erecting the famous temple of the Sacred Wisdom (St. Sophia) at Constantinople; and finally all the treasures and ancient offerings that could be brought from Hellas and

Asia were collected, as in a museum, within the new capital of the Hellenic nation on the shores of the Bosphorus.

The Pirates—Krete.

The Ægean Sea was from the earliest times infested by pirates, who boldly attacked the coasts, islands, and harbors, seizing vessels and plundering property. They had a fleet of about one thousand ships, famous for their swiftness and lightness, as well as for the daring and courage of the crews. They had reached such a degree of audacity that they founded piratical ship-yards, captured more than four hundred cities, lived in the most sumptuous manner, and richly ornamented their ships with silver and with golden utensils, the prizes of their villainy.

The Romans finally, seeing these pirates attack the very coasts of Italy and threaten the capital itself, declared war against them in the year 78 B. C. But the generals in command showed such incapacity, that the pirates succeeded in capturing the provisions destined for Rome, wherefore a scarcity of food arose in that city. The senate was accordingly compelled to intrust to Pompey the conduct of the war, granting him an authority such as no Roman before had held; for he was declared general for three years of all the land and sea forces, and the treasury itself was placed at his disposal. He set forth with a force of five hundred ships, one hundred and twenty thousand infantry, and five thousand cavalry. Having destroyed the piratical ship-yards and harbors in Sicily and Italy, he sailed into the Hellenic seas, and everywhere pursued the pirates with such daring and energy that few of them ventured to oppose him, while the greater part surrendered at discretion. Ten thousand of them were put to death, twenty thousand were captured, and one hundred and twenty of their harbors and fortifications were destroyed. Pompey treated the captives wisely and leniently, for he established most of them in the Pe-

loponnesas, which country was then in want of inhabitants, and the rest he distributed among the various cities of Kilia, including Soli, a maritime town, which thereafter was named Pompeiopolis or City of Pompey.

Krete was also seized by the Romans during the war with the pirates. It had espoused the cause of these malefactors to such an extent that the island was considered "the second headquarters" of this strange kingdom. These terrible demons of the sea were regarded as fighting against the Roman rule, and hence many did not scruple to enter into an alliance with them. The Kretans had often defeated the Roman legions, but, hearing of the mild treatment of the pirates, hastened to submit to Pompey.

After the capture of Krete, Pompey passed into Asia, forced Mithridates back to his kingdom, changed Pontus and Syria into Roman provinces, surrendered Armenia to Tigranes, and, having finally arranged matters in Asia, decided in the year 62 to return home. Passing through Hellas, he gave ample proof of his philanthropy; for he treated with great respect the philosophers of Athens, and gave to that city fifty talents for its reconstruction.

The Roman Civil Wars.

Ten years later occurred the great struggle between Pompey and Cæsar for the supremacy of the world. Hellas furnished Pompey with every possible assistance, and a great Hellenic force was soon collected. Every city with one accord provided him with men, ships, or money. These sacrifices, unfortunately, were not made for national independence, but for settling the question who of the two Roman aspirants should rule the universe. The man for whom Hellas showed so great a devotion was not long after conquered by his opponent on the plains of Pharsalia in Thessaly, on the 6th of June, 48 B. C. Cæsar happily bore no malice against the Greeks; he only asked the bitter question, "How often will

the glory of your ancestors save you from the destruction which you bring upon yourselves?"

In the year 44, toward the end of his life, that great Roman erected for himself an imperishable trophy by rebuilding Corinth, which had been destroyed a hundred years before by Mummius. The city, rebuilt after a new plan, was settled by the descendants of freed Romans, who were speedily Hellenized. Cæsar conceived also the plan of cutting in two the isthmus of Corinth, but his death prevented its execution. Corinth became a great and flourishing city, and the bridge as it were of the commerce between the East and the West. It was also the seat of the Roman consul who from the time of Augustus ruled Hellas.

In the great Roman civil wars which followed Hellas again became the theatre of contention. Fickle Athens allied herself with Brutus and Cassius, the murderers of Cæsar, who were defeated at Philippi in Macedonia toward the end of 42 by Cæsar's nephew Octavius and his ally Antony. Hellas was thus again exposed to the wrath of the conquerors. But Antony was in his youth educated at Athens, had passed much of his time there, and had thus familiarized himself with the customs and habits of the Hellenes. After his victory he returned to Hellas and abstained from any act of oppression, rejoicing in hearing himself called a Philhellenist, and especially Philathenian. Soon afterward Antony and Octavius became enemies, and the greater part of Hellas declared itself for Antony, but suffered untold miseries on account of the heavy levies he demanded, which greatly impaired the already small population of the country. There was such a scarcity of sailors—formerly the strength and boast of Hellas—that the admirals of Antony were forced to seize for the fleet the drivers of donkeys, farmers, travelers, and even boys. Antony was defeated in the memorable naval battle at Actium (2d of September, 31 B. C.), and fled to Egypt, where in the following year he committed suicide.

Octavius, far from punishing the Hellenic cities which had espoused the cause of his opponent, treated them with great kindness. He distributed corn to many, but prohibited the Athenians from granting citizenship for money, and deprived them of the islands of Ægina and Eretria. On the other hand, he completed the stoa of Athene Archegetes or the Leader, and encouraged contributions of money from Asiatic princes for the continuation of the work on the temple of the Olympian Zeus, the foundations of which had been laid by Peisistratus. He also created near Actium a great city which he called Nikopolis, and granted to the Lacedæmonians, who had from the outset espoused his cause, many advantages and rights. But the greatest of his benefits was that the Roman civil wars, from which Hellas had suffered so much, now ceased. Shortly after Octavius, "first Emperor of Rome," assumed the name of "Augustus," and reduced Hellas to a Roman province; but whatsoever might have been the oppressions of his proconsuls, these were certainly much less than those suffered during the civil wars.

All Hellas was not subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman proconsul thereafter sent annually to rule it. Many cities and countries continued still to be regarded "as freed and allied." Strictly speaking, only the Achæan confederacy and its two allied states, Bœotia and Phokis, which had undertaken the last war against Rome, were under the Roman jurisdiction. Accordingly, the subject territory was designated by the name of Achaia, as if it did not form an integral part of "free Hellas." These free autonomous cities did not certainly escape the Roman censure; their liberty had its limits; the emperors of Rome, either directly or through the proconsuls, interfered in their internal affairs; but they paid no regular tribute, were not occupied by Roman armies, and, as they were governed after their ancestral traditions, they preserved to some extent their national character.

The Emperors.

Tiberius, who ruled next to Augustus (A. D. 14–37), was kindly disposed toward Hellas, though he committed many unjust murders in Rome. During his reign, both Achaia and Macedonia became, by reason of the harsh treatment received from the proconsuls, Cæsarean instead of public provinces; for Augustus had divided the Roman empire into two parts, one of which he kept for himself, and another he surrendered to the senate and people of Rome. This ordinance respecting Macedonia and Achaia was preserved until the year 44; when, during the reign of Claudius, these provinces were again surrendered to the people.

All the emperors were not destined to show the same mildness. It is strange, however, that the new misfortunes of Hellas arose from the fact that Nero (54–68) decided in the year 66 to declare the country autonomous. That monster—who, though a pupil of the famous philosopher Seneca, murdered his own mother Agrippina, sneered at every humane sentiment, and in fine left a name synonymous with every imaginable crime—had the mania to take part in public contests, both as a harpist and a charioteer. Nero ordered the Greeks to delay the celebration of all their contests—the Isthmian, Pythian, Nemean, Olympian—until his arrival. He came with a large multitude of attendants, who instead of arms carried guitars, plectra (instruments for striking the lyre), masks, and felt shoes. Nero took part in all the games, and of course took all the crowns also, for he collected as many as seventy-five. Who could dare contest the prize with him? Although he proclaimed the Greeks “free and autonomous,” he at the same time plundered Hellas, killed men, women, and children, confiscated property, stripped Athens and the temples of their most famous works of art, outraged the Pythia, slaughtered a large number of men at the opening whence the vapor emerged, and indeed

inflicted far greater misfortunes on Hellas than those sustained through the invasion of Xerxes.

Not long after Nero returned to Rome, where he was finally murdered. Hellas in the mean time continued much in the same political condition until Vespasian ascended the throne, who reduced the country again to a Roman province, alleging that "the Greeks had unlearned liberty."*

During the reign of Hadrian, who became emperor about forty years after Vespasian, the Ephesian Lollianus, one of the most noted sophists of the time, had charge of "the arms" at Athens—a burdensome public office, given generally to rich citizens, who defrayed all its expenses through their private means. About that time a direful calamity occurred at Athens, and the people were mainly sustained through the liberality of this sophist general. It is about this period also that we notice a marked change in the ancient laws of Hellas. The Amphiktyonic Council still had charge of the temple at Delphi; the assembly of the Bœotians, Phokians, and Achæans was still convened; Hellas still participated in the Olympian, Nemean, Isthmian, and Pythian games; and the olive-crown was still deemed the highest honor that could be conferred on a mortal. The victories over the Persians were still celebrated by sacrifices at Marathon and Platæa, by orations delivered on the fields of battle, and by contests carried on about the tombs of Leonidas and Pausanias. The Messenians still commemorated the career of the hero Aristomenes, and the Sikyonians that of Aratus, the founder of the Achæan league. But all these customs had no longer a political or real value. The Hellenes now resorted to the temple at Delphi, not to ask whether they should declare war or conclude peace, or make some material change in the constitution, but to ascertain whether they ought to marry, go on a journey, or engage in traffic.

* Ἀπομεμαθηκέναι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν.

But, however meaningless these customs may have become, their continued observance tended to some extent toward preserving the national spirit of Hellenism, which even now did not cease to produce some generous results.

The Sophists.

During the reign of Vespasian, nearly all the Greek philosophers were banished from Rome. Let no one suppose, however, that these men were genuine descendants of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and the other fathers of philosophy. Most of them belonged to the so-called sophists, a numerous class characteristic of the social state of the time. The word "sophist" was held anciently in high esteem, and Herodotus applies the name both to Solon and Pythagoras. But already at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century B. C. sophistry separated from true wisdom, and formed a science or art by itself, which thereafter the genuine ministers of philosophy did not cease severely to stigmatize.* Gorgias the Leontine, who flourished during the Peloponnesian war, is considered the chief of the sophists; he was the first who boasted that he knew all things, and could speak extemporaneously on all subjects. But the fact that men like Demosthenes and Æschines did not dislike to be called "sophists" shows that, although sophistry was not distinguished for its morality, yet for its dialectic power it was by no means an art wholly worthless.

From the time, however, that political freedom disappeared and the serious rhetorical exercises ceased to be in vogue, and philosophy fell to a mere repetition, or even to

* Xenophon says: *Τοὺς τὴν σοφίαν ἀργυρίῳ τῷ βουλομένῳ ποιοῦντας, σοφιστὰς ἀποκαλοῦσιν.* Plato calls them *σοφιστῆς νέων πλουσίων ἔμμισθος θηρευτῆς.* Aristotle says of them: *Ἔστιν ἡ σοφιστικὴ φαινομένη σοφία, οὐσα δὲ μὴ· καὶ ὁ σοφιστῆς χρηματιστῆς ἀπὸ φαινομένης σοφίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὔση.* Anciently, the most eminent philosophers imparted knowledge gratuitously, and nothing seemed so contemptible as to teach philosophy for pay.

the systematic distortion, of the ancient dogmas, the new-fledged rhetoric and philosophy sought refuge with sophistry. From the union of these strange elements resulted the later philosophy, whose followers, having no serious object of study, professed not only, like the more ancient sophists, that they were ready to harangue extemporaneously on any subject, but that they possessed actual experience in every art. Dion Chrysostomus, who flourished about the end of the first century A. D., and who was one of the few really wise men of that epoch, in one of his essays, "On a Philosopher," shows distinctly that the existing philosophy could reasonably be defined as the perfection of everything that is unproductive in speech; for the art of speech came to be regarded as an end, and not as an instrument.

We do not wish, however, to say that the Hellenic people at that epoch produced only those empty forms of rhetoric and philosophy. From the first century B. C. to the third A. D. ancient Hellenic literature showed forth many great works, sufficient in themselves to impart a lasting glory to any nation. Then flourished Strabo, the great geographer; the learned historian Diodorus Siculus; the no less learned but more practical Dionysius of Halikarnassus; Plutarch of Chæroneia, whose "Parallel Lives" and "Moral and Political Essays" we have had occasion so often to cite; Arrian, the historian of Alexander the Great; Appianus of Alexandria, another great historian, and the not less famous Dion Cassius; Herodianus, a distinguished writer on Roman history; Epiktetus of Hierapolis in Phrygia, whose wonderful discourses on the Stoic philosophy the historian Arrian took down in writing; Longinus the Athenian, a very distinguished rhetorician and philosopher, whose work "On the Sublime" is to this day considered inimitable; and, to confine ourselves to the most prominent, then flourished Lucian of Samosata in Syria, who with unsurpassed grace and wit stigmatized the social, moral, and religious anarchy of his time.

But the works of these men resembled the few warblings of the nightingale which one may hear while crossing a ravine, mingled with the incessant croaking of frogs. The representative literary men of that period were the sophists. They had in charge the education of the youth ; they taught at Athens, whither flocked men from all parts of the world to be initiated into the mysteries of Greek letters, arts, and science ; they became rich ; they were esteemed at Olympia ; they finally penetrated even to Rome, as the educators of that community which, though it had mastered Hellas, yet never ceased to acknowledge her intellectual supremacy. Unfortunately, many of these, by turning into traffic the sacred work of a teacher, debased both their profession and the Greek name, which was intimately connected with that avocation. Lucian in one of his treatises severely stigmatized the life which these men passed in the capital of the empire. He represented in inimitable colors the servility to which they stooped in order to gain admittance to a great and wealthy house ; he related the many contrivances through which the rich Kræsus of Rome limited to a mere pittance the pay of these men, to whom, however, they acknowledged that they trusted both their souls and those of their children ; he ridiculed the really degraded condition of these sophists, who, while they constantly repeated the sayings of Plato and Aristotle, and delivered eloquent addresses on "independence," stooped to the meanest drudgery conceivable before the grandees of Rome.

Nor did these servile descendants of a noble race even have the consolation that they taught anything to the Romans, from whom they suffered so many insults ; for it appears that the Romans of that period cared for nothing so little as for Hellenic philosophy or education. They maintained the sophists in their houses simply as a piece of furniture, or because it was fashionable to have a learned Greek in their retinue. To give an idea of the life of such

a person, we may relate the degradation of the Stoic Thes-mopolis, who was the reputed teacher of a rich and fashionable woman. She employed this successor of Zeno to keep her little dog, from which the philosopher suffered many inconveniences, and was called by the other servants in the house "a Cynic instead of a Stoic philosopher." It appears that the women of Rome were ambitious to be called "learned," and to be spoken of as composing verses not inferior to those of Sappho. Accordingly, many employed orators, grammarians, and philosophers. But they listened to them only while arranging their hair or preparing for supper, for they could not spare any other time. It would often occur that while the philosopher was expounding the principles of virtue and morality, the maid would rush in with a love-letter, and then the words of wisdom ceased until the mistress could answer the note and resume attention.

Had the sophists confined themselves to their legitimate occupation, the emperors would not probably have disturbed them. But many thought it the duty of philosophy to attack the ruling power, arouse the multitude, disturb established customs, and introduce innovations. This conduct forced Vespasian to banish the sophists from Rome, though it would seem that their exile was not lasting, since during the reign of Domitian, the second son and second successor of Vespasian, the philosophers are again said to have been driven from Rome, when a few also were killed. Vespasian, however, who issued the first decree of banishment, was the first also to allow regular pay to the orators; and under the immediate successors of Domitian Hellenic learning and art obtained from the rulers of Rome considerable protection and encouragement.

Trajan.

We now enter upon perhaps the most prosperous period of the Roman supremacy. Trajan (98-117) proved himself

one of the greatest benefactors of the Hellenic nation. During his reign Maximus was sent to Hellas as the plenipotentiary and reorganizer of the free Hellenic cities. Pliny the Younger, the minister and friend of Trajan, gave to Maximus instructions which amply show that there were many Romans who revered the sacred ruins of Hellas. "Fortunate Maximus," said Pliny, "the emperor sends you to Achaia—the true Hellas, the land of beauty, letters, and agriculture. The emperor lays to your charge free cities and free men, whose virtues, deeds, alliances, treaties, and religion have for their object the preservation and defense of liberty, the best and most sacred right of nations. Realize the greatness of the charge. Honor the gods, the founders of the country of the Athenians; honor the ancient renown of that nation of poets and warriors; revere the sacred antiquity of the cities. Never forget that we, the Romans, received from Attica our public code; that, while we impose on the conquered nations our laws, we derive from the Hellenes the laws which they gave to themselves. Remember that you rule Athens and Lacedæmon, and that it is cruel and barbarous to insult the shadow of lost liberty. Remember rather what these cities were than what they are."

These noble instructions seem to have been kept by Maximus, judging from the fact that the Greeks erected a statue of Trajan at Olympia. Trajan increased the number of the free cities. During his reign was built on the hill of the Museum, lying toward the southwest of the Acropolis, the tomb of Philopappus Besæus, nephew of Antiochus IV, a descendant of the famous family of the Seleukidæ, which is preserved to this day.

Hadrian.

The conduct of Hadrian, the successor of Trajan (117–138), presents us with a strange mixture of virtue and vice, wisdom and folly, mildness and roughness. He visited

Athens five times, and for a considerable period resided there, not as a monarch, but as a private citizen. Hadrian was twice vested by the Athenians with the honorable title of "archon eponymus." He sought to ameliorate the condition of the people by pecuniary presents and annual grants of corn. He furthermore munificently rewarded the philosophers and sophists who then flourished at Athens, the most famous of whom were Favorinus and Herodes the Attic (Atticus). The Athenians were much attached to Hadrian, and they were perhaps justified in their devotion, because, like another Perikles, he adorned the city with numerous splendid and imperishable edifices. The inimitable works of Iktinus and Mnesikles still stood intact on the Acropolis, and Hadrian was emulous to ornament in like manner the lower city by new and costly buildings. By his orders were erected a temple to Here, another to Zeus Panhellenic, and a third "common to all the gods"; a gymnasium, and a magnificent stoa, which had one hundred and twenty pillars of Phrygian stone, the remnants of which are still to be seen in the market-place of modern Athens. On the southeast of the Acropolis, near the shores of the Ilissus, he founded a new city, which he called after his own name.* Not far from this spot fifteen pillars raise to this day their lofty and beautiful heads, and about them are scattered the ruins of the famous Olympian temple, which had a circumference of four stadia, and a colonnade round the building of one hundred and twenty pillars.† Many statues of the gods and of Hadrian himself stood in this temple, the most famous of which was that of Zeus, constructed of ivory and gold.

* A triumphal arch still exists near that spot, bearing the inscription: Αἰὲς εἰς Ἀθῆνας Θεσέως ἢ πρὶν πόλις. This inscription faces toward the northwest, while another inscription, on the same arch, but facing toward the Ilissus, reads thus: Αἰὲς εἰς Ἀδριανοῦ, οὐχὶ Θεσέως πόλις.

† The foundations of the temple were laid six hundred and fifty years before by Peisistratus, but it was completed and dedicated to the first of the gods by order of Hadrian.

But Hadrian's sympathy was shown not merely in the temples and buildings with which he adorned Athens and other cities of Hellas. He brought to Athens the water of Kephissia, and to Corinth that of Lake Stymphalus ; placed Hellenic life on the firm basis of Roman law, without however abolishing municipal institutions ; and gave the rights of Roman citizenship to the Hellenes nearly a century before Caracalla gave them to all free subjects of the empire.

Antoninus Pius—Marcus Aurelius.

The emperors Antoninus Pius (138-161) and Marcus Aurelius (161-180) are considered, on account of their virtues and political wisdom, among the best rulers the human race has known. Hellas preëminently flourished during their reigns ; for we are told that several new cities were founded by them, several were enlarged, and many that had been destroyed were rebuilt ; liberty and autonomy were granted to the principal cities ; and, in fact, the rule of these emperors was full of mildness and paternal solicitude. The Hellenic cities were replete with gymnasia, fountains, stoæ, temples, manufactories, and schools. Marcus Aurelius, who was wholly Hellenized, and even wrote in Hellenic the principles of the Stoic philosophy, reorganized the schools of Athens on a more distinct and practical basis.

Nations, however, never flourish through foreign protection and beneficence. As no art nor skill can for a long time conceal the inevitable fading of the most beautiful woman, in like manner Hellas, notwithstanding the many ornaments and benefits which she received from the Trajans, Hadrians, Antonines, and others, continued none the less to wither and decline. The praises of the sophists for the apparent prosperity of our fathers were partly flatteries addressed to the emperors, and partly the vagaries of men who were content with a superficial view. There were certainly some fine cities built during the Roman rule, such as Corinth, Patræ,

Nikopolis, and others. But what was the prosperity of these compared with the desolation of the rest of Hellas, the Peloponnesus, and the islands? Pausanias informs us that in cities once flourishing and great the people now lived in huts. At Thebes only a few temples still existed amid the desolation and ruin. Pausanias did not find one Delian at Delos, but only the military detachment sent from Athens to guard the temple. During the time of Dion Chrysostomus, who was born at Prusa in Bithynia about the middle of the first century of our era, a large part of Eubœa was uninhabited. The great and rich cities of that island, once so flourishing and so populous, had become wellnigh wild, and vast tracts of land within their gates were allotted for pasturage. It is no wonder, therefore, that, according to Plutarch, entire Hellas could not furnish three thousand hoplites, the number which the little city of Megara alone sent to the battle of Plataea. What a change! "But the stones and the ruins of thy edifices show rather thy past glory and greatness, O Hellas," says Dion Chrysostomus. Commerce had wholly ceased, and Rhodes itself, which relatively was still flourishing, could send only two small merchant-vessels to Corinth. While agriculture and commerce were in such a ruinous condition, society required its devotees to lead a costly life; and, not able to meet their expenses with their own resources, they resorted to loans, granted mostly by foreign capitalists on heavy interest, which finally brought inevitable ruin.*

These facts conclusively show that the benefits conferred by the Roman emperors, and especially those of the second century, were not sufficient to impart to Hellas any real vigor and strength. Indeed, all the splendid edifices of Hadrian and the other emperors did not suffice to compensate for the wholesale spoliations committed by the Romans. But while the monuments suffered much, it must be

* See Plutarch, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν δαυελζεσθαι.

acknowledged that, after a servitude of three hundred and fifty years, Hellas preserved still its ancient appearance of external splendor. The land was still classic, and many a city was filled with masterpieces of art. According to Pliny the Elder, about the end of the first century A. D. there stood still at Rhodes three thousand statues, and not less than that number at Athens, Delphi, and Olympia. Pausanias, too, who traveled in Hellas during the second century, describes so many treasures of art in Athens, Olympia, Delphi, Lebæia, and Patræ, that the mind is astonished at the wealth of the country in this respect. Even in painting, which much more than sculpture or architecture is subject to the destructive influence of time, there existed still in the time of Pausanias many fine specimens, especially in the Stoa Pœkile, in the Theseium, in the Kerameikus, in the Acropolis of Athens, and in the council-hall of the Delphians. The saddest misfortune of Hellas, which deprived her even of her external beauty, which she preserved long after her heart ceased to beat and her mind to create, occurred only after the third century. Then her material destruction was completed by the barbarians, who overran her like a deluge, and whose invasions we now proceed to relate.

CHAPTER II.

BARBARIANS AND CHRISTIANS.

Invasions of the Northern Barbarians.

DURING the first centuries of the Christian era, a movement of the barbarous nations living in the northern and central parts of Europe took place, whereby the eastern

provinces of the Roman empire suffered greatly. That empire was gradually wasting under the influence of moral and social causes not unlike those which caused the decline of ancient Hellenism. Religion, whose foundations philosophy undermined, had already lost its hold, especially among the higher classes. Besides, in the Roman empire, as formerly in Hellas, society was divided into two classes, the free and the slaves—a division which accelerated the decline of the empire. The free citizens alone composed the active part of society, for they alone held political rights, while the slaves were debarred from every career of energy, either political, moral, or social, forming in these respects a useless and dead capital. Hence, as soon as the free citizens began to neglect the advantages through which they had acquired their power, the empire, which was composed as it were of this class alone, withered, faded, and declined.

It was during this stage of decline that the invasions of the northern barbarians began. Had they made their attacks more systematically and possessed the means of laying sieges, such as the ancient civilized world employed, there is no doubt that the Roman empire would have been at once exterminated. But the barbarians came in disconnected hordes; they could not capture any of the fortified towns, and for a long time did not even form the idea of erecting a new empire on the ruins of the old. Allured by the graces of civilization, they often made treaties with the Romans, and even entered their service, so that the empire long escaped this imminent danger. In the mean time the promulgation of the gospel began to produce its first noble fruits; within the ancient diseased community a new and healthier society was formed; new men, distinguished for virtue, valor, and ability, ascended the throne; and thus the decline of the empire was retarded for three whole centuries. Finally its western part fell, but the eastern—the one composed especially of Hellenic elements—continued to flourish, and for a

long time to occupy a leading place in the history of the world.

Such were briefly the fortunes of the barbaric invasions which began about the end of the second century. About this time, also, as if the other causes of the decline of the empire did not suffice, a great civil strife broke out for "the supreme office." After the death of Commodus (192), the depraved son and unworthy successor of Antoninus the Philosopher, five men strove for the throne, and finally Septimius Severus prevailed (193-211); but the empire was shaken from its very foundations. The struggle was carried on for the most part in the East, and the Hellenic cities suffered much, and were deprived of one of their strongest bulwarks, the ancient and glorious Byzantium. Later, also, during the reign of Caracalla, the cruel and relentless son of Severus (211-217), the invasions of the Germanic tribes assumed a more extended form.

The Germans began to penetrate into the northern Hellenic provinces during the reign of Philippus (244-249), who was born in the neighborhood of Palestine, and was of Arabian descent. The inhabitants of Dacia and Mœsia (which included the present countries of Servia and Bulgaria) were forced to pay a large sum of money to these ruthless devastators, and thus finally induced them to depart. During the reign of Decius (249-251), the successor of Philippus, a large combined force of Goths and Germans repeated their marauding expeditions, and fairly deluged the fertile plains of Thrace and Mœsia. A great battle was fought near Philippi, in which the Romans were defeated; the barbarians captured the city by assault, and, if we credit the exaggerated reports of the historians, more than one hundred thousand of the inhabitants were put to the sword. Soon after Decius was betrayed by his generals, and perished with his son in a second battle fought toward the end of 251. His base betrayer and successor Gallus (251-254) finally prevailed upon the bar-

barians to return home, after having promised to them the payment of an annual tribute and permitted them to carry away their booty and captives.

This disgraceful treaty retarded only for a few months the direful misfortunes which the Roman empire was destined to suffer. A numberless host of barbarians—more generally called Scythians—deluged during the reigns of Gallienus and Valerianus (253–260) Illyria, Thrace, and Mœsia; pushed their work of plunder and devastation to the coasts of the Euxine; crossed on their large fleet of small boats to Asia Minor, captured Pityus and Trapezus, destroyed the temples and edifices of many other Hellenic cities, murdered without stint, laid waste the adjacent districts, and finally returned to their homes loaded with a rich heterogeneous booty.

During the last year but one of the reign of Gallienus (267), a vast number of Goths sailed down the Euxine on a fleet of five hundred vessels, seized Byzantium and Chrysopolis, destroyed the famous Kyzikus, crossed into the Ægean, occupied the islands of Lemnos and Skyros, and, having divided here into many bands, made almost a simultaneous attack upon the southern Hellenic coasts. They invaded Attica and many parts of the Peloponnesus, and pillaged Corinth, Sparta, Argos, Tegea, and Athens. Death and destruction followed every step of this ruthless horde. The Greeks were terrified and fled before the barbarians, leaving their homes at the mercy of the invaders, until finally the learned Dexippus the historian collected a force of about two thousand citizens, attacked the Goths as they were straggling about the country, and killed a large number of them. The terrified barbarians escaped to their ships, while many sought flight by land, pursued now by all the infuriated Greeks. Two Roman armies had in the mean time entered Epirus, Thessaly, and Illyria, scoured the country, and caused almost the complete destruction of the Goths. Those who escaped

to their boats nearly all perished in a naval engagement fought with the Romans near the Hellespont.

Such was the result of those memorable invasions which occurred in the year 267. The famous temple of Artemis in Ephesus, which had been many times before destroyed and as often more gloriously raised from the ashes, was burned by the Goths, and for ever disappeared from the face of the earth. That wonder of the universe had a hundred and twenty pillars of Ionic architecture, each having a height of sixty feet. Many masterpieces of art, the chief of which were the works of Praxiteles, perished with it.

The barbarians, however, were not long in coming back. Three hundred and twenty thousand warriors, bringing with them their wives, children, and household goods, again invaded Asia Minor, many of the Ægean islands, Hellas, Thrace, and Macedonia ; but they were vigorously pursued by the emperor Claudius, who killed a large number, while not a few perished both on account of their nautical inexperience and by the terrible pestilence which ever since the reign of Gallienus had been ravaging the East. The remaining Goths surrendered to the Romans, who settled many of them in Thrace, and drafted the sturdiest into their legions. These invasions, however, were repeated at intervals during the reign of Aurelian (270-275), and later of Probus (276-282). The barbarians were again routed, but Probus ceded to them vast territories in Thrace, and admitted them to all the privileges and rights of the Roman citizen.* For more than a century after that epoch no invasions of foreign nations oc-

* It is reported by a few historians, though doubted by many, that the Hellenic coasts were ravaged about that time by another Germanic tribe, the Franks. The Franks lived by the shores of the Rhine, and made frequent incursions into the Roman province of Gaul. Probus, having defeated them, established many of them near the Euxine ; but they, seizing a large number of boats, decided to return to their homes on the Rhine. While passing through the Ægean and the Mediterranean, they are said to have laid waste the coasts of Asia Minor, Hellas, and Sicily.

curred in Hellas. In the mean time the great religious and moral reform was accomplished, which, for three hundred years silently and persistently working within the Roman empire, finally triumphed during the fourth century, and laid the foundations of the political resurrection of the Hellenic nation, which soon after took place.

Hellenism the First Herald of Christianity.

The word of God from its very first proclamation assumed a character thoroughly Hellenic. Judæa and all the adjacent countries abounded in Hellenic schools, magnificent buildings, theatres, aqueducts, gymnasia, etc. But what more especially proves the complete Hellenization of these lands is the fact that the two most noted Hebrew writers of the first century, Flavius Josephus and Philo Judæus, both wrote in Greek, and their sentiments were entirely Hellenic. Philo, who lived during the reign of Caligula, composed many theological and philosophical works, by which he sought to reconcile the Sacred Scriptures with the Pythagorean, Epicurean, and Stoic doctrines. He was descended from a priestly family, was a Pharisee, and was consequently a warm adherent of the religion of his fathers; and his great object was to represent the sacred books of his nation as the most perfect product of wisdom. He became, however, much attached to the philosophic system of Plato, and deemed it the most consistent with the fundamental truths of the Mosaic revelation. Josephus, a contemporary of Vespasian, followed in his history the same course of association, because in his great work, "The Jewish Antiquities,"* he described the best known nations of the East, and especially the Hellenic, as being closely related to the Jewish, which formerly was deemed entirely isolated.

Again, the spirit of Hellenism which pervaded the East

* 'Ιουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία.

may be perfectly understood when we consider that, with the exception of Plutarch of Chæroneia, Longinus the Athenian, and a few others, the eminent men whom Hellenism produced from the first to the fourth century of our era, in the various branches of intellectual pursuit, belonged not to Greece, but to the new and greater Asiatic Hellas. Dionysius, who flourished during the reign of Augustus, and who is so well known through his historical and critical works, was born at Halikarnassus ; his contemporary Nikolaus, whose most important production was his "Universal History," was a native of Damaskus ; the well-known Arrian, who lived during the time of Hadrian, was a native of Nikomedeia in Bithynia ; Dion Cassius, who flourished during the third century, was from Nikæa in Bithynia ; Claudius Ptolemæus, the celebrated mathematician, astronomer, and geographer—best known through his astronomical work and his historic geography—was from Pelusium in Egypt ; Galen (Claudius Galenus), the greatest medical writer in antiquity, was born at Pergamus, A. D. 130 ; Dion Chrysostomus, the most famous of sophists, was a native of Bithynia ; Lucian, the most witty of the Greeks, was a Syrian ; Epiktetus was a Phrygian ; Plotinus, who in the third century sought to unite the various doctrines of the ancient philosophers into one, and associated with them the dogmas of the Eastern nations—a system known as the *Neoplatonic* or the *Alexandrine philosophy*—was born at Lykopolis in Egypt, about A. D. 203 ; Theon, the famous mathematician, was from Smyrna ; Strabo, the celebrated geographer, was a native of Amasia in Pontus. This catalogue, which could be further prolonged, shows that Hellenism flourished more in the East during the Roman supremacy than in Hellas itself. These countries politically belonged to Rome, but socially, morally, and intellectually they were thoroughly Hellenic.

Oriental Hellenism, however, not only thrived in a literary point of view, but also produced many eminent prac-

tical men. Demosthenes, the brave general and commander of Cæsareia, which had a population of four hundred thousand, distinguished himself by his daring and wisdom in the wars against the Persians. Zenobia, the queen of Palmyra (a city replete with Hellenic architecture, magnificent temples, and other costly edifices), famous for her beauty, wisdom, and learning, and in whose court both the Hellenic and the Asiatic tongues were spoken, ruled over Syria and many countries of Asia Minor; she fought most daringly against the Romans, but was finally defeated, and is said to have died a prisoner in Italy. Many other examples could be adduced to show the wonderful vigor of Hellenism in every sphere of action.

Such was Hellenism in the East at and after the time when the incarnation of Christ was made known. As Alexander the Great three centuries and a half before, raising the flag of Hellenism, had marched from Macedonia to the conquest of the East, so the Christian religion, assuming the panoply of the Hellenic tongue, argument, and administration, sallied forth from Palestine for the subjugation of the West.

The word of God, through which the world was destined to be reformed religiously, morally, and socially, was first preached and believed in Palestine and Syria. In the Hellenic cities of Damaskus, Beroëa, and Antiocheia, noted Christian churches were from the outset established, and almost at the same time seven churches flourished in Asia Minor. The new religion began to spread on the one hand in Kyprus, Krete, and Alexandria, and on the other in Thrace, Macedonia, and Hellas. No one worked for its success with greater wisdom, energy, and devotion than the truly inspired Paul. He was born at Tarsus in Kilikia, a city whose Hellenic schools were held in higher repute than those of Athens. The apostles in the beginning preached Christ only to the Jews, and the believers of the Mosaic revelation were alone accepted into the bosom of the church. The spirit of the

new religion was in its infancy extremely conservative, the Jews wishing to hold Christianity fettered within the Mosaic dogmas. But from the moment Paul became one of the apostles, Christianity shattered the barriers within which Judaism wished to limit it, and received a cosmical character; for the new apostle became, as he has been truly called, the teacher of nations. The new preaching was based on the principles of equality, liberty, love of one's neighbor, the immortality of the soul, judgment, and reward; wherefore it responded to the yearnings and to the moral and material needs of humanity.

Paul went about the year 53 or 54 to Macedonia. He visited on Saturdays the synagogues of the Jews, and preached Christ. Many believed and were baptized, but the Jews traduced him to the magistrates for acting contrary to the authority of the Cæsar, and for declaring another (Jesus) to be the King. Paul was scourged publicly without trial, though a Roman citizen, and was cast into prison. Persecuted, he came to Athens, where "his spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." Paul appears to have remained a long time at Athens, and it is supposed by some that from that city he addressed his two letters to the Thessalonians. Then he went to Corinth, where he remained eighteen months, was again persecuted, and finally returned to Asia, after causing many to believe in Christ. A Christian Jew, Apollos by name—a man of great learning and well versed in the Scriptures—continued his work in these countries. But Paul again returned to Macedonia and Hellas. He sent to the Corinthians the Greek Timotheus, a dear pupil of his, and two letters to appease the difficulties which troubled the newly established church. In his second letter, with a just consciousness of his sufferings, he says: "Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of

robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren ; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."

By such struggles, agonies, and dangers were the first Christian churches established in the Hellenic countries, both in Europe and Asia. The gospel was in the mean time preached in the East as far as the confines of the Indus, and in the West as far as Spain. Christianity obtained many more followers in Macedonia and the great Hellas of the East than in the ancient hearth of Hellenism ; and the number of the Christians in general was in the beginning of the fourth century greater than that of the heathen.

Constantine the Great would not have allied himself with the Christians, nor would have assumed openly the defense of the new religion, had not the Christians excelled their opponents, if not numerically, at least socially and morally. Various causes wrought this moral and social supremacy. Equality, liberty, love toward one's neighbor, the doctrine of a future life, the care for the poor, the sick, the orphans, and the widows—the salutary principles of the gospel which tend to strengthen the soul, elevate the mind, and ennoble life—all these poured a divine strength and energy into the veins of the new society ; while the ancient was oppressed and withered by a senseless idolatry, by dry philosophical researches, or by the extreme moral degradation which the want of religion caused. Moreover, the political organization of the new religion steadily gained strength on account of its democratic doctrines. Therefore, although pagan society received the powerful protection of the Roman monarchy, it was daily losing ground ; while the Christian, though sustained by its own force and resources only, was daily extended and strengthened. The necessary result is easily perceived. No physical force can replace for a long

time the indispensable internal requirements for the growth of a social body, while on the other hand the inner conditions inevitably beget the necessary physical strength. In the midst of the great anarchy which prevailed in pagan society, the Christian churches, like oases in a desert, presented an entirely different aspect; for while about them the laws were neglected, while numerous self-elected emperors were fighting among themselves, while numberless hordes of barbarians pillaged and plundered, the Christian alone knew who was his commander; he alone felt that he was protected, supported, and led. In every city was found a man whose power was uncontested among the energetic part of society; he was neither the leader of ancient life nor the minister of the emperor; he was the representative of Christ. In every land there existed a common bond which held together the Christian inhabitants of the East and the West; this was neither the withered sentiment of ancient patriotism nor the fading devotion to the emperor, but the faith in the principles and teachings of the new religion. Philosophy and rhetoric, which had long since lost their ancient claim and power, reappeared vested with a vigorous life in the pulpits, which had succeeded to the bema, and had drawn to themselves the audiences of the sophistic chairs. In every city existed two societies, one full of vigor and youth, and the other old and dying. Could they long remain at peace? The Romans displayed at first an indifference toward the new doctrines; but finally the struggle between the two became unavoidable.

Nero was the first of the emperors who exercised his cruelty upon the Christians. During his reign, in A. D. 64, a great conflagration, lasting for six days and nights, consumed most of the city of Rome, and the people suspected the emperor as the cause of the misfortune. Nero sought to escape the odium of suspicion by blaming the Christians as the authors of the fire. No proof appeared, but the Chris-

tians were condemned by the common aversion of the human race, as Tacitus, the Roman historian, says. Both the apostles Peter and Paul are said to have suffered death during this persecution. The second persecution occurred during the reign of Domitian (81-96). John, the beloved disciple of Christ, was then imprisoned at Patmos, where he wrote his Revelation. During the reigns of Decius and Diocletian the church again suffered new misfortunes. In fact, persecution upon persecution followed, and nothing which the depraved imagination of the emperors and the idolaters could devise was neglected. The Christians were deprived of every political right; they were banished, their property confiscated, and many were put to death. The empire was filled with victims, and thousands of men, women, and children met bravely a martyr's death in behalf of the new faith. Their sufferings finally moved to pity even the followers of the ancient religion, and aroused everywhere a protest against this heart-rending cruelty. In the midst of this terrific storm, Constantine the Great appeared.

CHAPTER III.

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Division of Imperial Power.

THE emperor Diocletian understood that amid these persecutions he would be unable alone to direct his vast empire, which externally was continually attacked by foreign foes, and internally was torn by constant turmoils. Accordingly, in the third year of his reign (286), he took as associate the rough Maximian, "who had long hated the Christians, and who delighted in acts of blood and violence." Later Diocletian

deemed it best to share still further the cares of the sovereign power, and in 291, in addition to Maximian, he appointed two Cæsars—Constantius of Dardania, surnamed Chlorus, and Galerius (who entertained the most implacable aversion for the name and religion of the Christians); but he declared that the office of "Cæsar" was second to that of "Augustus," which title he himself shared with Maximian. The Roman territories were divided among these four, Diocletian retaining the chief power and the government of the eastern provinces, with Nikomedeia for his capital. Constantius, though a near relative of the emperor Claudius, was then a simple general, and had married a girl of low rank, Helena by name, afterward so famous as the mother of Constantine, who was born, according to the best authority, at Naissus in Dacia in 274.

Raised to the rank of Cæsar, Constantius was forced by Diocletian to leave his wife Helena, marry a relative of Maximian, and give his son Constantine as a hostage to the emperor. Diocletian became strongly attached to this young man, and took him in 296 to Palestine, whither he had gone to subdue a local revolution. Constantine stood on the right of the emperor, and all admired his tall stature, the refinement of his appearance, the strength of his body, and the royal bearing which was delineated in all his movements. Diocletian, struck with these traits, soon raised him to the rank of commander of a thousand men. Constantine was in the palace at Nikomedeia when Galerius issued his edict of persecution against the Christians. He was a witness of these bloody proceedings, and declared openly his utter disapprobation of them. Galerius was much incensed against Constantine, and soon found an occasion to show his enmity. In 305 the two emperors (Diocletian and Maximian), desirous of committing to other hands the work of persecution, divested themselves of the imperial purple, and Galerius and Constantius Chlorus were raised to the throne; but, instead of giv-

ing Constantine the rank of a Cæsar, Galerius caused one Severus, a disreputable man of obscure rank, and Maximin, the son of his own sister—a boon companion of Severus—to be appointed.

Constantine concealed his indignation, but decided to avail himself of the first opportunity to escape from Nikomedeia. Learning that his father, who ruled the western provinces of the empire, was sick, he obtained permission from Galerius to go to him ; but shortly after his arrival Constantius died in the city of Eboracum (York) in England, and the army immediately proclaimed his son “Augustus.” Galerius refused to recognize him as such, and Constantine, who knew how to moderate his passions, expressed himself satisfied with the rank of Cæsar only. But other circumstances were destined to bring about a new and complete separation of the men who ruled the fortunes of the world.

In 311 Galerius died of a painful disease, after having, amid the tortures of his illness, revoked his edict of persecution against the Christians. His empire was divided between Maximin and the Illyrian Licinius, whom Galerius had proclaimed Augustus in 307 ; while at Rome the people, becoming dissatisfied with the maladministration of Galerius and Severus, had proclaimed Maxentius, the son of the old Maximian, emperor of the West.

Conversion of Constantine.

Maxentius, dreaming of the subjection of all the western provinces, announced that he intended to avenge his father, whom Constantine had put to death in 311, on the ground of plotting against him. Constantine hastened to anticipate his opponent, and made preparations to invade Italy. Reaching the foot of the Alps, he was in great perplexity, not knowing what to do. The army of Maxentius was far more numerous than his own ; the omens were unpropitious, the gener-

als were murmuring, and the undertaking seemed altogether hopeless. It is no wonder therefore that Constantine, with so small a force and with the omens of the old faith against him, felt the need of some other protection to strengthen him in his enterprise. During his short career, he had seen that the men who held the highest offices of the empire, trusting to their gods, had nearly all met an unfortunate end. Constantius alone, his father, who, if he did not believe in the God of the Christians, at least acted reverentially toward Him, ended his life in peace. Constantine therefore decided to seek the help of the God whom his father honored. It is related that, while he was praying and urgently beseeching God to lend him his assistance, a most wonderful manifestation took place ; for, in one of the marches of Constantine, he is reported to have seen with his own eyes the luminous trophy of the cross, placed above the meridian sun, and inscribed with the following words : 'EN TOY'TQ-NIKKA (*Under this standard thou shall conquer*). This amazing object in the sky astonished the whole army, as well as the emperor himself, who was yet undetermined in the choice of a religion ; but his astonishment was converted into faith by the vision of the ensuing night. Christ appeared before his eyes, and, displaying the same celestial sign of the cross, directed Constantine to frame a similar standard, and to march, with an assurance of victory, against Maxentius and all his enemies.

Early in the morning Constantine communicated to his friends the apparition, and at the same time ordered a standard of the cross to be made, exactly as it had appeared on the sky, and to be adorned with gold and precious stones. This first Christian flag is described as a long gilded pike intersected by a transverse beam, making the shape of a cross. The summit of the pike supported a crown of gold studded with precious stones, which inclosed the mysterious monogram, at once expressive of the figure of the cross

and the initial letters of the name of Christ written in Greek, i. e., X-P, linked together, and which the emperor thereafter carried always on his crown. A purple silken veil hung down from the beam, on which, curiously inwrought with gold and precious stones, were the images of the reigning monarch and his children. This first flag was preserved for many centuries, up to the ninth, and was called the *Labarum*—a strange name, the etymology and meaning of which remain yet unknown.

It will ever be a memorable incident in the history of the Hellenic nation, that the first Christian flag was adorned with Hellenic and not Latin letters ; as if Constantine had the feeling that he was destined to become the founder of a new race of emperors, who, gradually separating from the ancient metropolis of the Romans, were to rule over Hellenic countries and through the Hellenic tongue.

Proclaiming this standard as a positive means of success, he invaded Italy, full of confidence ; and having routed, on the 28th of October, 312, the forces of the enemy in a great battle, in which Maxentius himself was killed, he entered on the following day the capital of the world, radiant with victory, and admired and applauded by the enthusiastic populace on account of his genius, manly appearance, and wonderful achievements. Constantine at once issued an edict which provided for the restitution of all the civil and religious rights of which the Christians had been so unjustly deprived, and at the same time enacted that the places of worship and public lands which had been confiscated should be restored to the church, without dispute, without delay, and without expense. Maximin, who governed the eastern countries of the empire, forthwith declared his intention to yield to the requirements of the edict. But this was simply a pretense ; for, availing himself of the absence of Licinius, his co-emperor and Constantine's ally, he hastened to occupy Byzantium. Licinius, however, soon came up, and compelled him

to retreat to the interior of Asia Minor, where finally, in his despair, he put an end to his life.

But peace could not long be maintained ; for Constantine, in the consciousness of his power, saw with vexation the constantly increasing strength of Licinius. When finally, in 314, hostilities broke out between the two, Constantine compelled Licinius to surrender to him Illyria, Macedonia, Dardania, Hellas, and a part of Mœsia.

This new triumph of Constantine was followed by nine years of peace, such as the empire had not for a long time enjoyed. The emperor regulated all the political and penal laws according to the principles of the gospel ; and though it may be true that, in his excessive zeal, he often had recourse to tortures, yet his laws were by far more philanthropic than those which preceded them. Polytheism, indeed, had not yet entirely disappeared, but it became daily more limited and as it were besieged within its ancient shrines. If the trunk of idolatry still raised its head, its various branches were daily cut off, and its far-spreading shadow was gradually contracted. Private superstition, sorcery, witchcraft, and the use of any kind of drugs, potions, or spells, which formed the living part of idolatry, were strictly prohibited.

Constantine sole Emperor.

While the new religion was thus strengthened in the European countries, in Asia Minor, where Licinius ruled, it suffered much through his edicts of persecution. Licinius, seeing his opponent sustained chiefly by the Christians, deemed it his interest to draw to himself as much as possible the followers of the ancient religion. He expelled many of the Christians from the court and the army, deprived them of their religious rights, and even ordered some of their churches to be destroyed. When finally he thought himself sufficiently strong to engage in hostilities, he declared

war against Constantine. The forces which both combatants mustered were enormous. According to Zosimus, the army of Constantine was composed of twelve myriads of infantry, ten thousand cavalry, two hundred triremes, and two thousand transport-vessels; while that of Licinius consisted of fifteen myriads of foot-soldiers, fifteen thousand horse, and three hundred and fifty war-vessels. This great contest was to be decided within the Hellenic countries. Indeed, the naval force of Constantine was mainly composed of Hellenic vessels,* and was commanded by Crispus, his eldest son.

On the 3d of July, A. D. 323, the two armies met in battle near Adrianopolis; and, after a desperate encounter, Licinius was forced to retreat as far as Byzantium. Here he was closely besieged by Constantine, who at the same time ordered Crispus to hasten with his fleet from the Peiræus, where he had been stationed. This order obliged Crispus to cross the Hellespont, which was held by the much greater force of Licinius. Crispus, however, though very young, displayed on this occasion remarkable bravery and military ability. Leading his Greeks, who had not yet forgotten the naval trophies which they had formerly erected in these seas, he routed the fleet of Licinius, crossed the Hellespont, and appeared victorious before Byzantium. This feat decided the fortune of the war; for Licinius was again completely defeated, and escaped to Nikomedeia. He surrendered himself afterward to Constantine, on condition that he would pass the remainder of his life in peace in Thessaly; but before the expiration of one year he was put to death by order of the emperor. Many writers of the early church sought by eloquent arguments to conceal or mitigate this violation of promise. St. Jerome alone condemned conscientiously this violent act. It is a fact that, next to the disciples of Christ, no one has done more for the establishment and strength-

* Zosimus: Κατὰ τὸ πλεόν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος οὔσας.

ening of the Christian religion than Constantine ; but, born and brought up as he was in an age of violence, it is no wonder that sometimes he failed in Christian virtues ; on the contrary, it is astonishing, and shows the strength of his character, that, having overcome so many temptations, he finally came to understand and to confess, if not always to maintain, the principles of the gospel.

Thus, about the end of 323, when forty-nine years old, Constantine became master of the whole Roman empire. The first of his acts was to restore the Christians of the East to the same position which they had occupied before the time of Licinius. And, though Constantine was unwilling to engage in open warfare against idolatry, the vicious and immoral acts perpetrated by the idolaters finally necessitated the intervention of political influence for the sake of public morality. From that time onward we may consider Christianity as definitely and positively prevailing throughout the empire. The ancient mode of life, however, was not destined without battle to surrender its aims to the younger. Among the various classes of pagan society there was one composed of most learned men, who stood, as it were, on the boundaries of the two religions, striving to render logical everything unreasonable which polytheism professed, and to explain philosophically everything surpassing the strength of human understanding with respect to the divine character of Christianity. This party produced by its various philosophical discussions the first great dispute concerning the nature of the Trinity.

Arius.

About the year 319 Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, a mild and virtuous man, heard that among the priests of his diocese various opinions prevailed concerning the nature of the second person of the Trinity. It was claimed, for instance, that the Son was indeed the first born of beings, but was created like all the rest, and did not exist from eternity.

The bishop ascertained that these innovations were propagated by Arius, one of the elders of Alexandria, and well versed in the Scriptures. If the Father begat the Son, said Arius, the progenitor must have existed before the one born, and hence the Son could not have existed from eternity.

This discussion created a great scandal in Egypt, which the weak hand of Alexander could not suppress. He had by him, however, an excellent assistant—a young deacon of small stature, but possessing within a weak body a luminous soul, the flames of which shone from his very eyes. This young deacon, then hardly twenty, was Athanasius, destined to fill the Christian world with his fame. He had already achieved considerable reputation by his two great addresses * against the idolaters. Both these orations show a deep mind, powerful reasoning, broad science, and to some extent that flowing style which the fathers of the church did not hesitate to draw from the oratorical wealth of the older Greeks. The soul of Athanasius was filled with the principles and precepts of the gospel, and he possessed a keen intelligence, a practical mind, and a wonderful courage. He understood from the first the imminent danger threatening the Christian religion; he was persuaded that Arius, either not daring to explain himself clearly, or not conscious of the ultimate consequences of his syllogisms, tended none the less to deny the divine nature of the Saviour, by placing his teaching in the rank of human dogmas, and surrendering it, without the panoply of revelation, to all the attacks of the philosophical mind. Considering these dangers, he rushed to the contest, dedicating his life and strength to the defense of the Trinity, with so strong a religious belief and so fearless a courage, that he became the foremost of the defenders of Christianity.

Led by this young man, Alexander began to act ener-

* *Λόγος κατὰ Ἑλλήνων*, and *Περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ (Θεοῦ) Λόγου καὶ τῆς διὰ σώματος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ.*

getically against Arius, who now did not hesitate to assert that the Word of God was not sinless—a confession which forced Alexander to excommunicate both him and those accepting his dogmas, eleven deacons and two bishops besides Arius. But Arius was a learned, intelligent, and energetic man, and soon organized a large number of followers in the East, among whom was Eusebius, one of the lights of the church.

Thus matters stood when Constantine, after defeating Licinius, reached Nikomedeia, then the capital of the East. The emperor was exceedingly wroth, not because he realized the danger of the church, but because he had hoped that the laws already enacted would restore peace in the empire, which he now saw again disturbed by civil strifes among the Christians. These discussions led Constantine to the convocation of the first general council of the Christian church, which assembled at Nikæa (Nice), a city of Bithynia, in A. D. 325. This council must be regarded as entirely Hellenic, for, although invitations were issued to all the bishops of Christendom, the emperor promising to pay all their expenses, out of the three hundred or more who assembled hardly three or four came from western Europe, while the bishop of Rome was represented only by two of his church dignitaries. Constantine, indeed, delivered the address in Latin, but his words were translated into Hellenic as fast as they were uttered; and later, when he took part in the discussions, he spoke in Greek—for, says Eusebius, “he was not ignorant of it.” The synod lasted only about twenty days, and within this very short space of time the difficult questions which divided the church were solved, by sanctioning the principles of the orthodox faith and creed, and excommunicating those of contrary mind. Arius was banished into Galatia, one of the remote provinces of Asia Minor; his person and disciples were branded by law with the odious name of Porphyrians—from Porphyrius, one of the

followers of the Neoplatonic philosophy ; his writings were condemned to the flames, and capital punishment was denounced against those in whose possession they should be found.

More than fifteen hundred years have passed since that period. The empire over which Constantine ruled and in which the council of Nice was held long since passed away ; various other kingdoms were raised on its ruins ; new nations have been formed, new languages created, new continents discovered ; new arts and sciences have been invented ; new constitutions have regulated the fortunes of the people ; the social and political aspect of our world has been changed completely ; and yet in what part of this earth has not resounded, and does not resound daily, the creed of our Lord as defined at Nice by the representatives of Hellenic Christianity ? Certainly the Hellenes of to-day owe many benefits to their heathen ancestors, who by their masterpieces defined the principles of the beautiful and the lofty—laws still admired, and destined to be admired as long as there exist noble souls in this world ; but do they owe any less gratitude to those others—their Christian ancestors—who by their truly inspired discussions and resolutions defined the rules concerning the nature of Divinity ?

Constantine now decided to return to Rome, the only capital city in the empire where idolatry still continued to be recognized as the religion of the community. He entered that stronghold of ancient traditions and customs in July, 326. Eight days had not passed when differences of sentiment between the people and the emperor became manifest. The emperor refused to take part in any of the pagan festivals, and even scoffed at a certain sacrifice which was intended to be offered to Jupiter at the Capitol. This excited the populace, and curses were hurled against him by the enraged multitude as he was going through the streets of the city, while at the same time serious disturbances broke

out in his own family. Constantine had by the second marriage of his father three brothers, toward all of whom he ever behaved coldly, yielding, as it is said, to the wishes of his own mother Helena. Amid the agony of mind which he suffered, both on account of the seditious spirit so prevalent at Rome, and the troubles which had broken out in his family, Constantine, yielding to the nefarious accusations of his second wife Fausta—who sought the promotion of her own children, the youngest of whom, Constantine and Constans, already held prominent positions in the empire—ordered the death of his son Crispus, who had so eminently distinguished himself in the war against Licinius.*

Helena, the aged mother of Constantine, came from the East, where she then resided, to express her indignation and sorrow at the death of Crispus, to whom she was especially attached. The words of that reverend woman finally opened the eyes of Constantine, and he hastened to depart from the ancient capital of the empire, to which he never afterward returned, and went to the East, having in mind other plans for the future fortunes of the world.†

Foundation of Constantinople.

Constantine departed from Rome—which seems neither to have understood nor realized the great change which the Christian religion had wrought on the world—for the pur-

* We are told by some ancient writers that, Crispus having conceived a passion for his step-mother Fausta, she accused him to Constantine of an incestuous attempt on her chastity, and thus easily obtained an order of death against him. But this is simply a myth—altogether unfounded; and we are inclined to believe that Fausta, disliking Crispus, whom she considered with reason as the most formidable rival of her own children, finally prevailed upon Constantine to order the death of his innocent and brilliant son.

† We are told by some writers that as soon as Constantine discovered the truth, he again stained his hands by ordering the death of Fausta. But we are inclined to believe with Gibbon, who sustains his opinion by well-authenticated facts and arguments, that this new crime is highly improbable.

pose of establishing his throne in the midst of those Hellenic cities in which the gospel had so greatly flourished, and also of erecting a great edifice, the bulwark, as it were, of the redeemed world.

This was the critical moment in the life of Constantine. He could have followed any policy with respect to Christianity ; he could have protected or persecuted it ; yet Christianity would have finally prevailed. But the slightest mistake respecting the choice of position for his capital would have resulted more seriously both for the fortunes of the world and the fate of Hellenism. To Constantinople alone are due both the political resurrection of the Hellenic nation in the middle of the fourth century, and the preservation of its autonomy for about one thousand years. These results followed, not because there was erected in Hellenic territory a new, powerful, and well-fortified city, but because, on account of its peculiar advantages, it seemed especially adapted for the center and capital of a great monarchy. Situated on the forty-first degree of latitude, the imperial city commanded, from her seven hills, the opposite shores of Europe and Asia. The climate, says Gibbon, "was healthy and temperate, the soil fertile, the harbor secure and capacious, and the approach on the side of the continent was of small extent and easy defense. The Bosphorus* and the Hellespont may be considered as the two gates of Constantinople, and the prince who possessed those important passages could always shut them against a naval enemy and open them to the fleets of commerce. Whatever rude commodities were collected in the forests of Germany and Scythia, as far as the sources of the Tanais and the Borysthenes ; whatsoever was manufactured by the skill of Europe or Asia ; the corn of Egypt, and the gems and spices of farthest India, were brought by the varying winds into

* The navigation from the outlet of the Bosphorus to the entrance of the Hellespont is about one hundred and twenty miles.

the port of Constantinople, which for many ages attracted the commerce of the ancient world." Like the great city of Alexander, thus this glorious edifice of Constantine passed through the various vicissitudes of centuries; but both evinced the wonderful genius of those inspired minds, for both cities are to this day the great centers of the commerce of the East.

The city was dedicated on the 11th of May, A. D. 330—the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Constantine. The dedication was accompanied and followed by solemn religious ceremonies as well as other festivities, distribution of corn and provisions, and games, all of which lasted for forty days, for the most part celebrated in the vast and world-renowned race-course. An edict also, engraved on a column of marble, bestowed the title of SECOND or NEW ROME on the city of Constantine; but the name of Constantinople has prevailed over that epithet, and after fifteen centuries still perpetuates the fame of its author.

The last Seven Years of the Reign of Constantine.

The last seven years of the reign of Constantine present us with a state of affairs entirely at variance with his former career. Arius and his associates were recalled from exile, and were treated with the respect which would have been due to innocent and oppressed men. Alexander, archbishop of Alexandria, had died in 325, and in the following year Athanasius was elected as his successor. "The immortal name of Athanasius," says a historian, "will never be separated from the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defense he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. . . . He filled the eminent station [of archbishop of Alexandria] above forty-six years, and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was Athanasius expelled; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive; and almost every province of the

Roman empire was successively witness to his merit and his sufferings in the cause of the orthodox faith. Amid the storms of persecution, the archbishop of Alexandria was patient of labor, jealous of fame, careless of safety; and he displayed abilities which would have eminently fitted him for the government of a great monarchy."

After the recall of Arius Constantine seemed still anxious to repair the injustice done to him, and accordingly issued an absolute command that he should be solemnly admitted to the communion in the cathedral of Constantinople. We are told that, on the same day which had been fixed for the triumph of Arius, he suddenly died (A. D. 336) of a most repulsive disease; but his death, which was regarded by the orthodox as a direct judgment from heaven, was attributed by his friends to poison.

The death of Arius caused great trouble and anxiety to the emperor, which gradually increased to a lamentable state of mental suffering. He had hoped to eradicate the last vestiges of contention, but already every corner of Christendom was agitated with religious discussions; he had hoped to defend orthodoxy, and already, through his concessions to the Arians, he came into open warfare with the most sacred principles of religion. Thus troubled, he decided in 336 to divide his vast empire among his sons, expecting that this course would at least prevent dispute respecting the succession. He granted to Constantine, the eldest, the provinces beyond the Alps—Gaul, Spain, and Britain; to Constans, the youngest, he surrendered the middle provinces—Italy, Illyria, and Africa; while to Constantius, the second, whom he loved above all, he left the East—i. e., Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Having thus destroyed with his own hands the union of the empire, in behalf of which he had so long labored, he now prepared for death; for we are told that he had for a long time had a presentiment of his approaching end, which indeed was not long in coming. He expired on

the 21st of May, A. D. 337, when about sixty-four years old, and was buried with all the pomp suitable to his great rank.

Remarks on the Life of Constantine.

The ancient world during the long reign of Constantine changed both in appearance and spirit. The empire, freed from its various external wars and civil strifes, enjoyed under the protection of his strong arm the blessings of a lasting peace. Christianity, delivered from its fearful persecutors, was secured and protected; and furthermore, the constitution of the empire was regulated after the salutary principles of the spirit of the gospel. Is it possible, therefore, to deny "greatness" to the man who so earnestly contributed to the reformation of the world? And yet many noted historians have slighted and despised that great man, and even characterized him as a malefactor. Gibbon and Voltaire, for instance, both of whom belong to that modern school of philosophy which despises every religion, and especially the Christian, naturally attacked Constantine, who devoted so much of his life to the propagation and strengthening of this new faith. They pass over his many virtues, especially from the time he espoused Christianity, exaggerate and misrepresent his failings, mock at his convictions, and ridicule every religious and political regulation made by him.

But modern historic science, correcting the many blunders of the past, has gradually dissolved the fog covering the memory of Constantine, and presented us with his true picture—a picture bearing, indeed, a few spots, but nevertheless grand and worthy of esteem. Constantine stands on the boundaries of two worlds, the ancient and the modern—that of the pagans and that of the Christians. He was born and educated within the former; he acted and died within the latter. It is not possible, therefore, to judge him absolutely from the standpoint of either; but the various fortunes of his life should be examined according to their

individual circumstances. Constantine resembles those fruitful trees into which has been grafted the sap of other plants, in consequence of which their fruit possesses the peculiarity of both tastes. Christianity, which he espoused at a ripe age, did not completely change his nature ; while his mind understood the lofty truths of Christianity, and accurately measured the benefits which they promised to humanity, his heart—we do not deny it—remained pagan, and it never cast off the impression, traditions, and customs of the ancient religion. But this very struggle of heart and mind, in which the former finally triumphed, may show the greatness of his good and noble nature. Few, indeed, having to contend with so many moral, political, private, and social difficulties, have acted with more clearness, and united their names with a more glorious reformation in both theoretical and practical life.

CHAPTER IV.

THE WORK OF REFORMATION.

Constantius.

MUCH anarchy followed the death of Constantine. Constantius, alleging that his father had been poisoned by his own brothers, not only killed his two uncles, but also seven of his cousins and many other prominent men. Gallus and Julian, however, sons of Julius Constantius, the half-brother of Constantine the Great, escaped. At the same time Constantine II sought to seize upon the inheritance of his youngest brother ; but he was murdered on the 9th of April, 340, and thus Constans became master of the middle and western provinces of Europe. Ten years later he was himself murdered by Magnentius, chief of his body-guards, and thus

Constantius remained the absolute ruler of the empire until his death in November, 361. During his reign the provinces of the East were afflicted by a Persian war. Sapor II, king of Persia, defeated the forces of Constantius in Mesopotamia, and Asia was then saved only through the long and stubborn resistance of the ancient city of Nisibis, which thrice repulsed the attacks of Sapor.

Meanwhile the great question of religious reformation continued to agitate the minds of the people; just as, after the death of Alexander, the Hellenization of Asia was not retarded on account of the civil struggles among the successors. The ancient beliefs gradually crumbled away, not so much from any direct attack as from their own loss of vitality; while the new continued to prosper and to flourish even in the midst of almost daily strifes and contentions. The sons of Constantine, indeed, enacted special laws against the ancient religion—prohibiting, for instance, nocturnal sacrifices, and ordering the destruction of the temples; but these laws were never rigorously enforced. Indeed, we are told that Constantius shortly before his death took under his special protection the ornaments and temples of antiquity. But, for all this, the temples were falling to ruin, and the faith was withering and dying; but it was wasting its life slowly, rather through an organic mortal disease than from hostile wounds.

Julian the Apostate.

It has already been stated that during the general slaughter of the relatives of Constantine two of his cousins, Gallus and Julian, escaped death. The former was at that time twelve years old, and the latter six. In 351 Constantius deemed it best to grant to Gallus the title of Cæsar, with the sovereignty of Asia, and Antiocheia for his capital. Gallus evinced no ability whatever, committed many acts of cruelty, and was finally put to death in 354. Julian would have

shared the same fate had not the good and noble Queen Eusebia prevailed upon Constantius to spare his life, and to assign to him the city of Athens for his place of habitation.

Athens had long since lost her political greatness ; but the luster with which this capital of ancient Hellenism was surrounded, the splendid monuments with which she was adorned, the reverence in which the Eleusinian mysteries were still held, and the sense of gratitude which Hellenism bore to her, rendered this city even in its decline an object of respect to the emperors of Rome, and an attraction to the learned men of the world. Above all, Athens was considered as the last great asylum of ancient beliefs, and large throngs flocked thither, much in the same way as the Christians in the East to this day flock to Jerusalem.

Julian, who was ordered to repair to Athens, was what we may call a half Greek ; for he was born at Byzantium, and the Hellenic was his native tongue. It is no wonder, therefore, that from his earliest youth he loved that language, and studied and admired all its intellectual productions. Deep also were the impressions which the monuments and customs of the ancient world made on his sensitive soul. He knew that his cousin Constantius had inaugurated his imperial career by the slaughter of his relatives ; he knew that Eusebius of Nikomedeia, one of the highest ministers of the Christian religion, was said to have instigated this lamentable tragedy ; he saw the new faith divided into two opposite camps, the contests of which were not limited to theoretical discussions, but had resulted in exiles, persecutions, murders, and revolts. He did not understand, or would not understand, the seriousness of the discussions ; yet he knew that the prevailing party—the Arians—used the new religion to satisfy human passions and interests. Julian had not only accepted holy baptism, but had shown for some time an excellent zeal in behalf of Christianity. Gradually, however, a change of sentiments and thoughts began to take place in

him. By comparing the present with the past, he arrived first at the conclusion that Christianity was the cause of this strange decline, or at least that Christianity was not adapted to prevent the demoralization of the empire ; and he gradually came to a second conclusion, that this change of affairs resulted from the debasement of the ancient religion and life, and that the reformation of the world could only be accomplished through their reestablishment.

This hallucination of Julian's is easily explained. He possessed many of the advantages through which men succeed in the world, and accomplish great deeds. He had intelligence, education, morality, courage, and fortune. He lacked only one thing—which indeed men of genius and energy too seldom possess—"a practical mind." The practical mind of men like Constantine and Athanasius understood that no law carried into effect through men can possibly escape the influence of human weakness and individuality ; and that, when it has passed through many trials, it finally produces its best fruits. On this account, therefore, they persevered in the midst of misfortunes, believing that the days were nigh at hand when finally Christianity, cleansed from the rust with which it necessarily came in contact, would pour on the world its pure and bountiful blessings. Has not the same thing occurred with reference to other laws in their first application ? Did not constitutional government even in England produce during its earlier stages constant civil wars, slaughters, confiscations, and a moral and social debasement of which we read to this day with disgust ? How, then, can we be at a loss to understand why Christianity passed through similar trials ?

Julian was sustained in his views by the Neoplatonists, the most famous of whom were at that time *Ædesius*, *Chrysanthius*, and *Maximus*. As long as the discussions of the Neoplatonists were limited to philosophical theories concerning the Most High, or to attempts to unravel the mystery

of the allegories which were supposed to be concealed behind the Hellenic myths, these discussions could at least please if not instruct the learned public to which they were addressed. But the ambition of the new heresiarchs was not content with this ; they sought to exert a more direct influence, and to establish even a new religion. Perceiving that philosophical and theological arguments were not sufficient to convince the masses, the Neoplatonists contrived to draw to their assistance the gods and demons of idolatry, and to astound the credulity of the *ochlos* by a complex system of magic and sorcery. Availing themselves of the mysteries of the ancient religion, they claimed that they could penetrate into the secrets of the future, impose their will on the gods below, communicate with the gods in heaven, and, freeing the soul from its material fetters, bring it into direct communion with the highest divine mind. It may easily be understood what a strange confusion of ideas resulted from this union of philosophy, mythology, and thaumaturgy. Julian, who considered the precepts of the gospel unreasonable, became a victim of this monstrous complication of ideas ; and while, on the one hand, he confessed the existence of some Supreme Being, invisible, complete, and incomprehensible to human intelligence, on the other he professed that this Most High Being produced many inferior gods—Ares, Hermes, Athene, Aphrodite, and the other known gods of antiquity ; that to these latter deities the Most High allotted the creation of man and the government of the terrestrial world. In a word, he seriously believed that the commonest opinions of the old faith could be reconciled with the most philosophical comprehension of the Divinity.

Thus disposed, Julian reached Athens in May, 355. Everything now tended to strengthen him in his opinions : the sight of the most beautiful of the ancient monuments, and of statues whose exquisite symmetry and grace influenced souls and minds less susceptible than his ; the discourses of

the most eloquent orators ; and, finally, the Eleusinian mysteries, still regarded with the deepest reverence and awe. Urged by these combined influences, he decided on the first opportunity to raise the standard of the ancient religion, and to recall the glorious days of the past. For the present, however, he concealed his purpose, knowing well that the slightest promulgation of his true opinions would cause Constantius to put an end to all his glorious dreams ; but the trouble of his heart and conscience was betrayed by his looks and movements. There happened to be at that time in Athens, as fellow students and associates of Julian, two young men, Gregory Nazianzen and Basil—names destined for centuries to resound throughout the Christian world. They came to Athens, not to strengthen their convictions in idolatry, but in order to derive from ancient philosophy and eloquence the arms by aid of which they afterward fought so gloriously for the new faith. Julian never communicated his thoughts to them, but it would appear that Gregory at least understood from the outset the plans of his fellow student.*

Julian remained at Athens only about six months, because in November, 355, Constantius deemed it best to grant to him the title of Cæsar and the government of Gaul. This province was severely oppressed by the Germans, and needed the protecting hand of a strong leader. Julian succeeded within five years, not only in driving the Germans beyond the Rhine, but also in defeating and humbling them in their own country. Constantius, envious of the laurels won by Julian, ordered his victorious legions to repair to Asia and fight against the restless Sapor. The legions disobeyed, and declared Julian their emperor. Julian sought to make peace with Constantius, but the latter haughtily rejected his proposals. Julian therefore led his forces against Constantino-

* See the description Gregory gives, in the second *στηλιτευτικῶν κατὰ βασιλέως Ἰουλιανοῦ*, concerning Julian.

ple, but civil war was prevented by the death of Constantius, which occurred on the 3d of November, 361, and the people forthwith recognized Julian as their ruler, while he was still on his way to the capital.

The Reign of Julian.

Julian was about thirty years old when he acquired undisputed possession of the Roman empire. On the very same day on which he had broken off with Constantius, he had also renounced his faith in Christianity, declared his allegiance to the immortal gods, and become an *apostate* and *parabates* (transgressor) of the religion of Christ, by which names he is generally known in history. The main object of Julian on entering Constantinople was the restoration of the ancient religion—a foolish dream, for the realization of which he consumed in vain treasures of practical energy.

The hierophant or initiating priest of the Eleusinian mysteries was sent with many presents, in company with Chrysanthius and Maximus, the boldest and most skillful masters of the theurgic art, to assume the direction of the temples of Hellas; while Oribasius, the physician and friend of Julian, hastened by his order to restore the temple of Apollo at Delphi. But the decline of this once so rich and glorious temple is manifest from the following oracle given to the representative of the emperor :

“Say thou to the king that the curiously wrought court has fallen.
No longer has Phœbus a temple, nor the prophetess any bay-tree,
Or any speaking spring. The murmuring water has also ceased.”*

Do we not seem to hear in this the last farewell of Pythia, and the inscription, as it were, which she herself ordered to be inscribed on her tomb? Numerous temples, however,

* This oracle is preserved to us by George Kedrenus, a Byzantine chronicographer.

began to be erected and adorned in Macedonia, Epirus, and the Peloponnesus; Nikopolis and Eleusis emerged more splendid from their ruins; the ancient mode of life at Athens, which had never wholly disappeared, became infused with new vigor; the games and festivities at Delphi, Argos, Olympia, and elsewhere were celebrated with their pristine magnificence; the gymnasia were filled with athletes; and the schools of philosophy were especially protected by the emperor, who, in his encomium of Queen Eusebia, compared the philosophy of Hellas to the never-failing sources of the Nile. The emperor treated the Christians with moderation and mildness, much as his uncle Constantine the Great acted toward the unconverted; but he always admired and rewarded the perseverance of those pagans who had remained steadfast in their faith, and his enthusiasm prompted him to embrace the worshipers of Jupiter as his personal friends and brethren. We can not, however, accept the opinion of some historians that the restoration of the Jewish temple, which was effected by Julian, was secretly connected with the ruin of the Christian faith. On the contrary, we look upon this as a conclusive evidence of the freedom of religious worship, which the emperor continued to maintain; yet the force of circumstances drove him to many acts of cruelty.

Julian ardently admired Hellenic learning, and wrote in Greek. It is also worthy of note that all the Roman emperors who undertook any important reformation in the empire used the Hellenic as the organ of their plans. Marcus Aurelius, who hoped to educate the world morally after the principles of the Stoic philosophy, wrote in Hellenic.* The great Constantine, who raised the flag of Christianity, inscribed it with Hellenic letters and planted it within a Hellenic city. Finally, Julian, who dreamed of the restoration of the ancient world, composed all his works in the language of the Hel-

* Τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν.

lenes. But he sought to render the Hellenic learning and language the exclusive possession of himself and his adherents, deeming the Christians thoroughly barbarized on account of their aversion to the religion of ancient Hellenism. Regarding idolatry as a synonym for the rarest advantages of culture, he said ironically to the Christians: "To us belong eloquence and the arts of Hellas, as well as the adoration of her immortal gods; but your share is ignorance and barbarism." Sustaining his arguments on this sophism, he prohibited them from teaching the arts of grammar and rhetoric, on the ground that, if they refused to adore the gods of Homer and Demosthenes, they ought to content themselves with expounding Luke and Matthew in the church of the Galileans, as he was wont to call the followers of Christ. No other ordinance of Julian could have inflicted so severe a wound on Christianity, and no other moved more bitterly the indignation of the Christians against him—an indignation strongly expressed by Gregory Nazianzen in his famous apostrophe found in his first address against Julian.* The emperor, furthermore, decreed that the Christians should pay the losses sustained by the destruction of the temples during the preceding reigns, and especially during that of Constantine the Great. The execution of such an edict would certainly have caused a general civil war. But Julian did not live to carry it out. Desirous of crushing Sapor, who in the reign of Constantius had inflicted such signal misfortunes on the Roman empire, he invaded Persia with a large army, and defeated him in many engagements; but having once, on account of the heat of the weather, laid aside his cuirass, he was mortally wounded by a javelin. He died in the thirty-second year of his age, after a reign of one year and eight months from the death of Constantius (June 26, 363). It is said that when dying he took with one hand the blood from his wound, and sprink-

* Στηλιτευτικός I.

ling it in the air said: "Thou hast conquered, Christ; be thou pleased, Nazarene." His body was brought to Tarsus and buried in one of its suburbs.

Zosimus calls Julian a great man, while the Christian chronographers have heaped upon him the worst of insults. Had he lived during the acme of the ancient world, since his mind would have been in a congenial atmosphere, he would certainly have left in history an eminent name. As it was, his merits became unproductive, and might have proved subversive of order and progress.

CHAPTER V.

JOVIAN TO THEODOSIUS I.

Peace with the Persians.

THE unexpected death of Julian left the empire without a master and without an heir, "in a state of perplexity and danger which had not been experienced since the election of Diocletian." But we are told that, while the generals were debating in regard to a successor, a few voices saluted Jovian, who was no more than chief of the domestics, with the names of Emperor and Augustus. The first act of the newly elected sovereign was to make peace with the Persians, and he accordingly granted to them the provinces beyond the Tigris and the impregnable city of Nisibis, which had repulsed thus far every effort of Sapor's arms. Jovian at the same time abolished the decrees enacted by Julian in behalf of idolatry, and seemed favorably inclined to Christianity. But he died suddenly in the obscure town of Dastana, while on his march back to Constantinople.

Ten days after the death of Jovian, Valentinian, an officer in the army, was elevated to the throne. Thirty days after his election he bestowed on his brother Valens the title of Augustus, as well as the government of the East, from the lower Danube to the confines of Persia; while he reserved for his own sovereignty the western provinces of Illyria, Italy, and Gaul. Valentinian permitted "freedom of worship," while Valens in the East at once espoused the cause of the Arians. The allegation that Valens severely persecuted the Christians is probably unfounded; indeed, as a mark of his moderation, he allowed Athanasius to return to his flock, where he finally died in peace in May, 373, after forty-six years of a most eventful archbishopric.

Basil and Gregory.

About the time "the sun of orthodoxy," Athanasius, began to set, two new stars, Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian, shone on the ecclesiastical horizon. Both these Christian orators were of about the same age, for they were born between 329 and 331, were trained in the same liberal studies in the school of Athens, conducted by the most famous sophists of that time, and were united by ties of the strictest friendship. The Hellenic tongue, as if obedient to their wishes, expresses the new doctrines of Christianity with all the purity of the style of Lysias and Plato, or at least of their earliest imitators. The ancient force and beauty of the language is preserved in its entirety, gilded as it were by some Eastern tinge, yet always clear and harmonious.

Basil, on his return from Athens, taught rhetoric and practiced law in his native city Cæsareia. He achieved great eminence both as a teacher and a lawyer, but abandoned these pursuits, because the example of his father, mother, and sister, as well as his own nature and ambition, called him to the service of God. Having dispossessed him-

self of all his private property, much of which he spent in eleemosynary bequests, he visited the most famous churches, situated both in the great cities of the East and in the desert. Returning home, he chose an isolated habitation in the province of Pontus, not as a hermit, but as a man full of love for mankind, and simply contented with this mode of life, which he rendered productive of good by study and charity.

In 370 Archbishop Eusebius died, and Basil was appointed his successor in the see of Constantinople. Having reached one of the most exalted stations of the church, he did not suffer the reverses of fortune on account of which the history of Athanasius became so dramatic, but obtained the respect both of his contemporaries and of those after him. Basil was the true minister of the gospel, the father of the people, the friend of the unfortunate, unshaken in his faith, and inexhaustible in his charity. Remarkable indeed is the simplicity with which he surrounded the science which he had learned at Athens, in order to teach the people of Cæsareia to raise themselves to God by contemplating nature and the wonders of creation. The mild and graphic imagination of Basil is apparent in nearly all his writings. An ardent lover of ancient rhetoric and poetry, he wished to inspire the young with admiration for those inimitable masterpieces. In his enthusiasm for the productions of the Hellenic intellect, he deems all deserving of the study of Christians; he claims the highest virtue for the poetry of Homer, and recommends Solon, Euripides, and Plato. Basil's source of eloquence was the Old Testament, the poetry of which he readily borrowed—a poetry at once bold and descriptive; but in the vivid pictures of the Hebraic muse he mingles those mild sentiments of humanity and that gentleness of enthusiasm which are so strikingly beautiful in the New Testament. Hence the power which his words had over the minds of the people; and when he died (January 1,

379), pagans, Jews, and Christians alike followed him to the grave and bewailed the loss of a common benefactor.

Gregory was not equal to Basil in greatness of mind and heart, but his imagination possessed a peculiarity more resplendent and graceful. He attended the Hellenic schools of Cæsareia, Alexandria, and Athens, having like Basil sailed on the ocean of Hellenic philosophy before reaching the safe harbor of the gospel. Toward the last years of Valens he took an energetic part in the struggle against Arianism. But the time was near at hand when the church was destined to triumph definitely by the inflexible will of Theodosius the Great, and by the sword of the barbarians, who were about to mingle their savage passions in the solution of a problem which they seemed utterly unsuited to decide.

New Invasions of the Barbarians.

The Huns, starting from the eastern extremities of Asia, were now marching into Europe, having as their forerunners the fear and fright which their savage appearance and cruel customs everywhere inspired. One tribe of the Goths which had been long since established on the northern shores of the Danube, fearing lest they should have to meet alone that fierce torrent, sought and obtained permission from the Romans to cross the river and settle in some other province of the empire. A dispute, however, having arisen between these and the Romans, the emperor Valens in person marched against them, leading all the legions of the East; but in a severe engagement fought on the 9th of August, 378, the Romans were utterly defeated, and the emperor himself and most of his generals perished. Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly were overrun by the Goths, who ravaged the country, killing the inhabitants and destroying the cities that were not strongly fortified.

Valentinian I, who ruled the West, died in 375, and his

son Gratian succeeded him, taking as his associate his brother Valentinian II, then a child. The death of his uncle Valens made Gratian also emperor of the East. The empire was now in extreme peril; and Gratian, feeling that he was not equal to the task of defending it, although he was certainly not without ability, wisely granted the rule of the eastern countries in January, 379, to that Theodosius afterward called the Great.

Theodosius I.

Theodosius was the son of a general of the same name, who had greatly distinguished himself during the reign of Valentinian, but had been traduced and put to death. The young Theodosius was educated by skillful preceptors, and was instructed in the art of war by the care and severe discipline of his father. Under the standard of such a leader, young Theodosius sought glory and knowledge in the most distant scenes of military action, inured his constitution to the differences of seasons and climates, displayed his valor by sea and land, and observed the various modes of warfare of the Scots, the Saxons, and the Moors.

Theodosius first directed his attention to the pacification of the Goths, and succeeded within the space of four years in rendering them, if not fully submissive to his scepter, at least anxious to seek terms of peace. Soon after this was accomplished Gratian was murdered (A. D. 383), and one Maximus, a native of Spain—the countryman, fellow soldier, and rival of Theodosius, whose elevation he had not seen without envy and resentment—assumed the imperial title. Valentinian II,* brother of the murdered emperor, was forced to recognize the authority of Maximus in Gaul, Spain, and Britain; and Theodosius, being much harassed by the Gothic war and by other weighty considerations, was compelled to dissemble his resentment and to accept the alliance of the usurper.

* He ruled over Italy and Africa.

In the mean time Theodosius sought to put an end to all the ecclesiastical dissensions which for the last half century had troubled the consciences of the Christians. In the year 380 he dictated a solemn edict, which proclaimed the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, branded all who denied it with the name of heretics, and handed over the churches in Constantinople to the exclusive use of the orthodox party, who formed only a small portion of the population of the city. A few months afterward (May, 381), Theodosius convened at Constantinople a synod of one hundred and fifty bishops (the second general council of the Christian church), which completed the theological system established by the council of Nice.

While Theodosius was thus occupied with the Gothic war, the strengthening of the Christian religion, and the eradication of Arianism, he did not neglect the affairs of the West. In 387 Maximus, who aspired to the conquest of Italy, secretly crossed the Alps, fell upon Valentinian, and drove him out of the country. Hereupon Theodosius hastened to his aid, killed Maximus in a great and decisive battle, almost annihilated his army, and in June, 388, surrendered to Valentinian the government of the West. Four years later, on the 15th of May, 392, Valentinian was murdered by his chief adviser Arbogastes, a Frankish general, who, wishing to reign under the name of some dependent Roman, bestowed the purple on the rhetorician Eugenius, whom he had already raised from the place of his domestic secretary to the rank of master of the offices. In the summer of 394 Theodosius marched against the usurper, defeated him, and united all the Roman world under his scepter. He did not, however, long enjoy this last triumph. He died at Milan four months later (January 17, 395), of dropsy, at the age of fifty, having again confirmed the division of the Eastern and Western empires by granting the East to his elder son, Arcadius, and the West to his younger, Honorius.

Theodosius was called the Great. He is to some extent entitled to this appellation, which in the history of the monarchs of the Eastern Empire we have applied only to the founder of Constantinople. In his private relations, Theodosius was confessedly better than Constantine the Great; for he was an affectionate husband, a good father and brother, and a grateful friend. As a public man, he committed many mistakes. By entering into alliance with the Goths, instead of completely reducing them, he gave rise to many misfortunes in the empire, setting an example which, followed by many other emperors, tended to degenerate the character of the Constantinopolitan monarchy, which could otherwise have become much more Hellenic. But Theodosius, by protecting orthodoxy, which was wellnigh submerged by Arianism, by defending and securing the symbols of the faith, linked his name with one of the greatest events in the history of the world.

CHAPTER VI.

ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS.

Barbarian Incursions.

ARCADIUS, who was then about eighteen years old, reigned over the East, while his brother Honorius, in the eleventh year of his age, nominally assumed the government of the West; but the real rulers of the empire were Rufinus in the East and Stilicho in the West. Stilicho was noted for his military virtues, and his praises have been celebrated by the muse of Claudian; but Rufinus became notorious only for his wickedness, which led to many disasters in the East. He aspired to marry his daughter Maria to the young emperor Arcadius, a feeble youth, "whom the imperious prefect con-

sidered as his pupil rather than as his sovereign." But this dream was not to be realized. Eutropius, a eunuch, and the great chamberlain of the palace, persuaded Arcadius to marry the fair Eudoxia, the daughter of Bauto, a Frankish general in the Roman service. Rufinus, enraged, planned the destruction of the empire itself. He is said to have called in the Huns, who in 395 laid waste many provinces in Asia, and to have committed many atrocities, until finally he was murdered by Gainas, the general of the Goths. The unmanly Arcadius, after the death of Rufinus, surrendered himself entirely to the hands of Eutropius, who soon acquired the chief influence in the empire.

Rufinus is said before his death to have persuaded Alaric, the daring general of the Goths, to invade Hellas, having called his attention to the prosperity of the country, which for a long time had been free from the incursions of barbarians. Alaric, with whom not a few monks joined themselves—believing, in their fanaticism, that since the war was mainly directed against the pagans, the cause of religion would gain thereby—invaded Hellas, plundering and destroying whole districts and cities, slaughtering the men, and carrying away the women and children. Stilicho, however, entered the Peloponnesus, vigorously attacked the Goths, and forced them to retreat into Epirus, whence, four years later, Alaric led his warriors against Italy, where he continued for a long time his career of devastation.

Eutropius was beheaded in 399, and the government passed virtually into the hands of Eudoxia, who managed the affairs of the empire with great moderation until her death, which occurred shortly before that of Arcadius, in 408. The whole machinery of the government was by this time in the hands of the barbarians, who had acquired great preponderance in the East; for it must not be forgotten that not only Alaric and Gainas were Goths, but Eudoxia herself was the daughter of a Frankish general.

What, then, became of that Hellenic nation which, resuscitated by Christianity, seemed destined to establish a new and great empire in the East? Did it surrender itself to the barbarians without battle and in silence? No, certainly! The Hellenic nation in the East, after long and incessant combats, finally drove away the barbarians. The kingdom, the language, philology, art, law, and government, all came out of the struggle Hellenic; perhaps somewhat mutilated and bearing deep scars, but, like the wounds of veterans, redounding to its honor.

John Chrysostom.

John, who on account of his inimitable eloquence was surnamed Chrysostom or the Golden-mouthed, was born in 344, of a prominent family in Antioch. He studied rhetoric with the famous sophist Libanius, a faithful adherent of the ancient religion, who vainly strove, through the Homeric hymns, which he explained with rare eloquence, to induce his pupil to abandon the Christian religion. Chrysostom at first practiced law in Antioch, but soon entered the service of the church. Deeming himself unprepared for duties so responsible, he abandoned the world and spent six years in the desert in prayer and meditation. He had already acquired great renown by his learning, piety, and goodness; and on his return to Antioch, the bishop gladly permitted him to preach the word of God in that great and flourishing city, inhabited alike by Christians, Jews, and idolaters, all of whom spoke the Hellenic tongue. Like the people of ancient Hellas, the Christian communities were effectively swayed by the power of speech; and the brilliant interpreter of the Scriptures, with his fiery imagination and allegorical art, made a deep impression on the Hellenes, both Christian and pagan. His discourses form a complete system of moral instructions, imbued with his brilliant genius, deep knowledge of the human heart, and truly evangelical goodness. Furthermore,

they depict, as if on successive mirrors, the society of the times, standing as it were on the boundaries of Christianity and idolatry. His preaching created such enthusiasm that great numbers of the people, abandoning every career of activity, devoted themselves to the service of God. Chrysostom, unfortunately, did not understand the danger arising from this movement, and did not attempt to check the irresistible current he had himself set in motion. He stigmatized severely the abuses which many committed under cover of the monastic garb, but did not strongly oppose retirement from the world. He sought rather to arouse in the hearts of his people the sentiments of philanthropy and piety, firmly believing that these virtues alone would inevitably produce others tending to the preservation of the community. No other orator, minister, or moralist ever represented so forcibly and so eloquently the misfortunes of man, or more strongly moved or more persuasively called forth his best impulses. The preaching of Chrysostom, while learned, was at the same time popular. He knew how to take hold of the souls of his hearers by pictures of their daily life; he was the public counselor, the guide and comforter of every citizen, the type and example of religious eloquence and ministerial office, remaining to this day unsurpassed even by the most distinguished of divines.

In 397 Nectarius, archbishop of Constantinople, died, and both the emperor and the people with one accord named as his successor the greatest orator of Christianity. All the excesses and abuses which Chrysostom had for so many years stigmatized in Antioch appeared before him in all their brazen effrontery in the queen of cities. The levity and sumptuousness of the court beggar description; the magistrates spent their resources in the races; the multitude idly passed their time there; the profanity and immorality of the drama and song in the theatres surpassed all bounds; and many of the monks, leaving their retreat, filled the streets

and houses of Constantinople, plotting and committing every kind of crime. It is evident that in such a society, in the presence of these impious violators of the most sacred ordinances, Chrysostom could not long remain silent. He was the best, the mildest, and most patient of men, whenever he had to advise *the many*—those who, either from ignorance or weakness, had violated their duty. But in the presence of hardened wickedness, before haughty sin and base hypocrisy, and especially before the audacious sacrilegiousness of the monks, this same Chrysostom became inflexible, impatient, severe.

The pastoral labors of the archbishop of Constantinople naturally provoked and gradually united against him two classes of enemies: the aspiring clergy, who envied his success, and the ministers and ladies of the court, who were offended by his reproofs. The empress Eudoxia, also angered by his course, secretly planned for his exile, and to this end communicated with Theophilus, archbishop of Alexandria, who, we are told, had been exasperated by some personal disputes with Chrysostom. By the private invitation of the empress, Theophilus landed at Constantinople with a stout body of Egyptian mariners, to overpower the populace, and a train of dependent bishops, to secure by their voices the majority of a synod, which was convened in the suburb Chalkedon. A bishop and a deacon accused the archbishop of Constantinople; but as Chrysostom refused to trust either his person or his reputation to his implacable enemies, they condemned his contumacious disobedience, and hastily pronounced a sentence of deposition. The archbishop was rudely arrested and conducted through the city by one of the imperial messengers, who landed him, after a short voyage, near the entrance of the Euxine, from which place, before the expiration of two days, he was gloriously recalled (A. D. 403).

The first astonishment of his faithful people had been

mute and passive ; but they soon rose with unanimous and irresistible fury. Theophilus escaped, but the promiscuous crowd of monks and Egyptian mariners was slaughtered without pity in the streets of Constantinople. The torrent of sedition rolled onward to the gates of the palace ; and the empress, agitated by fear and remorse, threw herself at the feet of Arcadius, and confessed that the public safety could be purchased only by the restoration of Chrysostom. The Bosphorus was covered with innumerable vessels, and the acclamations of a victorious people accompanied from the port to the cathedral the triumphant return of the archbishop.

Ignorant or careless of impending danger, Chrysostom declaimed against the profane honors which were addressed, almost in the precincts of St. Sophia, to the statue of the empress. His fearless policy (which some western writers call imprudence) tempted his enemies to inflame the haughty spirit of Eudoxia, by reporting, and perhaps inventing, the famous exordium of a sermon : “ Herodias is again furious ; Herodias again dances ; she once more requires the head of John.”* This allusion enraged Eudoxia, and Arcadius was prevailed upon to convoke a numerous council of the eastern prelates, who confirmed the validity of the former sentence without examining into its justice. A detachment of barbarian troops was introduced into the city to suppress the resistance of the people ; and on the vigil of Easter, 404, Chrysostom was carried to the remote and desolate town of Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taurus, in Lesser Armenia. After remaining there three years, an order was dispatched for his instant removal to the desert of Pityus ; and his guards so faithfully obeyed their cruel instructions, that before he reached the sea-coast of the Euxine he expired at Comana, in Pontus, in the sixtieth year of his age, a few months before his bitter enemy Eudoxia.

* Gibbon.

Such was the end of this brilliant and inspired man. About four hundred and fifty of his discourses are extant, which justly proclaim him the greatest of preachers. Thirty years later, at the request of the people of Constantinople, his remains were brought to the city, and the emperor Theodosius II, advancing as far as Chalkedon, received them, and prayed for the forgiveness of his dead parents Arcadius and Eudoxia.

CHAPTER VII.

THEODOSIUS II.

Pulcheria and Athenais.

ARCADIUS died A. D. 408, in the thirty-first year of his age, after a nominal reign of thirteen years. He was succeeded by his son Theodosius II, surnamed Mikros or the Small, in contrast with his great-grandfather. As he was only seven years of age, the government passed into the hands of the prefect Anthemius, a man distinguished for wisdom, experience, and courage. Owing, however, to the jealousy of the other prefects, Pulcheria, the sister of Theodosius, who was only two years older than her brother, received at the age of sixteen the title of Augusta, and virtually assumed the government of the empire. Pulcheria embraced a life of celibacy, and "dedicated her virginity to God." Indeed, we are told that she renounced all vanity in dress, interrupted by frequent fasts her simple and frugal diet, and devoted several hours of the day and night to the exercises of prayer and psalmody. But the education which she gave her brother, who continued until his death to be a cipher in the government, plainly showed that Pulcheria wished to restrict to herself the absolute command of the empire. Instead of

devoting his energies to public affairs, Theodosius passed his days in riding and hunting, and his evenings in prayer, in modeling, and in copying sacred books ; and he acquired such dexterity in this latter art that the people bestowed upon him the ironical name of Kalligraphos, the fine writer or teacher of writing.

Affairs accordingly passed exclusively into the hands of Pulcheria, and during her long reign of nearly forty years (414—453) the empire was governed more wisely than could have been hoped, considering the internal and external difficulties with which she had to contend. The throne of Constantinople had been hitherto occupied by empresses of foreign descent ; but during the reign of Theodosius Mikros the royal purple was worn by a genuine Helleness, the famous Athenais, daughter of the Athenian philosopher Leontius, who had educated her in the religion and sciences of the Greeks. Leontius had three children, two sons and one daughter, Athenais, distinguished for her beauty and intelligence, as well as for her accomplishments in rhetoric and philosophy. But, while she had received many evidences of paternal love and solicitude, she was at her father's death, apparently without cause, disinherited by his will of nearly all the property which he left. Finding herself without resources, she repaired to Constantinople to submit her rights to Pulcheria, who was so much attracted by the grace and talent of Athenais that forthwith she determined to make her the wife of Theodosius. She accordingly spoke to her brother of the daughter of Leontius, whom she described as a Grecian maiden, well arrayed, of delicate features, with skin white as snow, large eyes, golden hair, well-shaped feet, and most admirably educated. Theodosius was curious to see this excellent creature, and, standing behind a curtain, feasted his eyes on the charms of Athenais, says one of the ancient chroniclers, and at once decided to make her his wife. The nuptials were celebrated magnificently. Athenais was

easily persuaded to renounce the errors of paganism, and received at her baptism the Christian name of Eudokia. The title of Augusta, however, was given to her only in the following year, when she bore to the emperor a daughter Eudoxia, who when fifteen years old espoused Valentinian III, the emperor of the West.

In the luxury of the palace Eudokia still cultivated those arts which had led to her greatness, and by her learning and poetical productions she contributed much to the refinement of the court of Constantinople. Forgetting, however, her obligations to Pulcheria, she sought to obtain the direction of the Eastern Empire; and this unwarranted ambition caused her downfall. Feeling that she had lost the affection of Theodosius, she requested permission to retire to the distant solitude of Jerusalem; but the vindictive spirit of Pulcheria, as well as the violent jealousy of Theodosius, aroused by false aspersions against the honor of his wife, caused the unhappy Eudokia to suffer still greater misfortunes. Stripped of the honors of her rank, she was disgraced, and spent sixteen years in exile and devotion. After experiencing the various vicissitudes of human life, the daughter of the philosopher Leontius died at Jerusalem in 460, in the sixty-seventh year of her age, declaring to the last her innocence of the charges against her.

Ancient Hellenism in the mean time continued to wither in Hellas, while the modern began to spread and strengthen itself in Constantinople. Yet from this time onward Hellenic literature produced none of those works by which the memory of nations is honored and perpetuated. How are we to explain this long intellectual sterility in a people to whom many failings may be attributed, but never worthlessness in the productions of the mind? Why did Christian Hellenism, which even during the fourth century brought forth orators and poets to this day admired and extolled, suddenly, like a noble tree struck by a violent wind, cease to

bear its precious fruits? This intellectual decline is mainly due to the incursions of the barbarians, by which society was shaken from its very foundations, and the genius and enterprise of the nation almost paralyzed.

Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople.

Nestorius was born in Germanikeia of Syria, and was made patriarch of Constantinople on the 10th of April, 428. Influenced by philosophical investigations, he propounded a doctrine much like that of the Arians; for Nestorius thought that we ought to distinguish between the divine and human natures of Christ. He revered Mary as the mother of Christ, but would not accept her as *Theotokos*, or the progenitrix of God; for he deemed the human nature of Christ to be the cloak, the organ, the temple, as it were, of his divine nature. It is evident that this belief tended to represent the Saviour as a man—sharing, indeed, in the divine nature, but not the less a man, and not identical with the Father.

Through the watchful energy of Pulcheria, a royal decree was issued in 430, by which all the archbishops of the empire were invited to come to Ephesus during the Pentecost of the following year. The synod began its sessions June 22d. About two hundred archbishops were present, all of whom condemned the heresy of Nestorius; but, as he refused to abide by the decision of the council, he was by a royal edict banished to an oasis in the Libyan desert.

Theodosius died in 450, and Pulcheria continued the sovereignty in her own name and in that of her nominal husband, Marcian, who had sworn to respect the promise made to God of passing her life in celibacy. Pulcheria, even in her foreign relations, preserved to a great extent the glory of the Eastern Empire. The successor of Yezdegerd, king of the Persians, had ordered a fierce persecution against the Christians; wherefore war was declared between the two empires, in which the Persian troops were repeatedly worsted.

Attila.

But the greatest and most direful event of the reign of Pulcheria was the destructive invasion of the Huns. In 424 the fierce and avaricious Attila, the "SCOURGE OF GOD," obtained the chief command of the Huns. His features bore the stamp of his national origin; and the portrait of Attila exhibits the genuine deformity of a modern Calmuck—a large head, a swarthy complexion, small deep-set eyes, a flat nose, a few hairs in place of a beard, broad shoulders, and a short, square body, of nervous strength, though of a disproportioned form.* Led by such a warrior, the Huns ravaged without resistance and without mercy the suburbs of Constantinople (the city itself was protected by a wall), and the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia, until finally Theodosius was induced to solicit the clemency of Attila, who imperiously dictated most harsh and humiliating terms.

Shortly after this inglorious peace Theodosius died; and when Attila haughtily demanded the fulfillment of the treaty, Marcian responded that he did not intend to abide by such an agreement, and forthwith declared war. Attila, however, soon afterward started on his great western expedition, during which he was defeated in Gaul in 451 by the brave Aëtius, and his death, which occurred two years later (453), freed the Eastern Empire from a terrible danger.

Marcian died in 457, leaving the public treasury in a flourishing condition. With the death of Pulcheria, which had occurred three years before, and that of Valentinian III, the nephew and successor of Honorius in the West, the family of Theodosius the Great for ever disappeared.

* Gibbon.

CHAPTER VIII.

END OF THE ROMAN RULE.

Leo the Thracian.

MARCIAN was succeeded by Leo Thrax (the Thracian), whom Aspar, the richest and most powerful man in the East, placed upon the throne ; for, being an Arian, and unwilling to abjure his belief, he did not dare to mount the throne himself. Later, however, he was put to death by Leo on the ground of treason. Leo was the first emperor who received the diadem from the patriarch of Constantinople, as formerly the emperors were elected by the political and military rulers of the empire. Gibbon blames this practice ; but with the Greeks this ceremony is purely religious, and has no political significance whatever. Its sole purpose is to call the blessing of God on the highest political magistrate, and to receive from him the assurance, made in the presence of God, that he will observe both the duties intrusted to him by the community and the regulations and doctrines of religion.

The most noteworthy event of the reign of Leo was his disastrous expedition against the Vandals in Africa. The fleet that sailed from Constantinople to Carthage consisted of eleven hundred and thirteen ships, and the number of soldiers and mariners exceeded one hundred thousand. Basiliscus, the brother of the empress Verina, was intrusted with this important command, but shortly afterward returned to Constantinople with the loss of more than half of his fleet and army. Soon afterward northern barbarians, taking courage at this disaster, invaded anew the Eastern Empire, and Leo was forced to make peace with them, granting territory and acknowledging them as his allies. But, although

Leo failed in his warlike undertakings as well as in the formation of a strong national army, he is justly considered one of the benefactors of the Eastern Empire; for he not only greatly diminished the tax of Antioch, which city had suffered from a most disastrous earthquake, but also exempted from taxation the citizens who rebuilt their houses.

Leo died in 474. Two years later the last Roman emperor, who had the strange name of Romulus Augustulus, was dethroned. In 476 Odoacer, a German, was proclaimed king of Italy, and from that year onward all political relations between Rome and the Eastern Empire ceased. It is true that the emperors of the East continued to be styled emperors of the Romans, but legislation, government, and customs became thoroughly Hellenized.

Zeno—Anastasius—Justin I.

Leo left no sons, but only daughters, the eldest of whom, Ariadne, married Zeno the Isaurian, by whom she had a son, who was proclaimed Augustus as Leo II. The sovereignty, however, soon passed into the hands of Zeno, because Leo II survived his grandfather only by four years. The first emperor of the independent Eastern Empire therefore was an Isaurian,* but completely Hellenized, and forced to accept a Hellenic name† and the Hellenic religion. He died in 491, and was succeeded by Anastasius, a friend of Ariadne, whom he married shortly after ascending the throne. The only noteworthy feature of his career is the successful wars he waged against the Isaurians; for he is said to have completely defeated them, and to have razed all their castles and fortifications.

Anastasius died in 518 without leaving any issue, and Justin, the chief of the body-guards, was proclaimed emperor.

* Isauria was a mountainous district of Asia Minor, little known, lying between Lykaonia, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Kilikia.

† His Isaurian name is not known.

He was born near the ruins of Sardica, the modern Sophia, in A. D. 482 or 483, of an obscure race of barbarians, the inhabitants of a wild and desolate country, to which the names Dardania, Dacia, and Bulgaria have been successively applied. He was the progenitor of a dynasty which lasted only sixty years, but exercised a great influence on the fortunes of the Eastern Empire. According to the rhetorician Prokopius, he was so ignorant that he could not write the word *legi*, meaning "I have read," which the emperors of the East were wont to inscribe on the edicts issued. He certainly possessed much military ability, and secured his empire against the invasions of northern barbarians; but he could not have conceived the idea of the great political changes with which the name of his family is linked, if he had not had for co-worker his nephew and successor Justinian.

Justinian I.

Justinian (527-565) was also born in Dardania, and acquired through the care of his uncle varied and extensive learning. He was naturally of a thoughtful disposition, but he possessed such extraordinary energy and strength, that often one hour's sleep was enough to rest his body, while the remainder of the night was given to incessant study. The mainspring of his success in life was an unrestrained desire for great deeds, and his wonderful good fortune in the choice of his ministers. Hence, many of the events of Justinian's reign are indeed wonderful: his expeditions to Africa, Italy, and Spain, the rebuilding of St. Sophia, the codification of the laws, and the construction of the numerous fortifications with which he strengthened his empire against foreign invasion. Justinian has been often extolled by historians in the most lavish terms, and as often unsparingly condemned. He was at times forced to bear the defects of the creators of his own glory, and hence committed blunders which obscured the most splendid pages of his rule. He constantly

suspected the fidelity of his generals, and especially of the most distinguished of them all, the great Belisarius. He was exceedingly vainglorious, and erected edifices disproportionate to the resources and requirements of the empire.

His wife Theodora contributed much to the strengthening and splendor of his rule. The life of this woman presents a curious illustration of the vicissitudes of fortune. She was the daughter of a man who earned his living by taking care of the wild beasts maintained by one of the factions at Constantinople, and passed her early youth in unchecked immorality. Impelled by some better impulse, she suddenly reformed, and dedicated her life to the saving of women of her former class. Then Justinian saw her, and fell so madly in love with her that, in spite of her previous career, he married her. It is not difficult to explain the passion of the young man, judging from the still extant pictures of Theodora, which represent her as a blooming woman, possessed of fine features, piercing eyes, and a most captivating expression.

In 527 Justin died, and Justinian celebrated magnificently his accession to the throne. Splendid victories over the Persians, whom he compelled to sue for peace, glorified his early years. Belisarius, the general who imparted such eminent distinction to the reign of Justinian, began his career in this war. He was born in Thrace, of an obscure family, but through his rare military talents soon reached the rank of general of the Byzantine army. In the mean time Justinian occupied himself with the creation of his most glorious and useful memorials, for he ordered the composition of the celebrated collection of laws comprising the Institutes, the Digest or Pandects, and the Code. The work was intrusted to ten law-teachers, over whom the famous Tribonian presided. He was a native of Side in Pamphylia, and at first practiced law; but the unerring eye of Justinian discovered him, and he was finally made minister of justice, an office

then much more exalted than at present. Gibbon does not hesitate to compare the mind of Tribonian with that of Bacon; for, like that of the English philosopher, it embraced all the business and knowledge of the age. He wrote both in prose and poetry on numerous subjects—philological, poetical, philosophical, political, and physical. He busied himself with various arts, and especially political science, of which his head was the completest library of those times. His vast learning, like that of Bacon, was adorned with eloquence, wisdom, moderation, and that address which disarms hostility and enchants both the lowly and the great. Unfortunately, he had not only the virtues of Bacon, but also one of his vices; for he is said to have often used his exalted position and vast learning in satisfying the ignoble passion of avarice.

But, while Justinian was occupied with these great works, he almost lost his throne in 532, through an outbreak which occurred among the so-called parties of the race-course. Chariot-racing always formed the principal part of the Hellenic festivals, the most famous of which were the Isthmian, Nemean, Pythian, and Olympian. These celebrations were transplanted after the spread of Hellenism to the most noted cities of the East. The chariot-races of Constantinople are especially worthy of mention, and were at first conducted much after the Roman fashion. The race in its first institution, as Gibbon says, was a simple contest of two chariots, whose drivers were distinguished by white and red liveries; two additional colors, a light green and a cerulean blue, were afterward introduced; and as the races were repeated twenty-five times, one hundred chariots contributed to the pomp of the circus. But at the same time as many parties were formed, whose turbulent and bloody strifes often troubled the city. If these races, however, were organized after the Roman type, the Hellenic character of the inhabitants of Constantinople, and the recollections by which they were

surrounded, modified much the spirit of this celebration. The hippodrome, or race-course (now called the At Meïdan or Horse Square), was adorned with many statues of the Homeric gods and heroes, as well as with a vast number of others representing both heathen and Christian emperors, philosophers, physicians, and charioteers. Among the other works of Hellenic, Roman, and Egyptian art collected there, special admiration was excited by the bronze Hercules, "the first and last work"* of Lysippus; the Kalydonian Kapros, also of bronze; and the bronze eagle which stood at the gate, with outstretched wings, tearing a serpent with its claws. But it would be impossible to give a full description of this magnificent race-course. We may simply add that the hippodrome represented exactly the noblest elements of which the Eastern Empire was composed; because one could here see the Roman, Eastern, heathen, Christian, and, above all, the Hellenic traditions; so that the inhabitants of Constantinople could not remain indifferent to their ancestral glory before so many masterly representations of it.

About the fifth year of the reign of Justinian a long and bloody strife arose, caused probably by one of the factions of the race-course, which sought to place on the throne a nephew of Anastasius. For the space of four days the capital remained in the hands of the factionists; and, as it usually happens on such occasions, they committed numberless atrocities, burning, pillaging, and killing. The Byzantine palace enjoyed a free communication with the sea; vessels lay ready at the garden stairs, and a resolution was already formed by Justinian to convey his family and treasures to a safe retreat at some distance from the capital, when the firmness of his wife Theodora and of Belisarius inspired the emperor with the determination to remain and crush out the revolution. The fidelity of the army was doubtful; but the body-guard of Justinian consisted of three thou-

* Έργον πρῶτον καὶ ἑσάτον.

sand veterans, who had been trained to valor and discipline in the Persian and Illyrian wars under the illustrious Belisarius. Led by him and by Mundus, an Illyrian, they silently marched in two divisions from the palace, forced their way through narrow passages, expiring flames, and falling edifices, and burst open at the same moment the two opposite gates of the hippodrome. A large multitude had collected there, which at once attacked them; but Belisarius and Mundus charged in military order, and the battle soon became a carnage, lasting for several hours, and causing the death, as it is supposed, of thirty thousand men. Thus ended, after a week's duration, this bloody revolt.

Among other memorable events which signalized the reign of Justinian, the successful wars which he waged against the Vandals in Africa and the Goths in Italy, and his expeditions to Sicily and Spain, during which his victorious armies were commanded by Belisarius, are of special importance. In the midst of his victorious career in the West, Belisarius was summoned to fresh victories over the Persians in Asia. He had already forced the brave Chosroes to retreat when he was again called to another field of action. Hereupon the Persian armies renewed their attacks, and the contest continued for about twenty years with indifferent success, when finally both parties, exhausted, concluded in 562 a peace of fifty years. Chosroes agreed to abandon considerable claims of territorial aggrandizement, and Justinian to pay a yearly tribute of thirty thousand pounds.

In the mean time other misfortunes occurred by reason of northern invasions in the European provinces of the empire.*

* In the relation of the foreign invasions which occurred during the reign of Justinian, we have for the most part followed the testimony of contemporary writers, of the Illyrian Markellinus, of Prokopius, Agathias, and Malalas; and not, as many modern historians have done, of Theophanes, Zonaras, Kedrenus, Nikephorus, Gregoras, and other more recent writers, who not only confound the dates and events, but have always a tendency to represent them rather tragically.

As early as 499, an army of Bulgarians, a nation of the Finnish race, entered the empire by way of the Danube, and later established themselves in the territory between the Danube and Mount Hæmus. During their first invasion they advanced as far as Illyria, and, as they were returning home through Thrace, were attacked by the Illyrian general Aristus, leading an army of one hundred and fifty thousand ; but he was utterly defeated, lost four thousand men, and had most of his officers killed. In 502 the Bulgarians again ravaged Thrace, and in 517 they penetrated as far as Macedonia, Thessaly, and ancient Epirus. The emperor Anastasius sent to the governor of Illyria one thousand pounds of gold (equal to 1,300,000 drachmæ), with which to liberate the prisoners of war ; but this sum was not sufficient to ransom all the captives. The invasions ceased during the reign of Justin, because that warrior strongly fortified those parts of the empire ; but after his death they were repeated not only by the Bulgarians, but by other barbarians. Shortly after the accession of Justinian, the Antes, a Slavonic tribe, having crossed the Danube with a large army, entered Thrace, but suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of Germanus, the imperial commander in that region. The destruction of the Antes was succeeded by a long respite from northern invasion. Chilbudius, the successor of Germanus (531), inspired the barbarians with such terror that for three years they not only durst not cross the Danube, but they were often defeated on the other side of the river, in their own territories. Unfortunately, in 534, in one of these expeditions, Chilbudius was killed ; and accordingly in 540, and again in 546, many northern barbarians committed fearful ravages.

Finally, in the thirty-second winter of Justinian's reign (559), the Danube was deeply frozen, and Zabergan led the cavalry of the Bulgarians and a promiscuous multitude of Slavonians as far as Thrace. Dividing his army into three parts, he dispatched one against Hellas, another against the

Thracian Chersonese, and the third, composed of seven thousand horse, he led in person against the capital, plundering and sacking everything on his way. It would naturally be supposed that the long walls of the Queen City would have defended the territory of Constantinople. But the works of man are impotent against the assaults of nature. A recent earthquake had shaken the foundations of the walls, and the forces of the empire were employed on the distant frontiers of Italy, Africa, and Persia. The tents of Zabergan, we are told, were pitched at the distance of twenty miles from the city, on the banks of a small river which encircled Melanthias and afterward fell into the Propontis. Justinian trembled; by his command the vessels of gold and silver were removed from the churches in the neighborhood, and even from the suburbs, of Constantinople; the ramparts were lined with frightened spectators; the Golden Gate was crowded with useless generals and tribunes; and the senate shared the apprehensions of the populace.* In this crisis both the emperor and the people remembered a feeble veteran, the old Belisarius, who, recalled ten years previously from the army in Italy, lived at Constantinople as a private citizen, neglected by the government. The glory he had gained from almost uninterrupted victories in Asia, Africa, and Europe; the great riches he had amassed from Persian, Vandal, and Gothic booty; the influence he had acquired both in the army and the community—all these causes had excited, if not the envy, at least the suspicion of the emperor. But the extreme danger with which Justinian was threatened compelled him to intrust again to that veteran the safety of all. Accordingly Belisarius, summoning his old comrades, mustered a small force of three hundred horsemen, and, having drawn the enemy into a narrow pass where their multitudes availed them nothing, forced them to seek safety in flight, and thus Constantinople was saved. The enthusiasm

* Gibbon.

which this victory kindled at Constantinople excited anew the envy of his enemies, and they represented to the emperor the dangers which might result to the throne should Belisarius achieve any new successes. He was therefore hastily recalled ; and Zabergan, who after his defeat had withdrawn to a respectful distance, continued for a long time to ravage the territories west of Constantinople.

Such were the misfortunes inflicted on the European provinces of the empire ; and since, according to the popular proverb, "an evil never comes alone," terrible earthquakes destroyed many cities, and in some instances the sea, swelling up, completely inundated whole regions. Koroneia, Antioch, Constantinople, Nikomedeia, and many other cities suffered greatly. In Antioch alone two hundred and fifty thousand persons are said to have perished by the earthquake of May 20, 526. But still worse misfortunes were caused by the great plague which began in 531, and continued with short intervals for upward of fifty years. This destructive disease appeared first in Egypt, and thence, tracing as it were a double path, it spread to the East, over Syria, Persia, and the Indies, and penetrated to the West, along the coast of Africa and over the continent of Europe. Prokopius, in the twenty-second chapter of his second book, describes the disease with a minuteness worthy of Thucydides. In fact, exactly the same scenes took place in the Byzantine empire as later in 1720 at Marseilles, when the plague so severely attacked that city. The French physicians would not believe that the disease was contagious, and hence at Marseilles alone, out of a population of eighty thousand, fifty thousand are said to have perished.


The Eastern Empire, accordingly, during the sixth century, and especially during the reign of Justinian, suffered extraordinary disasters—invasions, destructions, earthquakes, plagues, and a fearful famine occasioned by the accumulation of so many evils. But we must not accept to the letter

what both ancient and modern writers have said concerning the enormous destruction of human beings. Furthermore, we must not forget that our principal source of information is Prokopius, and that in his work entitled "Anekdota" he is no longer a historian, but an intoxicated maniac, striving to represent Justinian as a monster, during whose reign, on account of his evil courses, the human race was almost entirely wiped out. That Gibbon should have been misled by Prokopius is, to say the least, extremely surprising. For what does the "ten thousand myriads of myriads" whom Prokopius declares to have perished mean? If we accept it as a rhetorical figure, simply representing the great number of the lost, then it has no numerical value whatever. But if we account it a definite sum, we confess that we are astounded at the absurdity of the man; for he asserts that the loss exceeded by millions the population of our globe to-day! Professor Fallmerayer of Munich, probably basing his calculations on the assumptions of Prokopius, amazed the world in 1830 by announcing his wonderful discovery that the modern Greeks are not Greeks, but Slavonians! Fallmerayer, accepting as it seems to the letter the ten thousand myriads of myriads of Prokopius, and taking into consideration the foreign invasions, famine, etc., sought, with characteristic German patience and an overwhelming force of rhetorical arguments, to make himself notorious by marvelous assertions and startling conclusions. Carl Hopf's work, however, has now reduced his deductions to their just proportions. The loss of life no doubt was great, but the empire did not cease to exist and to flourish. In fact, how can we accept the vagaries of Prokopius, when, eight months only after "the complete destruction" of Antioch, Malelas represents this same city as flourishing and populous, and tells of magnificent scenic representations which were interdicted by an edict of Justinian, on account of the disturbances of the populace?

About this time Justinian was also afflicted with private misfortunes. In 547 he lost his wife, to whom he remained to the last devotedly attached, and in 564 ordered the imprisonment of Belisarius, alleging that he had formed a conspiracy against his life. His innocence was shortly after acknowledged, and his freedom and honors were restored; but death removed him from the world about eight months after his deliverance (A. D. 505). The name of Belisarius will preserve its luster in history; but, instead of according him the funeral, the monuments, the statues so justly due to his memory, the emperor even confiscated his treasures, the spoils of the Goths and Vandals. That he was deprived of his eyes, and reduced by envy to beg his bread—"Give a penny to Belisarius the general!"—is a fiction of later times, which has obtained credit, or rather currency, as a strange example of the vicissitudes of fortune.

The Temple of St. Sophia.

Among the many edifices erected during the reign of Justinian, the temple of St. Sophia is certainly the most famous. This inimitable masterpiece alone would have sufficed to show that, however great the misfortunes of the empire, its resources were far from exhausted. In attempting to give some account of it, we shall pass over its sacred treasures of gold and precious stones. Only the building itself has survived the repeated spoliations of later times, but it remains to this day the wonder and admiration of the world. The interior of St. Sophia is very simple. Great and broad half-domes, rising from the ground, ascend beautifully, by others smaller, toward the foremost vault, which unites to itself all the remaining parts of the edifice, and appears rather a product of nature than a work of art. The light which emanates from the twenty-four windows of the dome, illuminating the entire church, is such that it affords the illusion of the firmament itself lighted up by the meridian star. How



ΜΑΘΕ ΤΗΝ 'ΑΓΙΑΝ ΣΟΦΙΑΝ

THE TEMPLE OF ST. SOPHIA

different from the mysterious darkness in the somber cathedrals of western Europe! The light in St. Sophia grows dim and disappears only when it vanishes in nature itself. The brilliant and radiant appearance of the temple shows that its architects, Anthemius and Isidorus—the graceful and refined children of Ionia—preserved under a new form the spirit of ancient Hellenic architecture. Lightness, grace, and harmony are the impressions which affect us as we stand under the great dome of St. Sophia. Prokopius, who saw the temple in all its splendor, compared it to a meadow replete with the brightest and most diversified colors. The Christian who enters to pray within it feels his mind lifted toward God, who seems to dwell in this, his chosen habitation.

This temple unites in itself the ancient Hellenic and the new Christian characteristics, and by this union forms one of the completest works ever erected for the adoration of the Most High. When the church was completed, Justinian, in the fullness of his joy, exclaimed, "I have conquered thee, Solomon!"* Religious indifference, historic irony, hearts and minds foreign to Hellenic aspirations and claims, have derided the spirit that called forth that exclamation. But the Hellenes, who know that their entire mediæval life turned as it were on two poles, the monarchy and the church, that St. Sophia was the ark of the Christian religion, and that within this cathedral as in a council chamber were decided the fortunes of their nation for the space of one thousand years—the Hellenes, who know that later, during four hundred years of direful persecutions and unheard-of cruelties, their fathers and mothers did not cease to believe that the chants of their faith would again resound under the domes of St. Sophia—how can they help revering the memory of the man who epitomized in that masterpiece the sentiments, interests, recollections, and hopes of so many centuries?

* Νενίκηκα σε Σολομών.

PART ELEVENTH.

BYZANTINE HELLENISM.

CHAPTER I.

HERAKLIUS.

Overthrow of Phokas.

THE reign of Justinian belongs partly to the Roman epoch of the Eastern Empire, but that of Heraklius (610-641) forms certainly an integral part of mediæval Hellenism. Between these two we find four other emperors : Justin II (565-578), the nephew of Justinian ; Tiberius II (578-582), a Thracian by race, altogether foreign to the family of Justinian ; Mauricius (582-602), a Kappadokian by descent ; and the blood-thirsty Phokas (602-610).

It was about this time that another barbarous tribe, the Avars, a race of Turkish stock, appeared before Constantinople, and inflicted unspeakable woes upon the nation. Peace was finally bought at a great sacrifice and humiliation. Still greater misfortunes befell his unhappy subjects from the hands of Phokas, one of those tyrants who respect no law, either human or divine. The murders which Phokas and his associates committed baffle enumeration ; and the hippodrome itself, the sacred asylum of the liberty and the pleasures of the Romans, was polluted with heads, limbs, and mangled bodies. Finally Phokas attempted to destroy his

own son-in-law, Crispus, and the latter sought the assistance of Heraklius, exarch of Africa, which province, like that of Egypt, had refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Phokas. Heraklius intrusted the dangerous enterprise to his son, also named Heraklius; and the latter, in 610, came with a powerful fleet and army to Constantinople, deposed Phokas, and surrendered him to the infuriated people, who, after inflicting upon him every variety of insult and torture, beheaded him and cast his mangled trunk into the flames.

Rise of Mohammedanism.

The voice of the clergy, the senate, and the people invited Heraklius to ascend the throne, and his posterity till the fourth generation continued to reign over the empire of the East. In 627, after many brilliant actions, Heraklius inflicted so severe a defeat upon the Persians that their empire was "nearly crushed"; but almost at the same time arose in the Arabian peninsula an unexpected and more terrible opponent—Mohammedanism—whose conflict with Hellenism continues to this day. The Mohammedans of Arabia wrested from the empire Syria, Egypt, and northern Africa. Twice they laid siege to Constantinople, but were each time driven off.

Heraklius began to reign at the age of thirty-six, and kept the sovereignty to the end of his life, which occurred thirty years later. "Of all the characters conspicuous in history, that of Heraklius," says Gibbon, "is one of the most extraordinary and inconsistent. In the first and last years of a long reign the emperor appears to be the slave of sloth, of pleasure, or of superstition—the careless and impotent spectator of the public calamities. But the languid mists of the morning and evening are separated by the brightness of the meridian sun; the Arcadius of the palace arose the Cæsar of the camp; and the honor of Rome and Heraklius was gloriously retrieved by the exploits of his campaigns."

Without attempting to criticise the opinion of so emi-

nent a historian, we will only remark that Heraklius, after crushing his enemies, both Avar and Persian, seemed destined to pass his last years in peace. Already ambassadors from the extreme west and east hastened to congratulate him upon his achievements. But while, conscious that he had by his victories secured his dominions against every enemy, he hoped during the remainder of his life to devote his energies to the prosperity of his empire, suddenly a terrible antagonist, issuing from the Arabian peninsula, proceeded to nullify all his great triumphs, claiming that both the victors and the conquered should yield to the might of a new prophet and a new creed. This prophet was Mohammed.

Mohammed was born at Mecca in 569 or 571, began to preach at the age of forty, was forced to flee from his native city to Medina, returned afterward in triumph to Mecca, and spread and established his religious tenets in Arabia until his death in June, 632. The dogmatic part of the Mohammedan religion, which was destined to bring under its influence numberless people and vast countries, was very simple. This religion was called *Islám*, meaning *devotion* (whence its followers were called *Mosleman*, corrupted into *Musulman* or *Mussulman*), and was limited to two dogmas—the belief in a future life and in the unity of God. The latter was expressed in the following words: “THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD, AND MOHAMMED IS THE APOSTLE OF GOD.” Mohammed rejected the mystery of the Trinity, partly because he could not reconcile it with the unity of God, and partly because it did not suit the designs of the new prophet. His object was to leave God isolated in heaven, without any direct relation to humanity, while he proclaimed himself a *new* apostle destined to finish the work of his predecessors. He was ambitious to reconcile his doctrine with the two former monotheistic religions, the Christian and the Jewish. To this end he speaks reverentially of the Psalms, the Gos-

pel, Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, and Jesus, upon whom he especially lavishes praises, so that one could never have supposed that so fierce an antagonism would have arisen between Christianity and Islamism. He would not accept the Virgin Mary as the mother of Christ; but he declared that she, the sister of Moses, his own wife Ayesha and his daughter Fatima, were the four purest and holiest women of this world. He asserted that Jesus Christ, the son of Mary, was truly the apostle of God, His Word, who abode in the heart of Mary, the Spirit emanating from Him, worthy of every honor both in the present and future life, and that He came the nearest of all to God; but at the same time he professed that he himself was sent to bring back the Jews and Christians to the way they had abandoned, adding that both Christ and Moses rejoiced at the coming of a prophet destined to show himself more glorious than either. Mohammed presented future life in pictures and promises best calculated to deceive the vulgar mind. His ceremonial and moral precepts enjoined simply circumcision, cleansing, fasting, pilgrimage to Mecca, prayers, and almsgiving.

These were the elements of the new faith; and it is evident that, had Mohammed limited himself to these only, the spread of his religion would have met with much greater difficulty. But the lofty genius of the man added certain principles and opinions which easily explain the long triumph which his new dogmas attained. The Koran, the sacred book of Islam, contains many precepts respecting freedom of worship. It teaches that both the faithful and the followers of the Jewish and the Christian religions—in a word, all believing in God and in the day of judgment—will be rewarded by the Lord. “Do not force any one to a religion: the true road is easily distinguished from the bad.” “He who believes in a God and not in idols is sustained by a mighty pillar.” Referring to the Christians and the Jews, whom the Koran calls “men of the Bible,” it says, “Our God and

yours is the same." But creeds most akin often become the most antagonistic, just as strifes among relatives and in families are usually the bitterest. So this same Koran contains precepts fostering a spirit of deadly enmity between Islam and Christianity. "He who refuses to believe in Islam is more worthless than the beast before God; he will receive the punishment of his impiety, and will be punished with eternal fire." "Call forth the Jews and Christians to accept Islamism." "Fight your enemies in the struggle for religion." Thus the Koran, after saluting Christianity and Judaism as brothers, afterward despises them just as much as the idolaters, and finally invites Islamism to crush them. It recommends to the faithful to sacrifice their property and their blood in behalf of their faith, promising that they shall obtain the blessings of heaven, and shall live for ever in the habitation which God has prepared for them. "The sword is the key to heaven: one drop of blood shed in behalf of God, one sleepless night passed in arms for him, will be of more avail in the sight of God than two months of fasting and of prayer." "He who falls in battle will obtain the forgiveness of his sins." "In the last day his wounds will be bright and fragrant; wings of angels and the cherubim will replace the members which he lost; heavenly beauties, called *houris*, will reward his bravery and faith."

Such were the doctrines, opinions, and precepts of the new religion which made its appearance in the beginning of the seventh century in Arabia. It was not a passive religion—a religion which patiently and calmly waited to be espoused. It was, on the contrary, most energetic, having for its fundamental principle its extension by the sword. It satisfied all the material appetites and aspirations of man, and hence it spread over a large part of the world, while Judaism, in many respects closely akin to it, remained for ever stagnant with a few followers. Christianity, indeed, has a cosmopolitan character entirely foreign to Judaism. But, by

its principles of equality, of liberty, of love for one's neighbor, of the immortality of the soul, of judgment and of reward, Christianity addressed itself to the noblest, most moral, most intelligent needs of humanity ; while Islamism satisfied the humblest, most material, most carnal aspirations and dispositions. Christianity was suited to a society morally and intellectually advanced ; Islamism was wonderfully adapted to nations in the lowest degrees of civilization. The races which it met at the outset—the Arabian, the Persian, the Turkish, and the African—were much better fitted than the Christians to understand and espouse its doctrines and precepts. Hence the only nation which at that time offered any resistance to it was the Hellenic, which, both by its nature and civilization, was eminently Christian.

Conflict between Islamism and Christianity.

The first serious hostilities between Islamism and Christianity began immediately after the death of Mohammed. The fortune of Syria was decided in two great battles—first on the plain of Aiznadin in the south of Palestine in 634, and a second time in the same year on the banks of the Yermuk, east of the lake of Tiberias. The ferocious Arab general Khaled addressed only a few words before the latter battle to his soldiers. “Paradise,” he cried, “is before you, and the fire of hell behind you !” The battle was severely and resolutely fought for a long time. Thrice did the Byzantine cavalry repulse the enemy, but finally the stubborn enthusiasm of the Mohammedans prevailed, and the Christians betook themselves to flight. Jerusalem was captured shortly after, and the victories of the Mohammedans were crowned in 640 by the conquest of Upper Egypt. In October of the same year they laid siege to Alexandria. This great commercial city had an abundant supply of provisions, many strong forts, and the completest of defensive armament. Its inhabitants fought bravely, and could receive

assistance by sea ; but unfortunately Heraklius about this time died of dropsy. At length, after a siege of fourteen months, and a loss of twenty-three thousand men, the Arabs prevailed ; the Greeks embarked, dispirited and diminished in numbers, for Constantinople, while the standard of Mohammed was planted on the walls of the capital of Egypt.

However lacking in energy and ability Heraklius appeared toward the end of his life, it must not be forgotten that, in the vigor of youth, he achieved successes capable of imparting an imperishable glory to his memory. It is true that subsequent misfortunes detracted from his historic fame, especially since his life was related by ignorant and cold chronographers and poets, whom no one reads without disgust. The ten thousand Greeks who fought under Cyrus were compelled to retreat without accomplishing their object. Their expedition, however, became immortal, because Xenophon the historian related it. Hannibal finally failed, but his great deeds won the admiration of the world because they were related by the inspired pen of Polybius. Heraklius would certainly have been clad with heroic panoply had he obtained such a witness and exponent of his achievements.

CHAPTER II.

CONSTANTINE IV TO LEO III.

Siege of Constantinople.

AFTER the death of Heraklius we find the obscure names of Constantine III (also called Heraklius II), Herakleonas, and Constans II. But the next emperor of real historic value was Constantine IV, surnamed Pogonatus or the *Bearded* (668-685). In 671 the caliph Moawiyah prepared a power-

ful fleet and dispatched it to Constantinople. This first siege of Constantinople by the Mohammedans is a memorable event; for had they captured the city at that time, the Hellenic nation would have been exterminated, as is evident from the misfortunes Hellenism suffered wherever the Mohammedan religion and rule prevailed. Hellenism wholly disappeared from Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and not long after from eastern and northern Africa. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks eight hundred years later certainly did not produce such fatal results; but the character of the Mohammedan conquest of the fifteenth century was widely different from that of the seventh. In the seventh it was essentially a religious conquest, in the fifteenth a political one.

The failure of the first siege of Constantinople, therefore, was of critical importance in the history of Hellenism, and its issue not less momentous to the human race. Had the Mohammedans then captured the great rampart of Christianity in the East, no nation in Europe would have been able to escape the oncoming deluge—neither the weak Slavic tribes nor the divided and wrangling Goths and Franks. In the beginning of the following century the Arabs crossed into Spain, routed in one great battle in 711 the Gothic rulers of that country, became masters of the entire peninsula, crossed the Pyrenees, and were finally defeated in 732, in a terrific battle, by Charles Martel. Western writers generally attribute the safety of Europe to this great achievement, forgetting that within the preceding sixty years the same danger twice threatened Europe from another point of its horizon, and was averted only by the courageous, persistent, and ingenious defense which Hellenic Christianity opposed to the armies and fleet of the Arabs. Again, the peril in 672 was much greater than that of 732, and it may therefore with justice be claimed that Constantine Pogonatus, by repelling the forces of Moawiyah, exercised a potent influence in the formation of modern civilization.

But while this siege is an event of such great importance, the accounts we have of it are exceedingly meager and unsatisfactory. It lasted for seven years, but was not carried on uninterruptedly throughout this time. It began early in the month of April, and continued until September. On the approach of winter the besiegers retreated fourscore miles from the capital, to the isle of Kyzikus, in which they had established their magazine of spoils and provisions. So persevering were they, that they repeated in the six following summers the same plan of attack and retreat, until finally they were forced to relinquish the fruitless enterprise in 675. Thirty thousand of the Arabs were obliged to retreat through Asia Minor to Syria, because their fleet, much of which had already been destroyed, was not sufficient to carry all their vast army. Their ships, however, were overwhelmed by a severe storm, while the land army was pursued and utterly annihilated.

The most difficult question in regard to this periodical siege is not why the Arabs were unable to reduce Constantinople after their splendid achievement in the conquest of Alexandria, but how their fleet was able to withstand the Hellenic naval forces, strengthened as they were by the terror and efficacy of the Greek or liquid fire.

The Greek Fire.

Kallinikus, a famous chemist and engineer, a native of Heliopolis in Syria, came to Constantinople, bringing with him the secret of compounding and directing the artificial flame invented by him. The skill of Kallinikus, says Gibbon, was equivalent to the succor of fleets and armies. It would seem that the principal ingredient of this celebrated fire was *naphtha*, mingled with sulphur and with the pitch that is extracted from evergreen firs. From this mixture, which produced a thick smoke and a loud explosion, proceeded a fierce and obstinate flame, which not only rose in per-

pendicular ascent, but likewise burned with equal vehemence in descent or lateral progress ; instead of being extinguished, it was nourished and quickened by water ; sand and vinegar were the only available agents for diminishing the fury of this powerful substance, which was justly denominated by the Hellenes the *liquid* or the *maritime* fire. It was employed with equal effect by sea and land, in battles or in sieges. It was poured from the ramparts in large boilers, or launched in red-hot balls of stone and iron, or darted in arrows and javelins, twisted round with flax and tow saturated with the inflammable oil ; sometimes it was deposited in fire-ships ; but it was most commonly blown through long tubes of copper, which were planted on the prow of a galley, and fancifully shaped into the mouths of savage monsters, that seemed to vomit a stream of consuming flame. Neither iron nor stone could oppose its terrible energy. This important art was preserved at Constantinople as the palladium of the state ; its composition was concealed with the most jealous care, and the terror of enemies was increased by their ignorance and surprise. The use of Greek fire continued until the middle of the fourteenth century, when it entirely ceased. In modern times many attempts have been made to discover its chemical composition, but without success. It appears incomprehensible how the Arabs could withstand for so long a time the efficacy of such a weapon. Possibly the Byzantines had not yet perfected this energetic and destructive means of defense, as Kallinikus may have brought it to Constantinople during the last period of the siege.

Constantine devoted the last years of his life to the re-establishment of religious unity in his empire. To this end he convoked at Constantinople in 680 the sixth œcumenical council, which declared that the church has always recognized in Christ two natures, united but not confounded—two wills, distinct but not antagonistic. The emperor sanctioned these resolutions by a royal edict. By these two

greatest acts of Constantine, the deliverance of Europe from the threatened Arabian conquest and the reëstablishment of religious union, he rendered his reign one of the most memorable, not only in the history of Hellenism, but in that of the world.

Justinian II, Rhinotmetus.

After the decease of Constantine, the inheritance of the Eastern scepter devolved upon his son Justinian II (685-695), then a youth of sixteen. Justinian was not endowed with the military talents of his progenitor, but he possessed a much greater amount of courage and energy. The emperor, however, ascended the throne when "a mere lad," and surrendered himself at once to the fury of his passions, so that his courage was changed into savageness and his energy into foolish meddlesomeness.

Religious dissensions more formidable than ever before arose, and the emperor was finally compelled to summon in 691 a council, which issued one hundred and two regulations, six of which the Western church refused to accept. Two of these six were of cardinal importance, and led to the severance of religious relations between the East and the West—the thirteenth, which permitted the marriage of priests, and the eighty-sixth, which declared the equality of the pope of Rome and the patriarch of Constantinople. The justice of these claims is evident from the fact that the Catholics themselves, having during the sixteenth century advanced in education and civilization, and having more logically examined these questions, inscribed these two edicts on the banner of Protestantism, which they unfurled against papal claims, and which finally caused the religious separation of northwestern and southwestern Europe.

The barbarous acts and cruelties of Justinian surpassed the measure of human forbearance, and he was accordingly ejected from the throne, his nose was amputated (on account of which he was called Rhinotmetus or Cut-nose), and he was

banished to the land of the Chersonites in Crim-Tartary. Leontius, a general who had greatly distinguished himself in the war against the Arabs, was proclaimed emperor.*

Leontius—Tiberius Absimarus.

The Arabs, availing themselves of the anomalous state of the Eastern Empire, once more invaded Africa, and expelled the Greeks entirely from that land (698). Carthage was delivered to the flames, and the colony of Dido and Cæsar lay desolate above two hundred years, till a part of the old circumference was repeopled by the first of the Fatimite caliphs. The reign of Leontius was of short duration (695-698), for he was in turn dethroned and mutilated by the rebel Absimarus, who assumed the more respectable name of Tiberius. The reign of Tiberius is especially memorable on account of the military achievements of his brother Heraklius, whom he had appointed general of Asia Minor. Taking advantage of the disturbances which had broken out among the Arabs in Persia, Heraklius in the year 700 invaded Syria, and killed, as many chroniclers assert, more than two hundred thousand Arabs. In 702 he again routed the Arabs, and drove them away from Kilikia; and when two years later they attempted to invade that country, Heraklius marched against them, and is said to have destroyed in one battle more than twelve thousand.

While the Christian arms thus triumphed in Asia, an unexpected enemy made his appearance in the north, endangering the very existence of the Christian world. This enemy was no other than Justinian II, who ten years before had been banished from his kingdom. Brooding revenge, he escaped from the land of the Chersonites (the modern Sebastopol) to the hordes of the Khazars, who pitched their tents

* We thus perceive that, although the government was a hereditary monarchy in theory, the diadem was often conferred upon the ablest of the political and military men of the nation.

between the Tanais and Borysthenes. Their khan entertained with pity and respect the royal suppliant, and gave him his sister in marriage, who seems, from her name of Theodora, to have received the sacrament of baptism. But the faithless Khazar was soon tempted by the gold of Constantinople ; and had not the design been revealed by the conjugal love of Theodora, her husband must have been assassinated or betrayed into the power of his enemies. After strangling with his own hands the two emissaries of the khan, Justinian sent back his wife to her brother, and embarked on the Euxine in search of new and more faithful allies. His vessel encountered a violent tempest, and one of his pious companions advised him to deserve the mercy of God by a vow of general forgiveness if he should be restored to the throne. "Of forgiveness?" replied the intrepid tyrant. "May I perish this instant—may the Almighty overwhelm me in the waves—if I consent to spare a single head of my enemies!" He survived this impious menace, sailed into the mouth of the Danube, trusted his person in the royal village of the Bulgarians, and purchased the aid of Terbelis, a pagan conqueror, by the promise of his daughter (by a former wife) and a fair partition of the treasures of the empire.* Having mustered a large army of Slavs and Bulgarians, he marched against Constantinople, and, with the connivance of many confederates in the city, easily became master of the capital (A. D. 705).

Second Period of the Reign of Justinian II.

The second period of the reign of Justinian forms one of the most lamentable epochs of Byzantine history. A veritable madness seemed to have taken possession of the tyrant, and like a maniac he committed murders almost unparalleled in atrocity. Never was a vow more rigorously performed than the sacred oath of revenge which Justinian had

* Gibbon.

sworn amid the storms of the Euxine. The two usurpers were dragged, the one from his prison, the other from his palace, and put to death with slow tortures. The glorious bulwark of the nation, the victory-crowned Heraklius, was beheaded with many of his fellow soldiers before the walls of Constantinople. The patriarch Kallinikus was blinded and banished to Rome, while hundreds of men in civil and military stations were put to death by the severest tortures. Neither private virtue nor public service could expiate the guilt of active, or even passive, obedience to an established government; and during the seven years of his new reign he considered the axe, the cord, and the rack as the only instruments worthy of royalty.

Meanwhile the vital interests of the nation were wholly neglected. No care was taken against a possible attack of the Arabs, who had now reached the height of their power. This mighty enemy, steadily surrounding Christianity, had apparently but to stretch out its arms and seize Asia Minor and Thrace. Justinian, nevertheless, expended the revenues of his people in a lawless civil strife, which resulted in general anarchy. And yet, so great was the force of Eastern Christianity, that after the cessation of civil hostilities the Arabian nation still possessed with reference to the Christian empire only the same boundaries as before.

But the hour of the tyrant's fall was approaching. Having determined to put to the sword all the Chersonites who had refused to lend him assistance during his exile, he dispatched against them in 710 an army of one hundred thousand men, with instructions that no Chersonite should be spared. "All are guilty, and all must perish," was the mandate of Justinian. The command of the army was given to his favorite Stephen, who was recommended by the epithet of the Savage. Yet even the savage Stephen imperfectly accomplished the intentions of his sovereign, for he is said to have allowed many prominent citizens to escape,

and to have spared the infants. More than seventy-three thousand men, however, under command of Stephen, are said to have perished by a severe storm which overtook the fleet on its return to Constantinople. But even this terrible disaster did not appall the maniac, and a second expedition was ordered to extirpate the remains of the proscribed colony. Meanwhile the Chersonites had returned to their city, and were prepared to die in arms; they also invested one Bardanes, under the name of Philippikus, with the purple. The imperial troops, unwilling to execute the revenge of Justinian, made common cause with Philippikus; and shortly afterward Justinian, deserted by his guards, fell under the stroke of an assassin. His son Tiberius had taken refuge in a church; but the popular fury was deaf to the cries of humanity, and the race of Heraklius was extinguished after a reign of one hundred years (A. D. 711).

Philippikus—Anastasius II.

Philippikus reigned only a year and a half, and hence we can not accurately judge concerning his political and military abilities. He was murdered in his chamber in 713, and on the following day the senate and the people promoted Artemius from the office of secretary to that of emperor. Artemius assumed the name of Anastasius II, and his reign (713-716) was short and troubled. He appointed men of ability to the various offices of the empire, and allotted the government of the East to Leo, one of the most distinguished generals of that age.

Rumors were already rife that the Arabs were preparing for a new expedition against Constantinople. Their naval preparations were on a colossal scale, and whole forests were cut down on the slopes of Mount Lebanon to be used for the construction of ships. Anastasius ordered his fleet to repair to the island of Rhodes, and to sail thence against the coasts of Phœnicia, burn the wood, and otherwise prevent the

Arabs from their intended expedition. By a mutiny of the commanders of the fleet, Anastasius was deposed, and an obscure officer of the revenue, Theodosius III, was invested with the purple against his own will. The deposed emperor, reluctant to shed Christian blood, retreated after a few months of naval war to a monastery, and exchanged the royal for the clerical garb. Leo, however, refused to recognize the newly elected sovereign, and the latter in turn surrendered the scepter to the general of the Oriental troops.

Leo III, the Isaurian.

Shortly afterward the threatened danger burst upon the empire, and the Arabs arrived before the walls of Constantinople. Two divisions of their fleet, composed of eighteen hundred ships under command of Moslemas, steered against the capital of the East. The vast fleet with which this new Xerxes covered the Hellenic sea anchored partly on the coast opposite Chalkedon, and partly on the European side of the Thracian Bosphorus. The larger and heavier of their transport-vessels were becalmed in the midst of the current; and Leo, noticing this from the heights of the Acropolis—i. e., from *Sarai-Mpournoti*—dispatched fire-ships, which either burned or sunk the vessels of the enemy. This first brilliant achievement of the Hellenic fleet inspired the inhabitants of the capital with great courage. When later the winter set in, the Arabian army suffered extremely. The cold of 717–718 was unusually severe. For a hundred days the earth was covered with snow; a large number of men, horses, camels, and other domestic animals of the hostile camp, perished from cold and hunger. But the chief of the Arabs did not lose courage. Two new fleets, from Egypt and Africa, came to his aid, both of which were manned by Christian sailors whose fathers, owing to religious dissensions and persecutions, had formerly espoused Islamism. But the present crews, having experienced no such hostility, and finding themselves

suddenly before the great capital of Christendom, were drawn by an irresistible power to the religion of Christ. Hence they rowed with stout hearts and ready hands toward the capital, shouting and hailing the emperor. Nor was the loss of the Arabs limited to this only. Fire-ships were sent against their fleet, and their land forces suffered about the same time a severe defeat.

The situation of Moslemas was now precarious. Famine was carrying off the bravest of his warriors, and he finally made preparations to retreat. His fleet was overtaken by two severe storms, and all the ships excepting ten went to the bottom with their crews. Of these ten, five were captured by the Byzantines, so that only five escaped to Syria to report the greatness of the disaster. The destruction of the Arabs was appalling; they had lost twenty-five hundred ships and more than five hundred thousand warriors.

This was one of the happiest epochs of mediæval Hellenism. The victorious songs of Constantinople resounded throughout Europe, which acknowledged that it owed its safety to the great struggles of the Christians in the East. In his enthusiasm, Pope Gregory II sent the image of the emperor of the Hellenes to all the rulers of the West.

The high-minded and energetic Leo had apparently secured his dominions from all dangers. The long anarchy which had lasted for more than twenty-five years had ceased. All omens appeared propitious, and no one could have foretold that the empire was soon to be exposed to a great religious and social agitation. Leo was not only the chief of a new dynasty; he was likewise the creator of a reformation which for half a century shook from its very foundations the Christian world of the East.

CHAPTER III.

LEO III TO LEO V.

State of the Eastern Empire.

IN the beginning of the eighth century the extent of the Eastern Empire had been greatly reduced ; but it was still the broadest, richest, and best of all the existing Christian governments. Constantinople was still the metropolis of the civilized world, and no other city, ancient or modern, can give us an idea of the Queen City during the eighth century, combining as it did the Hellenic, Roman, Christian, and Asiatic memories and customs. The commodities of Asia, Africa, Scythia, Italy, France, Germany, Spain, and Britain found a ready sale in that center of commerce and activity. Various cities also in Hellas, such as Patras, Corinth, and Thebes, flourished wonderfully during the eighth and ninth centuries ; and the costly carpets and exquisite silk, linen, and purple garments of these places were known throughout the world. In fine, Hellas presents during these centuries a surpassing degree of prosperity and energy ; and the opinion of Fallmerayer and his followers that Hellas, conquered by the Slavs during the sixth century, suffered such a sweeping devastation that up to the tenth she was a veritable Scythic desert, is a phantom of the imagination, dispelled by indisputable events. Korkyra alone during the twelfth century contributed to the public treasury a revenue amounting to about 1,840,000 drachmæ of to-day. Asia Minor also, with the adjacent islands, possessed many large and flourishing cities, strong forts, and a numerous and warlike population, which often stopped the Mohammedan flood.

Such, in brief, was the state of Christianity in the East at the time when Leo III, having defeated the Mohammedan armies, turned his attention to the civil government.

Material prosperity, however, does not suffice for the welfare of nations. There is need also of moral qualities. Christianity in the East was not wanting in commercial, industrial, and naval dexterity ; was not deprived of scientific and practical engineers ; was not destitute of warlike courage ; for, without these, she could not have created so many resources, and could not have opposed for so long a time her many enemies. Two things, however, were lacking—a liberal mind and a generous spirit, which engender patriotism and national ambition, and give an impetus to science, art, and speech, developing all the latent forces of the community. A liberal mind and a generous spirit are often the attributes of nations during their youth, as for instance of the Hellenic in its heroic years. But when nations are governed by positive social, political, and civil laws, their intellectual advancement mainly depends on the character of these laws. In other words, two things regulate the fortunes of nations, as well as of individuals—nature and education.

Laws never existed that were better adapted to the preservation and growth of national spirit and thought than those that regulated the public and private life of ancient Hellenism from the seventh to the fourth century B. C. But these laws could not long be maintained, for reasons which we have elsewhere explained. A domineering monarchy succeeded the formerly independent communities. Under this new state of affairs, the Hellenic nation conquered the East, and effected the Hellenization of the people living therein. It bestowed upon them its language, learning, art, and industry, but not the moral virtues, of which it was itself then in want. To all appearances the East was Hellenized, but neither the East nor Hellas escaped the Roman rule. By their intelligence, learning, and art, the conquered people also Hellenized the Romans ; yet they lacked sufficient force to impart a new moral and intellectual energy to the third phase of Hellenic life. It is true that, in the mean

time, Christianity arose, which taught principles and opinions best of all calculated to ennoble the mind and strengthen the heart. But certain of the external forms and regulations of Christianity were abused to such an extent that they did not always respond to its fundamental principles. The excessive growth of monastic life, for instance, deprived the energetic portion of society of very many valuable men. Many abuses of external worship also contributed much to wither the moral and intellectual forces of those who remained in the world. It is true that often the monasteries furnished to the sick, to the poor, and to the weary traveler the aid and protection which could nowhere else be found. They were often, in political and social storms, the safe refuge of letters, arts, and sciences. But it is nevertheless true that, on account of monastic life, military duty, agriculture, and industry were deprived of its strongest arms at a time when the community especially had need of all its forces to oppose its numerous enemies.

Again, the worship of the Christians was at first very simple. They had neither churches nor images; the people gathered in private houses to offer short and simple prayers to God. But as time advanced and the new doctrine spread among the multitude, and came into hostility with existing governments, it was found necessary, in order to attract people accustomed to different types of worship, to erect costly buildings, and to enlarge and regulate the service by various new initiatory and preparatory prayers. The officiating ministers were distinguished into upper and lower grades, and were adorned by many costly ecclesiastical garments. The number of festive days increased, and manifold honors were granted to the founders and defenders of the faith. Later still the church was adorned with images of the Saviour and of Mary, and of the martyrs and heroes of religion—an innovation which caused serious abuses and misunderstandings. Holidays were so multiplied, that not a

day passed without the celebration of one or more of the martyrs of the church; the service became so long, that those attending regularly did so at the expense of their other occupations, and the direct worship offered to the images overshadowed the sentiment due to the Most High. Often miraculous powers were attributed to the pictures themselves. Men kissed them, placed them on their head, eyes, and bosom, made before them the sign of the cross, knelt, prayed, and in fine rendered to them all the attributes of direct worship. It is no wonder, therefore, that both the Jews and Mohammedans called the Christians idolaters.

These various abuses acted destructively on the national, social, and political life. While the liberal mind and generous spirit had long ago disappeared from the nation, while its social and political laws were ill adapted to elevate the mind and fortify the soul, while the only moral mainspring was religion, the latter was daily withered by misunderstandings and abuses, and the nation was gradually falling into a great paralysis. What a difference from the regulations imposed by St. Paul on the Thessalonians! Again, the numerous exercises of worship not only engendered idleness and its various pernicious results, they also stifled the spirit of the fundamental teachings of Christ. The miraculous power which was attributed to most of the sacred objects gave rise to the supposition that it would suffice to carry or have near by one of those images, in order to be free from danger or moral obligation. Superstition was rampant. In 716 the Christians, while Pergamus was besieged by the Mohammedans, tore open a woman, believing that by this hideous sacrifice they would appease the Most High. By this union of idleness and superstition, all the forces of human energy were misdirected, especially since learning was principally in the hands of the monks, who with a few exceptions confirmed the youth in the popular errors.

It is no wonder, therefore, that spiritual life was withered

and the customs of the people were barbarized. It is no wonder that nothing generous was produced, either in speech after the immortal masterpieces of Gregory, Basil, and Chrysostom, or in art after the erection of St. Sophia, or in practical science after the inventions of the chemist Kallinikus. Society, however, had not wholly passed into such degradation as to ignore the danger threatening the nation. Various attempts had already been made to eradicate image-worship, and large bodies of citizens combined to effect many changes in the existing religious beliefs.

It was in the midst of these antagonistic factions and opinions that Leo III found himself after the defeat of the Mohammedans (A. D. 718). At first he hesitated what to do ; but finally, seeing that the more thoughtful part of society longed for a reformation, he issued a decree in 726 forbidding the worship of images, and in 730 another banishing them entirely from the churches ; and he devoted the remainder of his life to the eradication of everything tending to debase the sacred ordinances of religion. These decrees divided the nation into the two intensely hostile parties of iconoclasts or image-breakers and image-worshippers, by whose contests it was long distracted. Leo died in the middle of 741, after a reign of twenty-five years ; and the Catholics who denounce his religious innovations are obliged to confess that they were undertaken with moderation and conducted with firmness. But the most glorious of his works, the laws which he enacted, seeking to infuse into the community the most Christian social principles—the laws by which he took from the clergy public instruction and surrendered it to the people—the laws, finally, by which he showed himself superior to his century—these laws were abrogated and despised. The most lofty-minded of legislators was represented as the most miserable of malefactors. How strange indeed are the opinions of this world ! How many praises and insults were heaped on the legislative works of Justin-

an, all of which tended to render his name famous! His legislative works, however, were more or less the systematic arrangement of older principles and ordinances, while those of Leo favored the completest reformation, having emitted rays of truths destined to warm and enlighten the nations of our time.

Constantine V.

The son and successor of Leo, Constantine V (741-775), not only remained faithful to the principles of his father, but attacked with even much greater zeal the images of the church. In 746 he invaded the north of Syria, defeated the Arabs, captured several of their cities, and rendered important service to the Christians of that region. In the following year he dispatched a powerful fleet to Kyprus, which, by the aid of the Greek fire, almost annihilated the Arabian fleet, composed of one thousand boats. A terrible pestilence, however, not unlike that which had occurred during the reign of Justinian, broke out, and compelled him to forego further successes. The pestilence lasted three years, and the loss of life was so great that the emperor was forced to bring to Constantinople and the adjoining districts new inhabitants from the European and Asiatic provinces. Constantine died in September, 775, of a severe illness which he had contracted during an expedition against the Bulgarians. He was succeeded by his son Leo IV (775-780), a youth of feeble constitution both of mind and body, the principal care of whose reign was the settlement of the succession. Conscious of his own decline, he did not hesitate to declare his wife Irene guardian of the Roman world, and of their son Constantine VI.

Constantine VI.

Irene, the wife of Leo IV, was an Athenian. Her sole fortune must have consisted in her personal accomplishments, for she was an orphan, seventeen years old, when Leo chose her for his wife. The career of Irene presents

one of the most heartrending and bloody pictures of all that can be found in the history of the world. Her love of power was boundless, and to achieve her ends she spared neither friends nor foes. Ambition stifled every sentiment of humanity and nature, for she contrived to have her only son, Constantine, the rightful heir to the throne, arrested and conveyed to the porphyry apartment of the palace, where he was unluckily borne by his heartless mother. Once in her power, she deprived him of his sight, and, although he lived many years after, he was incapacitated from ever assuming the government.

Thus, after constant and various struggles, Irene succeeded in seizing the reins of power ; but she did not prove herself worthy of the place obtained by means of so much hypocrisy and lawlessness. The Mohammedans freely plundered Asia Minor, and peace was finally concluded on payment of heavy tribute. In this miserable condition matters stood at Constantinople at the time when the Mohammedans were led by the brave Haroun al-Rashid, and nearly all the West was ruled by the strong arm of the glorious Charlemagne. The undue influence given to the monks by Irene, who had restored image-worship ; the abolition of many just taxes, which impoverished the treasury ; the summary punishment inflicted on veterans who had risked their lives on the field of battle for the preservation and honor of the empire, finally aroused from their lethargy the active part of society, and Irene was deposed and banished to Lesbos. The moving spirit of this daring action was Nikephorus, the great treasurer of the empire, who was invested with the purple.

Nikephorus I.

The first act of Nikephorus (802-811) was to regulate the relations of the empire with the powerful dynast of the West. At the same time he wrote a short and pithy letter to Haroun, declaring that he would not pay the tribute agreed

upon with Irene. To this Haroun replied much more laconically that he would himself bring the answer. The caliph crossed in the middle of winter the snow-clad Taurus, entered Asia Minor, and a great battle was fought near Krasus in Phrygia, in which not less than forty thousand soldiers under Nikephorus were killed. The emperor was finally compelled to retreat, but the Arabs also sustained so severe a loss that they were in turn obliged to withdraw to their own territories. Several other engagements were fought, by which Nikephorus freed his empire from tribute.

In the mean time the Bulgarians, availing themselves of the anarchy prevailing in the empire for the last twenty-five years, began to "show their teeth," as one of the ancient chroniclers puts it. Nikephorus marched against them; and, although he was defeated, yet the defeat was honorably covered by the death of the emperor and a great number of his officers and patricians.

Michael I—Leo V.

The successor of Nikephorus, Michael I, proved a weak ruler. If extreme mildness often becomes a private citizen, it is without question a grave defect in a public man. The Bulgarians continued to ravage and plunder the most fertile provinces of the empire, gradually advancing toward the capital itself. Michael led a large army against them, but at the very beginning of the battle gave the signal of retreat. The army was so wroth at this cowardice, that Michael finally concluded to abdicate in behalf of one of his generals, Leo V (813-820).

It became apparent at once that a powerful and strong arm had assumed the direction of affairs. But almost within a week after Leo's accession to the throne the Bulgarians appeared before the walls of Constantinople, and, having burned and destroyed all the churches, monasteries, palaces, and houses situated around the city, retreated to their terri-

tories. In the following spring Leo marched against them, surprised them while in disorder, and effected their complete ruin. No battle was fought, but a merciless slaughter took place. Leo forbade any captives to be taken, and spared neither old men, women, nor children.

Peace now prevailed throughout the empire, and Leo directed his energies to the recuperation of internal affairs. He forced the clergy to give up their political control, prohibited image-worship, caused the laws to be respected, placed the finances of the empire on a sound basis, and reorganized the army. Never was an army subjected to a more strict discipline. Leo himself led and exercised it, and knew the ability and value of each general and officer. He rebuilt many cities in Macedonia and Thrace, gave new life to agriculture, industry, and commerce, and variously developed the resources of the empire. He not only abolished the images from the churches, but also destroyed the songs and prayers addressed to them, and above all sought to develop the mind of the youth by a new educational system and new didactic books.

The reformation of the sixteenth century was a great event, not so much because it changed the types and forms of religion, but because it freed the human mind from its fetters, enthroned in the world the principles of liberty and accurate research, opened the road for modern science, sanctioned the impulse for progress, produced men like Bacon, and prepared the great intellectual movement of the eighteenth century, and the much greater political and social movement of our times. Certainly we could not expect such abundant fruits from the tree of the Hellenic reform of the eighth century, because its life was short, lasting only for about one hundred years; but during this period the national spirit was in some measure raised from the subtleties of the scholastic and typical method to the more enlightened laws of free conscience and research.

Leo, however, who had so greatly benefited his empire, not long afterward fell a victim to the inordinate ambition of one of his generals, Michael, whom the emperor had greatly befriended, but who, when about to be executed for conspiracy, was rescued and raised to the throne, Leo being murdered at the altar in church (Christmas day, 820).

CHAPTER IV.

THE DYNASTY OF MICHAEL II.

Michael II—Theophilus.

THE first difficulty against which Michael (820–829) had to contend was the question of the images. Most of the conspirators who had caused the death of Leo belonged to the party of the anti-reformers, or to those seeking the restoration of the pictures. In the mean time Thomas, a general and friend of Leo, escaped to the Arabs, mustered a force of eighty thousand barbarians, and marched against Constantinople to depose the usurper and avenge the murdered emperor. The situation of Michael was very precarious; but he finally succeeded in overcoming his enemies, taking a summary and fearful vengeance upon Thomas by means of the Greek fire, of which his adversaries were deprived, and by the assistance of his brave son Theophilus. The Mohammedans, however, profiting by the troubled condition of the Eastern Empire, succeeded in depriving it of two of its largest and most fertile islands, Krete and Sicily.

At the death of Michael II, which occurred eight years and nine months after he had ascended the throne, he was succeeded by his son Theophilus (829–842). One of the first acts of Theophilus was to inflict the punishment of death

on the murderers of Leo V. This act, as related by the logographers, has in its cruel justice the savageness rather of an Oriental despot than of the hegemon of a Christian and well-governed empire. In fine, throughout the career of Theophilus we find a nobleness of purpose blended with a relentless and savage disposition. He did not possess the religious indifference of his father, but devoted himself wholly to theological reformation, believing that by its success alone the safety of the empire could be secured. He forbade the word *holy* to be inscribed on the images, and also that they should be honored by prayers, kissing, or lighted tapers. He maintained that God alone is holy, and that the soul is truly purified when, free from all earthly surroundings, it raises itself to Him. His edicts astounded the monastic order, but did not crush it. Experience had shown that such decrees were not executed literally, and that the numerous classes of the people, assisted by the monks, finally thwarted the plans of the emperor, the more energetic through their opposition, and the others through their apathy. The empress Theodora herself privately worshiped images. Theophilus discovered it, but could not influence her to give up her religious notions. In the mean time he unfurled the banner of the cross against the Arabs; but his five expeditions were concluded by a signal overthrow. Armorium, the native city of his ancestors, was leveled to the ground, and from his military toils he derived only the surname of the Unfortunate. Thus, while Theophilus was compelled, on account of his love to his wife, to suffer the violation of his orders in the palace itself; while he was not able to suppress the opposition of the monks; while the higher social classes, which alone had espoused the reformation, began to weary of the long and unproductive strife—Theophilus, in the midst of these harassing troubles and perplexities, fell sick and died in the beginning of 842. His last words were in behalf of the reformation, recom-

mending to all to remain faithful to it if they desired the preservation of the empire.

The Successors of Theophilus.

The positive power of the government passed into the hands of the empress Theodora, assisted by her brother Bardas, her uncle Manuel, and one Theoktistus, an ardent anti-reformer. The sentiments of the empress concerning the images are already known. The pictures were again hung in the churches, and the monastic order more than ever before became potent both in society and government. The monks, who did not respect even the empress that befriended them, instituted a terrific persecution against the reformers. Their first victim was John Grammatikus, the late occupant of the patriarchal throne. Accused of having pulled out the eyes of an image, according to some he was deprived of his own eyesight, and according to others he was given two hundred lashes, such as were never before inflicted on the worst of malefactors! Two hundred lashes inflicted on the wisest and most virtuous man of that epoch—such was the first fruit of the return of the monks to power. Many others were deposed from office, punished, or exiled, including the learned bishop of Thessaly, and Leo the Mathematician, one of the ornaments of the Eastern Empire. Public education alone, which was taken from the hands of the monks, continued to thrive. But the genuine, the noble and brave spirit of liberty, which had for more than one hundred years inspired many eminent men in the government, the clergy, the community, and the army, had entirely disappeared.

A lamentable proof also of the great change was the education given to Michael, the first emperor since the abolition of the reformation. In the beginning of 842, when his father died, Michael was three years old. The infant had inherited, as it would seem, the violent temper of his father ;

but a suitable education could have moderated and even ennobled it. This should have been the first, the holiest duty of Theodora. Unfortunately, she intrusted this care to Bardas, who sought to foster and excite the most ignoble passions of the child, that he might render him unfit for the government and rule in his stead. He succeeded so well, that Michael became the most depraved of men, presenting a unique example of the change that human nature may suffer, abandoned to its own inclinations and impelled by an education adapted to confirm its basest tendencies. Suffice it to say that the worst characters in history seem holy compared with the monster created by Bardas and the satyrs that surrounded him. In the mean time the Mohammedans had occupied most of Sicily; the Franks had extended their dominions; Asia Minor was threatened by the Arabs, and the Peloponnesus by the Slavs. The only meritorious act which can be assigned to the reign of Michael is, that he permitted Bardas to raise the illustrious Photius to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. The genius of Photius may be understood when we consider that between the first Constantine, who established the Eastern Empire, and the last one, who died the death of a hero on the ramparts of Constantinople, no other name shines more resplendently in history than his. The conduct of Michael, however, became so odious that every citizen was impatient for the deliverance of the country from his rule. In the thirtieth year of his age, and in the hour of intoxication and sleep, Michael III was murdered in his chamber by the founder of a new dynasty, whom the emperor had raised to an equality of rank and power.

CHAPTER V.

THE MACEDONIAN DYNASTY—THE COMNENI.

The Reign of Basil I.

BASIL I, the Macedonian (867–886), was a native of Adrianople, and probably a Slavonian ; but he claimed descent from the Macedonian Alexander, and from the royal family of the Armenian Arsacidæ. In his infancy his family and the city were swept away by an inundation of the Bulgarians. He was brought up as a slave in a foreign land ; and in this severe discipline he acquired the hardiness of body and flexibility of mind which promoted his future elevation.* Obtaining his liberty, he went to Constantinople, and rose by degrees to the office of chief chamberlain to Michael III. Basil was not certainly a great man, yet he possessed a practical mind ; he was ambitious, and not afraid of difficulties ; and, above all, he was one of those characters whom rank ennobles. He applied himself earnestly and conscientiously to the improvement of his empire, and displayed an individual morality which even the strictest critics of the Byzantine period have not denied. Basil besides demonstrated what was the power of the Eastern Empire, when commanded by a man who knew how to avail himself of its resources. He defeated the Russians, checked the Moham-medans, humiliated the Arabs, and spread Christianity in the West among the Slavs. At the time of his death (August 29, 886), therefore, the Byzantine empire, if it had not regained all the countries of which it had been deprived during the preceding period, yet had successively routed its principal enemies ; and the Byzantine army was increased, drilled, and placed under capable leaders.

* Gibbon.

Leo VI.

Of the four sons of Basil, Constantine died before his father ; Stephen, the youngest, was content with the honors of a patriarch and a saint ; both Leo and Alexander were alike invested with the purple, but the powers of government were solely exercised by the elder brother. Leo VI (886-911) was a pupil of Photius, and had acquired all the learning of the age, but he did not inherit the practical ability of his father. He was surnamed the Philosopher, but he proved that mere learning, in the absence of every positive virtue, only renders wickedness more glaring and unjustifiable. He issued many wise regulations, but was himself the first of all to violate them ; while the cities of the empire were captured and destroyed by the Arabs, he composed speeches, prayers, religious hymns, and poems ; while the present circumstances were in a most precarious condition, he issued orders for the future ; and while his armies were routed, he copied the writings of the ancients concerning military tactics. In fact, he was the opposite of his father. The former was ignorant, but practical ; the latter learned, but devoid of judgment and sound wisdom. During his reign, therefore, the empire suffered greatly from the attacks of the Arabs, the Bulgarians, and the Russians. Its political recuperation, which had been undertaken by Basil, seemed to have proved abortive, especially since, on the death of Leo in 912, he was succeeded by his seven-years-old son Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus* (911-959), and thus the usual confusion of an imperial minority followed the inability of the former emperor.

* In the Greek language *purple* and *porphyry* are the same word. An apartment of the Byzantine palace was lined with porphyry ; it was reserved for the use of the pregnant empresses ; and the royal birth of their children was expressed by the appellation of *porphyrogenite*, or born in the purple. Several of the Byzantine princes had been blessed with an heir, but this peculiar surname was first applied to Constantine VII.

Indeed, for about one hundred and seventy years after the death of Leo, Byzantine history presents a sad picture of anarchy and devastation, the minute details of which astonish us at the folly and the lamentable incapacity of the men who were called upon to steer the imperial vessel. While the empire was externally attacked by the blood-thirsty Arab, the ruthless Bulgarian, or the rapacious and ignorant Russian, the generals of the Byzantine army were striving among themselves for power or authority. A few victories indeed were gained over the Arabs in Sicily and Syria, as well as over the Bulgarians; but what were these in comparison with the misfortunes the empire suffered both on account of external attacks and civil strifes? Superstition, the ancient disease of southern nations, was prevalent to a fearful extent. Usurpers believed that they could appease the anger of God for their nefarious and bloody deeds by building churches and monasteries. Myriads of men inflicted social death upon themselves by espousing a monastic life, especially at a time when a horde of worse foes than the Arabs found their way into the empire. These new-comers were neither Semitic nor Aryan, but Turanian, of a stock akin to the old Bulgarians, and to the Magyars or Hungarians. They were Turks, but of a tribe then far stronger—the Seljuks. The Seljuks were a nomad people, who knew nothing of a settled life. When they had devoured one district, they went on to plunder another. But the death-blow to the Byzantine empire did not come either from the Arab or the Bulgarian, the Russian or the Seljuk: it was dealt by the crusaders, whose incursions we shall presently relate.

Alexius I.

From this night of slavery a ray of freedom, or at least of spirit, begins to emerge. The Comneni—the first of whom, Isaac I, succeeded the last emperor of the Macedonian dynasty, Michael VI, in 1057—upheld for a while the

fate of the sinking empire. They were of Paphlagonian origin.* Alexius I (1081–1118), who came to the throne amid the violent storm which was threatening the very existence of the empire, was certainly the most illustrious scion of that great family. He had already given evidence of his exalted military genius by the many wars in which he had taken a leading part, and, though yet a young man, his name had become a terror to the enemy. Having therefore shown from early youth so much political and military wisdom, it was naturally hoped that, although half of Asia Minor was held by the Turks, the state of the empire would have been greatly benefited by his accession. A large army could yet be mustered from the European provinces; the resources of the nation were abundant, and Constantinople was still the first commercial port of the world. But, not long after ascending the throne, Alexius was informed that a most formidable enemy, the Norman Robert Guiscard, was ready to sail from the eastern coasts of Italy against the European provinces of the empire.

Robert Guiscard's Invasion.

The Normans, who did not perpetuate their name in any of the modern nations, exercised nevertheless, during the second half of the eleventh century, an important influence on civilization. Led by William the Conqueror, they subdued England, and gave rise to radical changes in its language, customs, and government. At the same time they were the principal cause of the subjection both of the Byzantine empire and of the church. Robert Guiscard, alleging that Constantine, the son and heir of the emperor Michael VII, and the betrothed of one of his daughters, had been unlawfully deprived of the throne of Constantinople and cast into prison, prepared a heterogeneous army of thirty thousand followers, thirteen hundred of whom were knights of Norman

* Gibbon believes that they were of Roman origin.

race, forming the sinews of the army, with which to avenge the insult cast upon his future son-in-law. On receipt of the news, Alexius began at once to prepare for the coming struggle. The condition of the empire was critical. The Turks were in Kyzikus and Nikæa; no regular army existed, the treasury was empty, and anarchy everywhere prevailed. But the genius of Alexius at once became manifest. He promptly took steps for the forming of an army, obtaining money, strengthening the forts, and securing allies against the approaching Norman foe. Robert conveyed his force in safety to the opposite coast of Epirus, and laid siege to Durazzo, the western key of the empire, although his forces had already suffered severe hardships. Part of his fleet was destroyed by a tempest, and the remainder by the Greek fire of the imperial galleys; communication with Italy was cut off; want of provisions produced a famine; a fearful pestilence was destroying the bravest of his warriors; the arrival of Alexius with a large army was daily expected. But the intrepid Norman did not lose his indomitable courage; every reverse made him only the more stubborn; and finally his wonderful pertinacity, which to this day arouses our admiration, was rewarded with success, for Durazzo fell into his hands (A. D. 1082). From Durazzo the Norman hero advanced into the heart of Epirus or Albania, traversed the first mountains of Thessaly, and approached Thessalonica; but as he was preparing to lead his victorious army before the capital itself, he received information which caused him to hasten back to Italy. In the spring of 1085 he again aspired to the conquest of Constantinople, but died in the seventieth year of his age, of an epidemic disease, in the isle of Kephallenia; and thus the empire was freed from a dreaded antagonist. The Norman army, deprived of its main support, soon after dispersed; and Durazzo, all the sea-coast forts, and the western islands, were recovered by the Byzantines.

The Crusades.

After the Norman war Alexius directed his attention to the Turks, who from the year 1043, when the serious complications between Greek and Turk began, did not cease to devastate the richest provinces of the empire. At the same time he undertook to reorganize the government, to form a well-disciplined army, to construct a powerful fleet, and to encourage art, science, industry, and commerce. But, in the midst of these endeavors, suddenly a storm burst from the West, the so-called *first crusade*.

Most Western writers assert that this crusade was undertaken at the instigation of the Byzantines, alleging that a hermit named Peter, a native of Amiens, in the province of Picardy in France, visited the holy sepulchre during 1093 and 1094, and, having witnessed the sufferings of the Christians at the hands of the Turks, returned bringing letters from the patriarch of Jerusalem, addressed to the pope and to the rulers of the West, imploring their aid; and that furthermore Alexius himself sought assistance through letters and ambassadors. This allegation, however, is false, especially with respect to Alexius. The Byzantine writers, and particularly Anna Comnena, make no such statement, but on the contrary regard it as altogether an unexpected and hostile attempt against the Byzantine empire. In fact, Anna Comnena attributes the movement solely to the "preaching" of Peter, and does not even make any mention of the "request by the patriarch of Jerusalem."* Again, the danger from the Mohammedans was not so serious at that time as to force him to sacrifice the dignity of the empire to an appeal for aid. How could Alexius implore the aid of the West, against which he had but recently fought? Would

* See book 10 of the "Alexias": Οὕτω δὲ μικρὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀναπαύσας, λογοποιουμένην ἠκηκόει ἀπείρων φραγκικῶν στρατευμάτων ἐπέλευσιν. Ἐδεδίδει μὲν οὖν τὴν τούτων ἔφοδον, etc.

he, of his own free will, introduce into the heart of the nation those who had but recently sought to overthrow his government, invaded on false pretenses the Hellenic territories, and had been driven away only after so many dangers and toils? Those who forged these letters, surpassing all the bounds of decency, represented Alexius not only as inviting the knights and barons of the West to plunder the public treasury and the mythical wealth of the inhabitants of the capital, but besides as describing the beauty of the Hellenic women, who were destined to reward the feats of their liberators! * Statements such as these need no refutation. The great movement of the West against the East, which lasted for about three centuries, forming one of the most memorable episodes of the world's history, was instigated by religious and political interests, and especially through the stubborn persistence of the popes of Rome in attempts to impose their supremacy on the Eastern church.

Peter the Hermit, on his return to Italy, was received as a prophet by Pope Urban II, who applauded his glorious design, promised to support it in a general council, and encouraged him to proclaim the deliverance of the Holy Land. Stimulated by the approbation of the pontiff, Peter traversed the provinces of Italy and France, arousing everywhere the greatest zeal against the Mohammedans, who were indeed an object of aversion on account of the lawless and barbarous arts committed by the Arabs in Spain. The appearance of Peter was well calculated to excite the fanaticism (or the martial spirit, as Western writers put it) of his hearers. His head and feet were bare, and his meager body was wrapped in a coarse garment; he bore a weighty crucifix; and the ass which he rode was sanctified in the public eye by the service of the man of God. He preached to innumerable crowds in the churches and the highways, and

* See "Thesaurus novus Anecdotorum"; also "Amplissima Collectio," and "Historia Hierosolymitana."

entered with equal confidence the palace and the cottage. In March, 1095, Urban summoned a council at Piacenza, which was numerously attended, and the wildest enthusiasm for marching against the Turks was manifested. In the month of November a second council was convened at Clermont in France, and as Pope Urban in a vehement exhortation urged the thousands who were present to march to the assistance of their persecuted brethren, those present with one voice exclaimed, "God wills it! God wills it!" "It is indeed the will of God," replied the pope; "and let this memorable word, the inspiration surely of the Holy Spirit, be for ever adopted as your cry of battle, to animate the devotion and courage of the champions of Christ. His cross is the symbol of your salvation; wear it, a red, a bloody cross, as an external mark, on your breasts or shoulders, as a pledge of your sacred and irrevocable engagement." The proposal was joyfully accepted; great numbers, both of the clergy and laity, affixed to their garments the sign of the cross, and the pope proclaimed a plenary indulgence to those who should enlist under the sacred banners.

While the great sovereigns of Europe were still occupied with their preparations, a vast throng, the lowest refuse of the people, "who mingled with their devotion a brutal license of rapine, prostitution, and drunkenness," pressed forward to the East. They committed such acts of rapacity and violence on their journey, that before arriving at the confines of the Byzantine empire numbers of them were destroyed by the enraged inhabitants of Hungary. Reaching Constantinople, they abused the hospitable entertainment of Alexius, for neither gardens, palaces, nor churches were safe from their depredations; so that Alexius soon came to fear these liberators more than the Turks themselves. The fate, however, of this first expedition of Christian Europe was sad indeed. Attacked by the great chief of the Turks, Kilidge-Arslan, the crusaders suffered a total defeat, and out of many

myriads three thousand only escaped. These also would have succumbed to Turkish valor had not Alexius, generously forgetting their depredations, sent them a fleet and an army, which brought them in safety to Constantinople.

As torrents, pouring down from several mountains, and following various courses, finally empty into one large river, so the different leaders of the West, advancing by separate routes, finally met before the gates of Constantinople, forming a vast camp, and marched to the capture of Jerusalem. On their way, the crusaders reduced two important cities, Nikæa and Antioch ; and Jerusalem itself fell into their hands (July 15, 1099). History seldom mentions so cruel a slaughter as these Christian liberators committed on taking the city. Neither sex nor age, nor the submission of the defeated, found grace before their eyes. Young children and infants were ruthlessly grasped by the feet and dashed against the walls or the ground. They mangled the bodies of the dead, and everywhere on the streets could be seen human heads and members heaped together without discrimination. By such acts these avengers of the Saviour and followers of his beneficent doctrines thought that they could please the Most High ! At the same time they violated their oaths to Alexius, for they instituted "a self-existing kingdom" in Syria, and appointed a patriarch of their own in Jerusalem.

The feats accomplished by the first crusade kindled such a wild enthusiasm throughout Europe, that in 1101 a swarm of pilgrims marched against the East ; but more than four hundred thousand were destroyed in Anatolia by famine, pestilence, and the Turkish arrows, while a mere handful escaped to Constantinople and Antioch.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LATIN AND TURKISH CONQUESTS.

The Second Crusade.

THE first crusade tended only to weaken the power of mediæval Hellenism, and to render more easy the final triumph of the Turks. But while Hellenism suffered such severe wounds, it recovered from the Turks during the reign of John Comnenus (1118–1143), the son and successor of Alexius, portions of its former possessions in Phrygia and Paphlagonia. He advanced with a great army against Cilicia and Syria also, but the treachery of the Latins forced him to turn back to Constantinople. Had the Latins assisted the Greeks on that occasion, John Comnenus could without doubt have freed both Asia Minor and Syria. Manuel Comnenus (1143–1181), the son and successor of John, also humbled the Turks both in Pamphylia and Cilicia, but was compelled to forego this line of success, because a new danger threatened him from the West, in 1147, in the second crusade.

The capture of Edessa, the strongest bulwark of the Latins in the East, by the Seljuks, was the cause of the second crusade. The leaders of this enterprise were Conrad III, king of Germany, and Louis VII, king of France. The ostensible intention of the crusaders was to free Eastern Christianity from the oppression of the Turks; but their ultimate object, as facts afterward showed, was the capture of Constantinople and the abolition of the Byzantine empire. Indeed, this plan was openly advocated among the leaders, but it was deemed best not to make any attempt on the capital for the present. Before Manuel, however, would allow a free passage through his provinces, both Conrad and

Louis swore that they would make the journey without injury and malice, pay for their supplies, and surrender to him all the cities they should capture from the Turks. But shortly afterward the crusaders refused payment for provisions, took what they required by force, and entered into open warfare with the inhabitants and the army. During the first crusade the Western armies succeeded at least in capturing certain cities of Syria; but on the present occasion they not only became masters of no city, but their failure was wholly inglorious, being relieved by no heroic deed whatever.

In 1147, while Conrad and Louis crossed the northern provinces, more as enemies than as allies, and forced Manuel to direct his attention to that quarter, Roger II, ruler of southern Italy and Sicily, marched against the southern countries of the empire, and ruthlessly plundered Thebes and Corinth. Such was the result of the second crusade, the advocates of which accused Manuel of having connived with the Turks for the overthrow of the Latins. Even were these allegations true, we could hardly blame the emperor for adopting this policy toward those who, while calling themselves soldiers of the cross, robbed the Christians, plotted for the capture of their capital, and laid waste the most flourishing cities of Hellas. In fact, the incidents immediately following will show that mediæval Hellenism required no aid from western Europe for the overthrow of the Turks.

While Manuel Comnenus was engaged in war with Roger, having dispatched an army to Sicily to punish him for his depredations, he gained at the same time many splendid victories over the Turks in Asia. In 1156 he compelled the famous Nureddin, before whom the Franks in Syria trembled, to sue for peace, and to return all his Christian captives (six thousand Franks and Germans, the miserable remnants of the second crusade), and to promise that he would follow the monarch of Constantinople in his wars

against Asia. In 1158 he forced the sultan of Iconium to accept the same conditions, and besides to surrender all the fortifications which he had captured since the beginning of the reign of Manuel. Who can doubt therefore that, if it had not been for the injury inflicted by the crusades, mediæval Hellenism would have early freed itself from the Mohammedans? Unfortunately, the incessant attacks of Europe, while they diminished the resources and weakened the forces of the empire, at the same time increased the bitter enmity felt in the East toward the Latins. The resources of the Hellenic power had become greatly enfeebled. Asia Minor, which for about eight hundred years had been its principal support, was now almost entirely ruled by the Turks; and Hellenism, thus attacked on both sides, could with difficulty maintain its political union. Besides, the Bulgarians had revolted and recovered their liberty, and thus the empire was deprived of one of its most fertile provinces.

The Crusaders in Constantinople.

In 1180 the last great Comnenus died, and the throne, after a short anarchy, was occupied by the dynasty of the Angeli, who did not show themselves equal to the emergency. Many provinces were gradually detached from the empire, and Pontus and Paphlagonia formed an independent kingdom under a Greek hegemon. In the midst of these events, two new thunderbolts successively fell from the West—the third and fourth crusades.

The overthrow of the Christian authority in Syria and the capture of Jerusalem on the 3d of October, 1187, by Saladin, the sultan of Egypt, called forth these movements. The third crusade did comparatively little harm to the empire, and it was at first supposed that the fourth would have been carried out in much the same spirit, since it was decided to transport the army to Egypt, and begin operations there against the Saracens. But Dandolo, doge of Venice,

who was at enmity with the Byzantine court, prevailed upon the leaders of the crusaders to attack the Queen City of the East.

Certain events had occurred in Constantinople well calculated to facilitate the designs of Dandolo. The various misfortunes which the empire had sustained for so long a time, not from the Turks, but from the Christians of southern Europe; began, as we already know, to exert an evil influence on the character of its rulers. The glorious days of the reformation, of the Macedonian dynasty, and of the Comneni had passed. Andronicus, younger son of Isaac and grandson of Alexius Comnenus, was certainly not without eminent military abilities; but, having put to death the successor of Manuel, Alexius II, he plunged recklessly into every sort of crime. He was deposed, and, after a thousand blows and outrages, was hung by the feet between two pillars by order of Isaac Angelus (1185-1195), who, however, was altogether unfit for the highest command. His brother Alexius III deposed him, and besides deprived him of his sight. But the son of Isaac, also called Alexius (IV), having escaped from Constantinople, came in 1201 to Pope Innocent III and to King Philip II of France, imploring the strong protection of both against his uncle the usurper, and promising in return the union of the churches without conditions, the submission of his people to the supremacy of the Roman church, and his assistance in the recovery of the Holy Land. He engaged to recompense the labors and merits of the crusaders by the immediate payment of two hundred thousand marks of silver, to accompany them in person to Egypt, or, if it should be judged more advantageous, to maintain during a year ten thousand men, and during his life five hundred knights, for service in the Holy Land.

The Venetians, who, under the pretense of espousing the cause of the youthful Alexius, concealed a sinister motive of plunder and revenge, vigorously pressed the departure of the

fleet and the army. No resistance was offered by the Byzantine monarch to the passage of the fleet through the Hellenic seas ; and, after a prosperous voyage, the crusaders reposed for nine days in Scutari, the Asiatic suburb of Constantinople (A. D. 1203). Had *a man* been seated on the throne of Constantinople, the undertaking would have failed. The crusaders and the Venetians hardly numbered twenty thousand men. Not many years before Manuel Comnenus had repeatedly defeated the Hungarians in Thessaly, the Normans in Korkyra, and the Turks in Asia Minor and Syria. The Norman army of eighty thousand, after having captured Durazzo and Thessaly, suffered a total overthrow not far from the spot where the crusaders were now encamped. But Alexius III was the most worthless of men, and after a short resistance he fled from his capital about the middle of July ; and the adherents of the blind Isaac hereupon hastened to proclaim both him and his son Alexius IV emperors.

Alexius IV finding himself unable to pay the money he had promised, the commanders of the Western army "officially" declared war against him toward the end of November, 1203. The siege lasted five months, and that great city, which since its foundation for nine hundred years had defied all attacks, had accumulated treasures from the whole world, and had preserved intact the best masterpieces of ancient art and intellect, fell on April 12, 1204, and became for four whole days subject to the most ruthless violence and devastation. The crusaders scattered about the city, plundering everything that aroused their cupidity—gold, silver, precious stones, and silks. They invaded not only the mansions of the rich, but even the houses of the poor. The sight of booty inflamed their avarice, and the intoxication of victory knew no bounds. Religious, national, political, commercial, and social passions, nourished for so many centuries, combined with their buccaneering propensities in giving full vent to their lawlessness. The slaughter does

not seem to have been proportionate to the other devastation. One thousand citizens are said to have been butchered the first day, but no one knows how many were sacrificed on the three following days. The survivors were much more unfortunate than the dead; for not only were they robbed of everything, but were insulted and violated by the conquerors, who revered neither women, churches, nor tombs. The sight which the suburbs of Byzantium presented during those terrible days was not less heartrending than the scenes within the walls. Thousands of fugitives thronged the highways around the city, naked and hopeless, yet deeming themselves happy to preserve life and the honor of their families. But devastation, violence, and murder were not the only means by which the Western conquerors wreaked their vengeance on the unfortunate city. The barbarians did not spare even the works of art which adorned the streets, palaces, and public buildings—works many of which had come from the inspired hands of Pheidias and Praxiteles. Finally, after the storm began to subside, Baldwin, count of Flanders, was elected emperor of the East, and seated the Venetian Thomas Morosini on the ecclesiastical throne.

Organization of the Latin Empire.

Thus was realized the ancient dream of the West for the conquest of Constantinople, and the submission of mediæval Hellenism to the church of Rome. But in what way was Europe benefited? The conquerors sought to introduce two regulations altogether foreign and irreconcilable to the opinions and customs of the Eastern world—the papal supremacy and the feudal system. The experience of centuries had shown that Hellenism would never consent to acknowledge the despotism of the pope of Rome, regarding this as the surrender of its nationality and language. The feudal system only resulted in a diminution of the resources of the em-

pire. The emperor was considered the highest magistrate, but his immediate authority was limited to the districts of Asia Minor and Thrace. To the Italian Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, were allotted Macedonia, Thessaly, and Hellas proper, which formed the so-called kingdom of Thessaly, but which later came into civil war with the emperor. The Peloponnesus, which was surrendered to the Venetians, was forcibly seized by the nephew of Godfrey of Bouillon, who was one of the most distinguished leaders of the fourth crusade. The Venetians in reality held in the Peloponnesus only Methone and Korone, but became directly or indirectly masters of all the islands, besides appropriating one half of the capital.

By such political and ecclesiastical regulations it was not possible to found a lasting empire in the East. To this strange structure of western Europe Hellenism, though at first worsted, finally proved itself in every way superior. Theodore Laskaris, one of the last brave defenders of Constantinople, having crossed over to Asia Minor and collected at Prusa a large number of exiles, declared war at once against the conquerors. A synod of political and ecclesiastical rulers congregated at Nikæa (Nice) in 1206, proclaimed him emperor, and founded on that coast and the adjacent islands an important power, which continued fighting both against the Franks and the Turks, with whom the Latins who had come to the East to free the Christians from the yoke of the Mohammedans did not hesitate to coöperate. It is hardly necessary to say that, in opposition to the anarchy introduced by the Latins, there prevailed at Nikæa a definite political and ecclesiastical union, which was the peculiar characteristic of the mediæval Hellenism.

The standard of revolt was at the same time raised in the European provinces by Michael Angelus Comnenus, who founded an independent kingdom extending on the north as far as Durazzo, and on the south as far as Naupaktus, includ-

ing also Thessaly on the west. Theodore, the brother and successor of Michael, also maintained a successful warfare against the Latins, Bulgarians, and Servians.

Recovery of Constantinople.

Finally, on the 26th of July, 1261, Michael Palæologus, with eight hundred horsemen and a few foot-soldiers, recovered Constantinople itself almost without battle. Palæologus found Constantinople for the most part in ruins, and with a scanty population. The ancient, splendid, and rich capital, which but sixty years before was full of treasures accumulated by the commerce, industry, art, intelligence, and conquests of the most powerful and richest of monarchies, had disappeared during the days when the Baldwins, Bonifaces, and Dandolo burned it, pillaged its palaces, plundered its churches, and cut down and converted into cheap coin the bronze of the priceless masterpieces of Praxiteles and Pheidias. The subsequent anarchy and want of security drove from the capital art, industry, and commerce. The Venetians, who had in the mean time made Krete the bridge, as it were, of their commerce between the West and the East, caused such disorder elsewhere that Constantinople became difficult of approach, if not inaccessible to all commercial relations. The islands and the coasts were changed into piratical headquarters, while the rulers of Europe, and even the duke of Athens, maintained piratical fleets. Indeed, their audacity reached such a height, that many of their "officials" declared themselves beyond the attacks of fortune, and constantly recited the phrase of Ovid, "*Major sum quam cui possit fortuna nocere.*" Soon the Seljuks began to attack the islands and coasts held by the Christians, and often committed fearful slaughters. During the first half of the fourteenth century Nicholas I, duke of Naxos, was forced to implore the aid of the Palæologi, because within a few years the Turks had carried away, exiled, and

slaughtered fifteen thousand men from his dependent islands. The Venetians, unable to suppress the evil, finally concluded an alliance with the Turks, and in 1331 more than twenty-five thousand Greeks, and not a few Latins, in Attica and elsewhere, were reduced to slavery. In May and July, 1332, three hundred and eighty Turkish ships, with forty thousand men, perpetrated murders beyond enumeration, and pitilessly pillaged the Hellenic islands and the coasts of Asia Minor.

How was it possible, therefore, for the commerce of Constantinople to flourish? The Palæologi certainly did not remain idle, but their efforts were for the most part thwarted, because the Western nations were opposed to the reëstablished Hellenic empire. On the other hand, the Palæologi could have limited the authority of the foreigners, but were afraid lest they should unite with the Turks, who did not cease, throughout the thirteenth century and the earlier part of the fourteenth, to assail the empire. In fact, did not the popes urge anew the expediency of recovering Constantinople? Did not Urban IV promise in 1264 forgiveness of sins to those who would join the crusades? The representatives of western Europe therefore, while unable themselves to create a strong empire in the East, were not willing that the Greeks should strengthen their authority, until finally the Turks, profiting by this state of affairs, seized all the European provinces of the empire. But, however feeble this resuscitated Hellenism may have been, it was for a time more vigorous than any of the western systems. No just critic can deny the splendid energies which that Hellenism displayed even in its decline. While compelled to oppose so many powerful enemies, yet for more than one hundred years it successfully withstood around the walls of Constantinople the persistent attacks of the Turks. Then, indeed, it fell, but fell with a heroism worthy of its most illustrious days.

Fall of Constantinople.

Constantinople was surrounded on land by one hundred and sixty thousand warriors, and on the sea by one hundred and fifty ships, while only seven thousand men and twenty-six vessels undertook the defense of its long walls. The famous Mohammed II led the Turks; he was a young man, not yet twenty-six, but brave, stern, with features that seldom relaxed into a smile, persistent, daring, and fond of glory. He had at his command abundant resources, because he already controlled half of Asia Minor, all of Bulgaria, Servia, Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly, most of Epirus, and a part of Albania. Opposed to him stood the last emperor of mediæval Hellenism, Constantine XIII Palæologus (1448-1453), with his devoted army numbering less than one twentieth of the force of the enemy, without means of replacing the fallen, and abandoned by the entire world. For about two months this unequal combat lasted. The Hellenic flotilla repeatedly drove back the numberless ships of the enemy, and many a time the brave defenders of the capital repulsed from their walls the assaults of Mohammed, and frustrated his attempts. On the morning of the 29th of May, 1453, the decisive engagement took place. Constantine, who already within four hours had repelled four successive attacks, suddenly saw the enemy pushing through a side entrance, which had carelessly remained unguarded, and himself surrounded on all sides. He understood at once that no hope of safety remained. Spurring his horse, he plunged into the thickest of the battle, while "the blood ran in torrents from his hands and feet." At length the besieged were forced to succumb to the constantly increasing numbers of the enemy, and the emperor and the city fell before the might of the Turk. The pillage lasted for three days, but the actual slaughter was not very great. At first all were killed without discrimination, both those resisting and those

fleeing—men, women, and children; but shortly afterward avarice supplanted revenge, and the victors sought to secure as many captives as possible, that they might enrich themselves by their ransom. The captives thus taken amounted to about sixty thousand, while not more than three thousand persons were slaughtered. We may thus justly surmise that the population of Constantinople at the time of its overthrow was about seventy or eighty thousand, but few of whom succeeded in effecting their escape.

History records many events which at first sight seem more tragic than the capture of Constantinople; but in reality no one of the great historic conquests entailed consequences so disastrous. By this victory, not only the captured city fell, not only was the empire abolished and the nation enslaved; but for a long time an entire civilization disappeared, and the fairest portions of the world passed under the sway of the most brutal and savage of barbarians. The Turkish conquest not only eradicated every trace of civilization in the East, but deprived the western nations of the various advantages which would have accrued to them had Hellenism preserved its autonomy. When finally the Turkish power was limited and humbled, its weakness became not less troublesome than its former strength had been; and even at the present day all Europe is perplexed, not knowing what steps to take for the eradication or correction of the evil which in an unlucky hour she herself permitted to be established in the East.

PART TWELFTH.

MODERN HELLENISM.

CHAPTER I.

TURKISH RULE.

By the fall of Constantinople, a nation possessed of a profound conviction of its fitness for preëminence, endowed with a peculiar firmness of character, and a lively recollection of its former grandeur, found itself by the ruling principle of the state excluded from all power and condemned to servitude. The occurrences in the East during the Turkish supremacy find a parallel in the history of no other country. The Greeks and the Slavs were the chief nations that succumbed to the Turkish yoke during the fifteenth century. Four hundred years have since elapsed, but to this day both Slav and Greek preserve their own nationality, speak their own languages, have their own history and their own political energies, and nourish an inextinguishable yearning for liberty. How different from the course of events in France, Spain, Italy, England, and Ireland! The inhabitants of these countries also were conquered by foreign invasions, but gradually victors and vanquished united and formed one nation, speaking one and the same tongue. Such a comingling never took place, nor could it have occurred, in the East, principally on account of the differences of language and religion. The languages of the Franks, Goths, Lom-

bards, and Normans, though different from those of the peoples they had subjugated, had a certain original and radical relationship to them, belonging to the same family of the Indo-Germanic tribes, and thus easily assimilated in each case into one tongue. But the Turkish belongs to a separate system, presenting no analogy whatever to the Indo-European idioms; and on this account every approach toward union was antagonistic to the fundamental laws of speech. Difference of religion also placed an insurmountable barrier between the Greek and the Turk. The opposing principles of the Koran and the Gospel are well known. We need, therefore, not inquire further how this antagonism is connected with the inherent truth of one faith and the falsehood of the other. Enough that it is so, and that this difference marks the distinctive character of the two systems. Each of the two religions produced a civil society varied and distinct. Marriage, family and social relations, calendar—everything in the two was separate and antagonistic, allowing no mutual concessions destined to bring about an amalgamation. Hence it is evident how vain were the hopes, which Europe for so long a time indulged, of securing an equality of rights for the Christians of Turkey. No promise or will of the sultan is able to overcome the opinions and prejudices which religious fanaticism and long supremacy have imparted to the Mussulmans. Again, what in the ancient Roman empire appears only as a judicial hypothesis—namely, that the actual property in land belongs either to the state or the emperor, and only its occupation and use to the individual—is in the Ottoman empire a positive reality, grounded on the religious belief that “all the land belongs to the caliph, the shadow and vicegerent of God on earth.” Whatever changes may have been effected in more peaceful times, this principle has remained in force, as it was fixed from the first. The entire extent of the Ottoman empire was, in the eighteenth century, as well as in the sixteenth, parceled out among the

Timarlis and Spahis, of whom there are said to have been one hundred and thirty-two thousand.

The only possible mode of assimilation would have been the complete absorption of the conquered by the conquerors. In fact, the Turks strove to draw the Christians to themselves, and in reality did draw not a few, either by force or through the advantages which the followers of Islam enjoyed. To this end the sultan Selim I issued a decree ordering that the army of the janizaries should be recruited only from the tribute of male children which was levied once in every four years on the Christian Greeks. This tribute of blood was imposed chiefly on the European provinces of the empire—Albania, Hellas, and later Hungary. The wretched inhabitants thought that they could escape this misfortune by marrying their children at the age of eight, nine, or ten; but this stratagem availed them nothing, because even then they were forcibly carried away. It is no wonder, therefore, that often the unhappy mothers raised their hands to Heaven, praying to the Most High to recall their children to Him, that they might thus escape the oppression of the infidels. The janizaries were originally celibate soldiers, vowed to the service of the prophet and the sultan, forming the peculiar instrument of Ottoman conquest. The child-tribute was abolished by the Porte in 1687, partly because agriculture could not spare so many able-bodied laborers, partly because the janizaries had acquired not only the right to marry, but also, from 1566, the right to enroll their sons in the corps, and had become jealous of admitting the Greek tribute-children. It would be easy to argue that the child-tribute was really after all a benefit to the Hellenes. No doubt it opened to many individuals far more prosperous careers than they could have had in their villages. Very possibly some struggling parents may have been well content to have a son taken off their hands on such terms. It is not so easy to say how many homes that tribute must have left

desolate, how many hearts it must have broken ; and most certainly it was fatal to all the better hopes of the nation. The manhood of a tormented people can withstand every plague of Egypt save the last ; but there could be no future for Greece while every household in the land where the voice of children was heard lay under the continual shadow of a power more appalling than the Angel of Death—a power which not only rent asunder the bonds of national loyalty and of natural affection, but forced parent and child alike to believe that in this world and in the world to come they were divided by an impassable abyss.*

Thus neither an amalgamation of victors and vanquished ever took place in the East, nor an absorption of the latter by the former. The Christians remained separated, and necessarily preserved their language and nationality, and the lands they inhabited. But other considerations besides tended to render this separation much more complete. The Turks granted neither justice nor security of life and property to the Christians ; they took no measures for the education of their subjects, and wholly neglected the salutary regulations through which agriculture, industry, and commerce are promoted. They refused even to rule the Christians, and left them to their own resources, on condition only that they should furnish the oppressive taxes demanded from them. “Oppress them,” it is said in the Koran concerning the infidels, “until they pay poll-tax and are humbled.” Every male from seven years of age upward is subject to this tax. The *teskeres*, or stamped receipts, serve at once as proofs of acknowledged submission, as certificates for protection, and as passports for those by whom they are received. And yet these despised and persecuted Christians were steadily increasing in number, while their haughty tyrants suffered from a decline in population ; the former were rich, the latter poor ; the former were edu-

* See Jebb's “Modern Greece.”

cated, the latter became daily more ignorant ; until, after the lapse of three hundred and fifty years, during the present century both Slavs and Greeks, having risen in insurrection and often defeated the Turks in the open field, forced them to grant important concessions. The contest still continues, and must continue until it results in the entire abolition of the now enfeebled Turkish authority in Europe.

Hellenism, nationally considered, remained so unchanged during the Turkish rule, that we may justly assert that the nation which organized the last revolution in nowise differed in its fundamental principles from the nation which was forced to succumb to the yoke. The Turk and the Greek remained as distinct and separate from each other as water and oil. Regarded, therefore, in its national associations, modern Hellenism is the same as that of the fourteenth century. Morally, intellectually, and numerically it suffered a few changes ; but nationally it underwent no change whatever. Nor did the foreign blood, introduced before and after the fall of Constantinople, produce any marked effect. When, during the fourteenth century, the foreign elements were at their height, and desired to make known their own military achievements to the people of the East, they wrote the "Annals of the Peloponnesus," not in the Slavic, Albanian, or Bulgarian tongue, but in the Hellenic. When again the Hellenes, from the fifteenth century onward, sought to glorify their incessant struggles for liberty, their national songs were composed in that immortal language spoken on the mountains of Hellas. Throughout the entire period of Turkish rule the church, the political rulers, and the learning that survived, from the northernmost boundaries of Thrace and Macedonia to the extreme southern promontory of Hellas, throughout the islands and all the western coasts of Asia Minor, employed the Hellenic. Great ignorance of course prevailed for a long time among the vanquished, because most of the learned men during the fif-

teenth century emigrated either to Europe or to the Hellenic islands still occupied by the Venetians. Thus, while Hellenic learning was kindled both in Italy and France, and continued to develop itself in the islands, in the continental countries of the East, on the contrary, the schools disappeared for want of teachers. The terrible anomalies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did not permit the establishment of any systematic scheme of education, so that the Hellenic nation was deprived for two hundred years of every means of intellectual progress. But in the seventeenth century, through the foresight and energy of the community founded by Hellenic fugitives in Venice, schools were established in Athens and Janina. The national spirit was thus strengthened, and the manner in which many of the teachers explained the ancient texts especially tended to inspire the youth with devotion to their fatherland and a yearning for the recovery of liberty. As the mediæval Hellenism, in the acme of its power and prosperity, gained fresh vigor by its association with the ancient, thus elevating and embellishing both its public and its private life ; so the modern Hellenism, in its deepest misfortunes, turned to the same sources in order to regenerate its forces and its hopes. In fact, the oppressed nation recalled more often the brilliant annals of the past, and remembered with a far more passionate enthusiasm its ancestral glory, than did mediæval Hellenism, occupied with the preservation and regulation of its own supremacy.

CHAPTER II.

THE GREEK REVOLUTION.

General Survey.

THE revolution of 1821 was the most national of all the revolts against the Turkish authority. Its success was mainly due to the efforts of the *Pheleke Hetaeria*, or Society of Friends, organized by three business men, who conceived the plan of uniting the scattered nation and offering a combined and effective resistance to Turkish oppression. No people in the history of humanity had suffered such direful persecutions. Neither the complete submission of the vanquished, nor the payment of the taxes or of the tribute of blood, satiated the savage cruelty of the Turk. The archbishops and bishops of the church were hanged like the worst of malefactors in Constantinople; hundreds of Christians were butchered in the churches of Smyrna; hundreds of patriots were roasted to death in Attica, Eubœa, and elsewhere. No family was safe; no woman dared appear in the streets; nobody's life was secure, because a Turk was promoted in proportion to the Christians he could claim for his victims. Is it a wonder, therefore, that the nation finally arose with the determination to free itself from the tyrants, or die in the attempt? Or need we enumerate the heroic deeds and sufferings of this great revolt? More than two hundred thousand Greeks, according to the lowest calculation, without arms and non-combatants, were mercilessly butchered by the unexampled ferocity of the Turks. But the revenge of the survivors was indeed terrible. An equal number of Mussulmans fell in the battles fought on land and sea; a whole fleet of frigates and other men-of-war was blown to pieces along the coast. New names were inscribed on the scroll of

Hellenic heroes, whose memory will survive as long as history itself endures. The devotion to the fatherland surpassed every human measure. Finally, the Christian nations of Europe, comprehending that the coexistence of the tyrants and the oppressed was impossible, decided to sacrifice the principle of the inviolability of the Turkish empire. But, yielding still to ancient customs and unpardonable hesitations, they stipulated for the autonomy only of a small portion of the Hellenic countries, and again placed under the Turkish supremacy Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace, in which provinces had taken place some of the most heroic achievements of the revolution. The soil of Macedonia was wet with the blood of her warriors at Galateia and Kassandra, around Athos, Niauxa, and elsewhere.

The battles of Niauxa were the most bloody of modern Hellenic history. There fell more than fourteen thousand Turks and not less than ten thousand Hellenes. When finally the Macedonians were forced to retreat, they effected, under the heroes Karatassos, Gatsos, and Marco Botsaris, the ever-memorable march through Thessaly; and, having united with the warriors of Pindus, they forced their way to Epirus to assist their brethren who were fighting at Peta and Sullion. For three years the Thessalians of Magnesia waged a bloody contest, and even besieged Volos. Forced to raise the siege on the approach of the vast army of Dramales, they continued the struggle around Magnesia, and inflicted many defeats on the enemy, especially during the summer of 1821. About that time, Eubœa having been occupied by the Turks, the Macedonians retired into the interior of Hellas, where they did not cease until the end of the revolution to risk their lives for the liberty of the nation. Nor must we pass over without mention the heroic destruction of Psara, the bloody fate of Kassos, and the ever-famous deeds of the Kretans from the beginning to the end of the revolution.

In the midst of these long trials and sufferings, the Hellenic nation has always proved itself worthy of admiration. Having for so long a time, in the preparation of this work, lived both in heart and mind with the ancient, the mediæval, and the modern Hellenism, I may say that in devotion and endurance the nation has never shown itself so brilliant as during those years of suffering—not even during the ever-memorable Persian invasions. The death of Leonidas, the patriotism of the Athenians, the battle of Salamis, were certainly great deeds ; but that crisis lasted only three months, while during this last rebellion the struggle continued for about ten years. Many a fortification was forced to succumb before superior numbers, such as the Palæokastro, the Neokastro, and the acropolis of Athens ; but the Hellenes remained ever faithful to the national cause. Women, children, and old men fled to the mountains, to caves, and to shoals ; they were hungry and thirsty, shivered and died ; were sold as slaves, lashed, and tortured ; but they were never subdued, and they never surrendered. The soldiers met the enemy in despair ; they died, were taken captives, or saved themselves as best they could ; but they never gave up their arms. It would certainly be impossible to give a connected history of this great rebellion in our remaining space ; but by narrating a few of its most striking features the reader will be enabled to form a fair idea of the sacrifices by which the Hellenes obtained their liberty.

The Fall of Mesolonghi.

In the beginning of 1825 the revolution was, in the language of Mr. Mavrokordatos (one of its foremost champions, and the president of the temporary Hellenic government), “in a flourishing condition.” Throughout the year 1824 the enemy made only one expedition against eastern Hellas, and was driven back with severe loss. On the sea also were performed some brilliant exploits. The fleets of Constantino-

ple and Alexandria were repeatedly worsted, and several of their ships were blown to atoms; fifty transport-vessels were taken, sunk, or destroyed; more than four thousand sailors were either captured or killed, and about five hundred Arabs of the regular army were carried captives to Nauplia, at that time the capital of the Hellenic government. The French ambassador at Constantinople wrote to his government on the 3d of December, 1824: "The brilliant feats which the revolutionists have accomplished during this year have strengthened the work of their regeneration." A closer examination of affairs, however, could easily discern the storm ready to burst upon the long-suffering nation. Sultan Mahmoud, despairing of overcoming the Hellenes, intrusted their overthrow to Mehemet Ali of Egypt. The eagerness with which Mehemet undertook this order foreboded his determination to put an end to the revolution. He at once dispatched against Hellas a military force altogether different from the Albanian and Asiatic hordes with which the Greeks had contended for the last four years. During the years 1825-1827, therefore, affairs changed altogether. The revolution now had to contend against a regular army, well organized and admirably conducted. The daring, intelligent, and stubborn commander of this army, Ibrahim Pasha, was sustained by the abundant resources of Egypt, and by a fleet which maintained constant communication between Alexandria and the Peloponnesus.

Shortly after the arrival of Ibrahim in the Peloponnesus—about the end of April, 1825—began the siege of Mesolonghi, the most glorious achievement on land of the revolution. Anticipating an attack, Mavrokordatos had in 1824 considerably strengthened this fortress. The ditch was dug deeper, and the surrounding ground was fortified with trenches and redoubts, while the islet called Basilaki, which formed a sort of advance rampart between the coast and the sea, was defended by six cannon. To this island were con-

veyed more than two thousand of the women and children. There were still left in Mesolonghi twelve thousand inhabitants, four thousand of whom consisted of the best warriors of Epirus, Ætolia, and Akarnania. About one thousand of the others could bear arms. The siege was carried on by the combined forces of Ibrahim and Redshid, the latter commanding the irregulars, and reported to have been a daring and resolute officer. Several assaults had already been made and repulsed, when the Greek admirals Miaules and Sachtoures sailed bravely through the Turkish fleet and provisioned the city. On the 7th of August of the following year, the hero Kitsos Tsavellas entered Mesolonghi with his devoted band of Suliots, and strengthened the hopes of the garrison. Meanwhile, Miaules defeated the Turkish fleet (January, 1826), and again provisioned the city. About the middle of February two successive assaults were made, but both were repulsed with great loss to the enemy. The peril of the city, however, was greatly increased when thirty-two Turkish boats entered the lake and occupied the islet. Hereupon the English governor of the Ionian Islands, Frederick Adams, offered to mediate; but the champions of Hellas, however desperate their situation might have been, proudly refused his intervention.

On the 25th of May a desperate assault was made by Redshid and his Albanians against Kleisova, an isolated spot distant about a mile from Mesolonghi, and defended by one hundred and thirty warriors under Kitsos Tsavellas, whose name sends a thrill to this day through every Hellenic heart. A terrific encounter ensued, during which the Turks presented their bayonets, and the Greeks bore down upon them with their swords. In less than an hour six hundred of the assailants lay upon the field of battle, and at length Redshid, having been wounded, was forced to retreat. Ibrahim laughed at the defeat of his fellow commander, and said, "You will presently see how my Arabs will capture these Greeks." He

at once ordered Hussein Bey, a daring Turkish officer, who had already reduced Krete, Kassos, Sphacteria, and many provinces in Hellas, to lead the Arabs against Kleisova. Was it possible that the place, defended as it was by a handful of Greeks, should not succumb? But Kitsos Tsavellas was still there, and the Arabs were also driven back with the loss of eight hundred of their number. Hussein Bey himself was mortally wounded in the forehead by the never-failing shot of the hero Tsavellas.

Provisions at length began to fail. Miaules appeared again on the horizon; but fifty-seven Turkish frigates and a large number of other vessels vigilantly barred every approach, and the Greek admiral was forced to withdraw. Meantime a terrific fire was kept up incessantly upon Mesolonghi; its defenders were forced to feed on rats, skins, and sea-weeds; no medical assistance whatever was obtainable. A few hundred defenders only had fallen in battle, while thousands of Turks were lying in the lake and before the city; but out of the twelve thousand inhabitants, three thousand had already perished from hunger and disease. An English officer who was a witness of the siege said afterward, "I do not know which to admire more, the stubbornness of the Turks or the bravery of the Greeks." But the last hour of this fierce conflict was at hand. "You know," said one of the interpreters of the Sublime Porte to the Turks—"you know that the Greeks never surrender." They did not, indeed, surrender; but on the night of the 10th of April they resolved to cut their way through the Turkish lines, hoping that the women and children, in the confusion, would be able to follow in their footsteps. But they did not find Ibrahim unprepared. The Greeks, dividing into two columns, with a loud shout rushed forward, sword in hand. Neither the yataghans of the Albanians nor the bayonets of the Arabs for a moment stopped their resistless onset. Those incomparable champions of liberty dashed forward

over ditches, traverses, and redoubts. But while they covered the ground with slaughtered Moslems, other divisions of Turks drove back the women and children into the city, where a demoniac sacrifice was perpetrated. The despair of the conquered and the frenzy of the victors joined in a last and furious contest, during which every woman and child died the death of a hero. Rather than surrender, they set fire to their ammunition, and blew up themselves, their city, and the Turks. Those who fought their way through the hostile lines suffered untold hardships; they were pursued by the cavalry, fell into ambuscades, and finally, when they had escaped all these dangers, found neither food nor shelter, for the interior of Hellas was a veritable desert. When at last they reached Salona, they numbered scarcely thirteen hundred men.

Such a fall was in its results equal to the most brilliant victory. The world was astounded by such heroism, and large supplies of provisions and ammunition were sent to Hellas by the Philhellenic associations of Europe and America. This heroism indeed did more toward changing the political policy of England than even the powerful efforts of Lord Byron, who, drawn to Greece by the glorious memories of the past, fell a victim in her cause during the siege of Mesolonghi. Whatever may have been the faults of Byron, the Greeks must always speak of him with admiration and respect. At the most critical period of her history he brought to Hellas those typical English virtues of which the nation then stood in especial need. He did much toward creating a strong Philhellenic sentiment throughout Europe, contributed generously from his private means to the support of the cause he had espoused, and finally sacrificed for it his life.

Naval Triumphs.

The fall of Mesolonghi must serve to illustrate the great struggle on land which the Hellenes single-handed carried

on against the combined forces of Turkey and Egypt. But our account of this remarkable rebellion would be wanting in some of its essential features without a brief description of the naval triumphs gained by the Greeks.

The naval power of the Sublime Porte was in 1821 much superior to its land forces. Turkey possessed about thirty-five ships of war, some of which, to use the expression current at that time, were "huge as mountains"; and the sultan had besides at his disposal the naval forces of Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli, and Egypt. The whole Hellenic fleet amounted to about one hundred and fifty small merchantmen, principally owned by private individuals of the islands of Hydra, Spétzia, and Psara; but the government did not possess a single man-of-war with which to meet the Turkish adversary. Thus the difference in the relative forces of the combatants was most marked. The daring of the Greeks in fighting, with means so inadequate, the powerful fleet of the Turks, has always aroused the greatest wonder and admiration, and their naval victories have been even more extolled than those achieved on land.

The Samians, who on many former occasions had sought to incite to insurrection the prosperous but unprepared island of Chios, finally succeeded in their object, and on the 10th of May, 1822, landed on the island about twenty-five hundred men. A few days later the Turkish fleet, commanded by the notorious Kara Ali, reached Chios, disembarked seven thousand men, and forced the Samians to betake themselves to their vessels, leaving the Turks to plunder and slaughter. Had the Hellenic fleet arrived a few days earlier, Chios would have been saved, because the Greeks had already armed their ships, large and small (each vessel carrying from five to twenty guns), and had by their daring and dexterity often put to flight the Turkish gunboats. For it must not be forgotten that the Hellenic nation, both by nature and position, has from the earliest times to the present shown

itself preëminently nautical. Chios, before its destruction, had a population of one hundred thousand ; but seven days after the arrival of the bloodthirsty Ali, seventy thousand were slaughtered by his orders, and about ten thousand were sold as slaves in the markets of Asia Minor. A few days later the Hellenic fleet, consisting of fifty-six boats, reached the island. A sharp engagement followed, lasting for three hours, but with indecisive results. The two fleets finally separated—the Turkish retreating to Chios and the Hellenic to Psara. But a storm was about to succeed this apparent calm. The chief commanders of the Turkish fleet assembled on the 6th of June in the admiral's vessel, to celebrate the Bairam, one of the principal Turkish feasts. The night was dark, and the entire fleet was grandly illuminated. The Greeks, who were anchored at Psara, knew well what was transpiring, and all the circumstances were so favorable for some daring project that it was forthwith decided by Admiral Kanaris—"the bravest man of all that modern history records," says of him the French admiral Jurieu de la Gravière—to dispatch fire-boats against the Turkish vessels. Kanaris made fast his fire-boat to the admiral's ship, lighted it, jumped into his skiff, and in a moment's time Kara Ali and two thousand other Turks were blown to atoms. The confusion and astonishment that prevailed that night in the harbor beggar description. The Greeks passed undisturbed through the Turkish fleet, and reached Psara without even the loss of one out of the thirty-two men who shared in the daring deed. The Turkish fleet no longer ventured to attack either Psara or Samos, but hastened to escape to the Hellespont, pursued by the Hellenic boats. Thus was the destruction of Chios avenged by the daring of one man—the hero George Kanaris.

A few months later the Hellenes gained a new triumph ; for Kanaris, hearing that the Turkish fleet was anchored between Tenedos and Troy, hastened with two fire-ships from

Psara and destroyed the rear-admiral's vessel and eight hundred men. "Kanaris alone," says the admiral of the French man-of-war *Fleur de Lis*, "never failed in operations of this sort ; a hero capable of moving the hearts of poets, a sailor whom the sailors of all the world will never cease to admire. Within six months he destroyed two frigates and three thousand enemies." Another French officer, Raybaud, says : "Kanaris has so much terrified the Turks, that their men-of-war durst not anchor near their opponents ; threatened continually, they do not know how to extricate themselves from the small, light ships which are day and night on the lookout for them."

CHAPTER III.

THE KINGDOM OF GREECE.

By such acts of heroism and unprecedented devotion to the cause of liberty, the Greeks finally succeeded in obtaining their liberty.* Their intrepidity and sufferings finally awoke from their lethargy the great nations of Europe, and the fleets of England, France, and Russia almost annihilated the Turkish fleet in October, 1827, at Navarino, and sanctioned as it were by the blood of the best nations of the earth the autonomy of Hellas. In 1828 the French cleared the Morea (Peloponnesus) of the Ottoman troops ; and in February, 1830, the independence of Greece was fully recognized.

Shortly after the release from the Turkish yoke, the courts of England, France, and Russia took upon themselves the

* The government of Greece is a constitutional monarchy, but with political freedom in no respect less than that enjoyed in England.

responsibility of directing the internal affairs of the kingdom and of framing a constitution for the nation. The Greeks were opposed to the friendly (?) wishes of the powers ; they were opposed to the form of government the powers wished to establish over them ; they were unwilling to have foreigners direct the destinies of their nation ; so that in 1842 "The Minerva," a Greek paper published in Athens, used the following strong language : "After the lapse of more than ten years [since 1832], and an expenditure of thirty millions of dollars, the interests of the country are so completely neglected that to this moment Greece is left with the greatest part of her domain uncultivated ; with her forts filled with mud ; with many of her rich plains and valleys in a state of progressive desolation ; with some few schools and seminaries of learning supported principally by private contribution, and denied the benefit of a vigilant superintendence ; with churches more fit for stables than for temples of religion ; with a clergy in rags ; with a navy inferior to the one in the days of the revolution ; with a population small enough, and yet diminishing by constant emigration to Turkey ; with many and rich uniforms, but without a manufacturing establishment ; with plenty of commercial treaties, but with a commerce poorer and more insignificant than ever ; with a bank which promises wonders, but with no resources or public credit."

The above picture of Greece is by no means an exaggeration of the actual state of things at the time. The budget for 1843 showed a revenue of 15,669,795 drachmas, against an expenditure of 18,666,582 drachmas ; and it was feared that the deficit would be increased to more than 6,000,000, inasmuch as it was thought that the government would hardly realize more than 12,000,000 drachmas from the revenue of the realm. The causes of these misfortunes must be attributed to the fact that the powers were determined that there should be in Greece an "absolute monarchy," and the Hel-

lenes, on the other hand, wished to have a constitutional government. Others laid the blame upon the Bavarians—upon those “who,” to use the language of “The Minerva,” “disbanded the veterans of Hellas, and gave the bread of her liberators to worthless mercenaries ; who led to the slaughter-house the heroes of her revolution, and exiled in foreign missions the best of her statesmen ; who shackled the press, burdened the people with taxes, wasted the loans and the revenue, gave the national lands to strangers, weakened the interests of her protectors, dampened the sympathies of her friends, disregarded the protocols, despised the advice of kings, and introduced into the country that system of government which must be stigmatized as absolute and despotic.”

Others maintain, and perhaps with justice, that the real causes are to be sought in the memorable treaty of the 7th of May, 1832, between the minister of Bavaria on one side and the plenipotentiaries of England, France, and Russia on the other. By virtue of this memorable state paper, the sovereignty of Hellas was conferred upon Prince Otho of Bavaria ; and it was further agreed between the contracting parties that the king, being then a minor, should proceed to his kingdom under the tutelage of three regents, not one of whom was to be a Greek, and who, besides a loan of sixty millions of francs, were to have a mercenary army of four thousand men !

The history of the last fifty years, a Greek asserts, has recorded many wrongs, many acts of oppression and injustice ; but neither the history of the present, nor the annals of ancient or modern times, can afford us a more terrible example of national vassalage than that which we see in the case of Hellas, and which portrays in such vivid colors the beauties of an exotic policy, which Macaulay has justly characterized as the worst species of slavery. It has been well remarked by a Greek historian that the sacrifices of Greece, the full hecatombs which she laid on the altar of liberty, the

deep sympathy which her suffering and heroic courage created in the minds of the civilized communities of the world, are still fresh in our memory, and we can hardly dissipate our blush or smother our indignation, when, with such glorious antecedents, we find such wretched consequences ; when, in the place of that substantial good which animated the heroes of Greece, and which was anticipated by her people and her friends, we have a government which requires from two to three millions of dollars for its support, but which, at the same time, is swayed to and fro by some one of the three potent and irresponsible plenipotentiaries of England, France, and Russia ! Is there anything more humiliating or more degrading than this ? *

It is evident that this state of things could not be permitted to continue ; and finally Otho was expelled in October, 1862, and the crown was offered to George I, son of the King of Denmark, who accepted it on June 6, 1863. Under the wise administration of the latter, the nation has made a progress surpassed by no people in Europe. No king is certainly more dear to his subjects, and, since the death of Constantine Palæologus, the Hellenes have obtained no leader more worthy of their confidence and esteem. While nearly every other sovereign in Europe is forced to maintain his throne by force of arms, and we hear almost daily of attempted assassinations and plots by natives against his authority, the King of Greece alone is as open and accessible to his subjects as the President of the United States.

But the nation, deprived in 1832, by the decision of Europe, of the greater part of its patrimony, and fettered in the name of liberty within a narrow and stifling cage, was pitilessly wronged. Europe, however, was deservedly punished for having assumed, contrary to the teachings of four hundred years, to reconcile in the East the coexistence of liberty and tyranny. Within the space of forty years

* See Timayenis's "Language of the Greeks."

Krete revolted three times, Epirus and Thessaly once ; and in fact all the Hellenic countries that were surrendered to the discretion of the Turk have never ceased to writhe and to struggle for independence. Europe is constantly harassed with this state of affairs. When not engaged in actual war, her various governments are compelled to maintain extensive military establishments, not less ruinous than the wars themselves. It is now evident that the present status can not be maintained ; but there is much disagreement concerning the plan of reconstruction. The possession of Constantinople is the insurmountable obstacle—the rock on which all the schemes for the reëstablishment of Christian supremacy in the East have thus far been shattered. The Slavs have none of the indispensable qualities for the fulfillment of this great task, as appears from their history of one thousand years. The Bulgarians have twice founded great kingdoms and the Servians once ; but neither people has succeeded in occupying Constantinople, or even Thessaly, for the simple reason that the rulers of every great maritime city, and especially of Constantinople, must be a nautical race. For such a mode of life neither the Bulgarians nor the Servians have ever shown any adaptability, and are naturally unqualified. Of all the native races in the East, the only one destined, both by its history and its present prospects, to rule Constantinople, is the Hellenic. For twelve hundred years that nation made it the seat of its empire, and preserved it as a bulwark of civilization against numerous powerful enemies. And it finally succumbed, not through the power of the Turks, but weakened by the attacks of Europe. Could the latter have foreseen the dangers threatening her, as well as the difficulties with which she has to-day to contend, she would not have striven for the space of two hundred years to secure a result so lamentable. Now at last she feels the necessity of retrieving her ancient mistake, but fears, as she says, that the Hellenic people have not yet developed sufficient force

for the completion of this difficult task. But it is evident that, as long as the Hellenic nation continues imprisoned within its present narrow limits, the necessary expansion of its powers is impossible. In the mean time the Turks become daily more unfit for the preservation of Constantinople, while Europe is constantly troubled, not knowing who shall succeed to this inheritance.

Such in brief is the political history of the Hellenic nation for the last four hundred years. This nation, however, has not only fought for its autonomy, but in the midst of its sufferings, persecutions, and incessant struggles, it has never ceased striving for its intellectual growth, and for the advancement of its industry, commerce, and agriculture. That small part of its territory which was freed from the Turkish yoke became the lighted pillar, to which for fifty years the other unfortunate Greeks, who were condemned after so many sacrifices to live in the dark night of the most cruel servitude, have not ceased to gaze with fond admiration.

Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, was at Athens in 1832, and this is his account of it: "A few new wooden houses, one or two more solid structures, and the two lines of planked sheds which form the bazaar, are all the inhabited dwellings that Athens can boast." It is now (1880) a handsome and prosperous city. Athens has a population of 50,000; the Peiræus* has a further population of 30,000, and contains some thirty steam-factories, while in 1868 it did not contain a single one. The kingdom of Greece has in all no less than 112 steam-factories. There are besides about 700 which do not use steam. The number of artisans employed is about 25,000, and the annual products represent

* Sixty years ago the Peiræus—Porte Leone, under the Turks—had well-nigh ceased to be even a port. The traces of its ancient dignity were few and modern. There was a piece of deal boarding projecting a few feet into the sea, to serve as a landing-stage for small boats; and there was a wooden hut for a guard. (Jebb.)

a value of \$30,000,000. With respect to agriculture, as with every other form of national effort in the newly established kingdom, it had to begin almost as in primitive times. The Turks had left the land a wilderness. The Egyptian troops, after burning the olives and other inflammable trees, had cut down those which, like the fig-tree, could less easily be destroyed by fire. But the perseverance and industry of the Greek farmers have changed many portions of the kingdom into veritable paradises. The commercial interests, though having to contend with so many rich steam-navigation companies, in 1875 possessed 5,202 vessels, representing an aggregate burden of 250,077 tons. Since 1832 the population has nearly doubled, while in the space of ten years the foreign commerce has more than doubled. Public instruction, too, in all its grades, has received a tremendous impulse in the kingdom of Hellas. The stranger at Athens is astonished at the magnitude, the variety, and the splendor of the various edifices devoted to learning—the University, the Academia, the Observatory, the School of Technology, the Museum, the Zappeion, the Arsakeion (college for the higher education of women), and the two institutions for orphans, one for males and another for females. What a change, when we consider that fifty years ago not a book could be bought at Athens!

Fifty years of independence, and the Hellenic spirit has doubled the population of Greece, increased her revenues 500 per cent., extended telegraphic communication over the kingdom, enlarged the fleet from four hundred and forty to five thousand vessels, opened eight ports, founded eleven new cities, restored forty ruined towns, changed Athens from a hamlet of hovels to a city of fifty thousand inhabitants, and planted there a royal palace, a legislative chamber, six type-foundries, forty printing establishments, twenty newspapers, an astronomical observatory, and a university with fifty professors and twelve hundred students. What

other nation in Europe can show greater progress? In 1841 the University of Athens, then recently founded, had 292 students; in 1872 it had 1,244. In 1835 there were about 70 primary schools, with less than 7,000 scholars; in 1845, about 450 schools, with 35,000 scholars; in 1874, about 1,130 schools, with 70,000 scholars. The sum spent by Hellas on public instruction is rather more than five per cent. of its total expenditure. Thus after fifty years of independence the Hellenic spirit devotes to purposes of education a larger percentage of public revenue than France, Italy, England, Germany, or even the United States. Modern Greece, fifty years ago enslaved and beggared, to-day, by the confession of the most merciless statisticians, stands at the head of the list of self-educated nations. Indeed, the kingdom of Hellas has often been blamed for the great attention paid to higher education, and it has been asserted that it has a plethora of educated men. But we forget that this little state incessantly works not only for its own advancement, but for the progress of all the Hellenes in Asia; that the rôle of Hellas closely resembles its rôle in antiquity; that the Hellenic race represents the motive power in the Ottoman empire, as twenty-two centuries ago it represented it in Persian Asia; and that the very existence of this so-called over-education is a proof of the fitness of Greece to perform the part of a civilizing power in the East.* At any rate, whoever has familiarized himself with the miserable condition of continental Hellas before the great rebellion, and the still more lamentable state of the country after the cessation of hostilities by reason of the savage character of the war, can not but wonder at the change which has come over these lands in the space of fifty years.

Such advancement can not be expected from the many millions of enslaved Greeks condemned to continue under

* See the admirable articles of M. Lenormant and Mr. Sargeant on this question.

the Turkish yoke. No doubt these have worked with the same zeal as their more fortunate free brethren; but the haughtiness, the lawlessness, the oppression of the Ottoman government, have not permitted a like progress. Only in the sea-coast towns, where the presence of the representatives of the foreign powers limits somewhat the incorrigible Turkish despotism, has Hellenism succeeded in developing to some extent its natural resources. All the foreign commerce of the Ottoman empire passed into the hands of the Hellenes there. Smyrna is so thoroughly Hellenic that, out of a population of 250,000, 120,000 are Greeks. In Constantinople live 400,000 Greeks, and the various and numerous schools of this city, founded mostly through the efforts of the Greek Philological Association there, have long since attracted the attention of learned Europe. Neither was Hellenism satisfied with this progress in its ancestral countries. Pursuant to its ancient custom, it sent colonies to many parts of the world—to various parts of Europe, to Egypt, India, and Australia. These colonies, by their industry, economy, and activity, acquired treasures, which they have never hesitated to use in behalf of their parent land, and for the complete political autonomy of Hellenism. And, though only a few Greeks have found their way to the hospitable shores of the New World, there also patriotism has never failed to respond to the appeals of their fatherland.

While Hellenism has never ceased its activity in every useful career, it is only during the last twenty years that the Slavic tribes have given any signs of life. The Bulgarians especially, who for four hundred years slept most profoundly, finally awoke, but the measure of their enterprise has been amply shown. We do not, certainly, fail to sympathize with any people seeking to shake off the yoke of Turkish tyranny; but what comparison can there be made between the Slavs and the Hellenes? We need not recall the achievements and direful misfortunes of the great revolution. But in 1866-'69

Krete alone opposed for three years the combined forces of Turkey and Egypt, while Turkey had then at its disposal the treasures of western Europe ; and it fell only when, by its holocaust in the Arkadion, it rendered the struggle for ever memorable. Servia recently rose, after fifty years of freedom and fifteen years of incessant preparation, but could not even for three months successfully oppose the armies of Turkey, although by its position the country was free from the attacks of the sultan's navy ; neither did it glorify its defeat by any achievement of special importance. Nor need we revert to the more recent Bulgarian movement, which would have excited only ridicule had it not been sanctified, as it were, by the terrible slaughters of the Turks.

Such is Hellenism at the present day. The Ottoman rule in Europe and Asia Minor evidently approaches its end. Either the East will gradually be surrendered to that people which for three thousand years has from time to time ruled it, and even to this day holds a prominent position there, or the rulers of Europe, repeating the mistake of the thirteenth century, will distribute its territories among themselves. But, in such a case, they will create there a *polyarchia*, or government of the many, giving rise to various causes of antagonism and of war, whereby the Eastern question will become more complicated than ever before.

INDEX.

A

Abæ, town, excepted from the sentence against the Phokians, ii, 85.
 Abdera, foundation of, i, 114; Xerxes at, 168.
 Abronichus at Sparta, i, 231.
 Absimarus, emperor as Tiberius Absimarus, ii, 353.
 Abydos, only Asiatic city retained by Sparta, i, 389.
 Achaean league, the, ii, 241 sq.; object of, 243; the Peloponnesus united under, 250; end of, 251.
 Achæans, the, i, 6, 57, 58; subjected to the Thebans, ii, 25; again allied with Sparta, 27; war of, with the Ætolians, 247.
 Achæus, son of Xuthus, i, 6.
 Achaia, i, 55, 57; humane policy of Epaminondas in, ii, 25; lost by the reversal of, by the Thebans, 27; distinguished from "free Hellas," 264.
 Acharnæ, Archidamus in, i, 309.
 Achilles, i, 17; death of, 21; Alexander at the tomb of, ii, 97.
 Acropolis of Athens, the, capture of, by Xerxes, i, 189; surplus treasure on, 305; inscription on, by Alexander the Great, after the battle of Granikus, ii, 104.
 Adams, Frederick, governor of the Ionian Islands, ii, 402.
 Adeimantus, Coriuthian admiral, i, 178, 184; opposed to Themistokles at Salamis, 192.
 Æakidæ, the, i, 344.
 Æakides, Epirotic prince, ii, 181, 182.
 Æetes, i, 10; and the Argonauts, 11 sq.
 Ægæ, sacred city of Macedonia, ii, 61.
 Ægean Sea, islands of the, i, 110; interested by pirates, ii, 261.

Ægina, Athenian war against, i, 109, 140, 141, 169; ended, 172; removal of Athenians to, 188; palm of bravery at Salamis awarded to, 205.
 Æginetans, the, submit to Persia, i, 140; coerced by the Spartans, 141; in the battle of Salamis, 198 sq.; allied with the Corinthians against Athens, 255.
 Ægospotami, battle of, i, 380.
 Æimnestus, Platean general, i, 151.
 Æneas, i, 16, 23.
 Æolians, i, 6.
 Æolic colonies, i, 111.
 Æolus, king of Thessaly, i, 6; his descendants among the Argonauts, 9.
 Æropus, king of Macedonia, ii, 63.
 Æschines, ii, 47, 49; the third Sacred War caused by, 56; bravery of, 78; one of the ten ambassadors to Philip, 81; sustained by the Athenian assembly, 84; his oration against Ktesiphon, 131.
 Æschines of Sikyon, i, 82.
 Æschylus, the "Prometheus" of, i, 7, 15; contest between him and Sophokles, 250.
 Æsepus, the, i, 15.
 Æther, i, 1.
 Æthlius, i, 6.
 Ætolia, i, 53.
 Ætolian league, ii, 241 sq.; object of, 243.
 Ætolians, the, rude condition of, i, 54; independence maintained by, ii, 89; abandon their post in the ranks of Leosthenes, 156; attacked by Antipater and Kraterus, 163; masters of nearly all Thessaly, 169; character of, 243.
 Africa, the Greeks expelled from, by the Arabs, ii, 353.

- Agamemnon, i, 16 sq.; breastplate of, 31.
- Agariste and Megakles, i, 81.
- Agathokles, son of Lysimachus, ii, 225; death of, 227-8.
- Agathon, i, 265.
- Agesilaus II, character of, i, 405; a letter of, 406; his expedition to Asia, 410; armistice extended by, 411; outwits Tissaphernes, 412; his victory over him, 413; over Pharnabazus, 414; his simple habits, *ib.*; recall of, 417; in the battle of Koroneia, 418-20; his return to Sparta, 420; disastrous news received by, 426; the Phliasiens surrender to, 439; conduct of Spartan affairs by, 441; declines the command against Thebes, 446; takes command against the Thebans, ii, 6; presides over the congress at Sparta, 10 sq.; declares war against the Thebans, 13; defense of Sparta by, 33; his expedition to Egypt, and death, 39.
- Agesilaus, uncle of Agis IV, ii, 245.
- Agesipolis, king of Sparta, i, 416, 418; death of, 439.
- Agis I, king of Sparta, Attica invaded by, i, 322, 359; Elis ravaged by, 403; death of, 405.
- Agis III, revolution of, ii, 130; death of, *ib.*
- Agis IV, reforms attempted by, ii, 244; killed, 245.
- Aglaokreon of Tenedos, ii, 81.
- Agnonides, chief of the Athenian embassy to Polysperchon, ii, 176; decree passed by, respecting Phokion, 177.
- Agora, the, i, 27.
- Agrigentum, Sicily, i, 225.
- Agrippina, ii, 265.
- Aiznadin, battle of, ii, 347.
- Ajax, son of Telamon, i, 17.
- Akanthus, city of, i, 437.
- Akarmania, i, 53.
- Akarmanians, the, i, 54; Theban power extended over, ii, 19; chastised by the Romans, 249.
- Akesines, the, ii, 138.
- Akte, promontory of, i, 436.
- Alaric, invasion of Hellas by, ii, 318.
- Alcuade, the, i, 39; ii, 24, 46, 74.
- Alexander of Epirus, brother of Olympias, ii, 87.
- Alexander II of Epirus, ii, 242.
- Alexander I of Macedonia, sent to Athens by Mardonius, i, 208.
- Alexander II of Macedonia, ii, 24.
- Alexander the Great, at Chæroneia, ii, 56; birth of, 69; his separation from his father, 87; his early life, 91; his accession and consolidation of his power, 92; chosen hegemon in place of Philip, 92-3; his expedition to the Danube, 93; revolt caused by a report of his death, 94; his capture and destruction of Thebes, 95; his visit to Corinth, *ib.*; to Delphi, 96; his entry into Asia, 97; his army, *ib.*; smallness of his resources, 98; his military genius, *ib.*; at the Granikus, 100; his exploits in the battle, 102; rewards and punishments adjudged by, 104; his conquests in Asia Minor, 105; cuts the Gordian knot, 106; his illness, 108-9; his march and counter-march, 109-11; his dispositions at Issus, 111; his victory there, 113; his behavior to the royal captives, 115; his letter to Darius, 116; remarks upon it, 117; his siege and capture of Tyre, 117-18; rejects Darius's new proposals, *ib.*; his visit to Egypt, 119; founds Alexandria, *ib.*; visit to the temple of Zeus Ammon, 120; his plans for the battle of Gauganela, 122; his victory there, 123 sq.; becomes the Great King, 127; at Babylon, 128; his enterprise purely Hellenic, 129; his advance from Persia, 131; Darius buried by, *ib.*; cities founded by, 131-2, 135, 137, 237; amalgamation of Hellenic and Persian elements by, 132, 140; cruel conduct of, 132-4; Kleitus murdered by, 134-6; his repentance, 136; his marriage with Roxana, *ib.*; his conquests on the Indus, 137; compelled to turn back, 138; the westward march, 139; his innovations, 137, 140-41; mutiny suppressed by, 141; height of his power, 142; his death, 143 sq.; remarks upon it, 145; contrasted with Cæsar and Napoleon, 146; conclusion, 147; the confusion caused by his death, 149; ambassadors to, 142, 230; final division of his empire, 232.
- Alexander of Pheræ, ii, 23; restrained by Pelopidas, 24, 25; seizes Pelopidas, 28; the true ruler of Thessaly, 29; conquered by the Thebans, 31; death of, 41; his dynasty abolished, 74.
- Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, ii, 293.

- Alexander, son of Alexander the Great, ii, 173, 182 sq.
- Alexander, son of Kassander, ii, 223.
- Alexander, son of Polysperchon, at Athens, ii, 174; left in command of the army, 180.
- Alexandria ad Indum, ii, 138.
- Alexandria ad Tanaidem, ii, 134-5.
- Alexandria in Arachosia, ii, 131-2.
- Alexandria in Asia, ii, 131.
- Alexandria in Egypt, foundation of, ii, 119; Mohammedan siege and capture of, 347-8.
- Alexandria in Thrace, ii, 92.
- Alexandrian library, ii, 239.
- Alexius I, Comnenus, ii, 375; his contest with Robert Guiscard, 376; his relations with the crusaders, 377 sq.
- Alexius II, death of, ii, 384.
- Alexius III, ii, 384; character of, 385.
- Alexius IV, ii, 384; war of, with the crusaders, 385.
- Alketas, Macedonian prince, ii, 62.
- Alketas, brother of Perdikkas, ii, 165; dissatisfaction of, 170.
- Alkibiades, i, 344; character of, 345, 349; education of, 346; his treachery toward the Spartan ambassadors, 350; his contest with Nikias, 351; incites the expedition to Sicily, 352; one of the commanders of it, 354; flight of, 355; recall of, 364; second flight of, 373; death of, 398.
- Alliance, the Athenian, object of, i, 235; the Ionic, i, 234.
- Alliances, new, i, 254.
- Allied cities, number of, i, 235.
- Allies, war of the, ii, 247.
- Alkmaeon, i, 87.
- Alkmaeonidae, the, 44, 89, 93, 103.
- Alphabet, i, 32-3.
- Alpheius, the, i, 55.
- Alyattes, king of Lydia, i, 123.
- Amasis, king of Egypt, i, 123.
- Amanus, Mount, ii, 110.
- Anastria, wife of Lysimachus, ii, 227.
- Amazons, the, i, 21.
- Ameinias in the battle of Salamis, i, 197, 199.
- Ammon, Zeus, Alexander's visit to the temple of, ii, 120.
- Amnopharetus, i, 215.
- Amphiktyon, i, 6.
- Amphiktyonic Council, the, i, 40; used by the Thebans for political aggrandizement, ii, 42; its decree against the Phokians, 43; its sentence against on, 54; third Sacred War declared by, 56; called together by Philip, to pass judgment on the Phokians, 85.
- Amphipolis taken by Brasidas, i, 337; surrendered by Philip to the Athenians, ii, 66-7; retaken by him, 68; Athenian claim of, 82.
- Amphissa captured by Philip, ii, 56.
- Amyntas I, the first important Macedonian sovereign, ii, 62.
- Amyntas II, i, 436-7; cities recovered by, 439; death of, ii, 24; his accession and career, 63; his family maintained by the Athenians, 64.
- Amyntas, nephew of Philip, ii, 66.
- "Anabasis of Cyrus," the, i, 397 sq.
- Anarchy in Hellas, ii, 41.
- Anastasius I, ii, 329.
- Anastasius II, ii, 356; deposition of, 357.
- Anatolia, destruction of the crusaders in, ii, 380.
- Anaxagoras of Klazomenæ, i, 272; persecution of, 297.
- Andromache, i, 20.
- Andronicus, the emperor, ii, 384.
- Andros, the Greek fleet at, i, 202; siege of, 204.
- Angeli, the, dynasty of, ii, 383.
- Angelus, Isaac, ii, 384.
- Anna Comnena, the "Alexias" of, cited, ii, 377.
- Antalkidas, peace of, i, 429 sq.; his new mission to Persia, ii, 9.
- Antenor, i, 23.
- Antes, the, destroyed by Germanus, ii, 335.
- Anthedon, Bœotian city, i, 51.
- Anthemus, territory of, ii, 68.
- "Antigone," the, of Sophokles, i, 280.
- Antigonus appointed satrap of Phrygia, ii, 153; refuses to assist Eumenes, 163; seeks assistance against Perdikkas, 164; assumes command of the army in Asia, 171; invites Eumenes to a conference, *ib.*; his march, 172; relations of, toward Eumenes, 182; defeated by him, 184; his march to Gabiene, *ib.*; defeats Eumenes, 187 sq.; puts him to death, 189; the war against, 190; authority of, 191; efforts of, to establish his supremacy in Hellas, 196; his attachment to his son, 197; the enmity of the satraps toward, 200 sq.; the influence of, 205; true position of, *ib.*; declares himself king, 206; in Egypt, *ib.*; his mild treatment of Demetrius, 206-7; his march against Ptol-

- emy, 207; its failure, 207-8; death of, 219.
- Antigonos Doston, ii, 244.
- Antigonos Gonatas, son of Demetrius, ii, 225; king of Macedonia, 231; character of, 241; death of, 243.
- Antioch, earthquake at, ii, 329, 337, 338; the crusaders reduce, 350.
- Antiochus I, son of Seleukus, ii, 229.
- Antiochus III, ii, 249, 254.
- Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, ii, 253.
- Antiochus, the pilot of Alkibiades, i, 373.
- Antipater, Macedonian viceroi, ii, 97; defeat of the Lacedæmonians by, 130; defeated by Leosthenes, 156-7; the terms demanded by, from the Athenians, 159-60; increasing power of, 163; war of, against Eumenes, 165 sq.; ambassadors sent to Eumenes by, 166; becomes guardian of the king, 170; death of, 172.
- Antipater, son of Kassander, ii, 223.
- Antiphilus, Athenian general, ii, 157.
- Antoninus Pius, ii, 273.
- Antony, Mark, ii, 263.
- Apheta, promontory of, i, 184.
- Aphobus, guardian of Demosthenes, ii, 43.
- Aphrodite, i, 4.
- Apollo, temple of, at Delphi, i, 42 sq.; festival of, at Delos, 111; answer of, to Oribasius, ii, 303.
- Apollo, the Karneian, festival of, i, 147.
- Apollo, the Triopian, i, 113.
- Apollodorus, Athenian senator, ii, 78, 79.
- Apollonia, city of, i, 437.
- Apollonius Rhodius, ii, 239.
- Appianus, the historian, ii, 240.
- Arabia, rise of Mohammedanism in, ii, 343, 346.
- Arabs, the, in Spain, ii, 349; failure of their siege of Constantinople, 350; at the height of their power, 355; new siege of Constantinople by, 356-7; immense losses of, 358; victories of, 366; unsuccessful expeditions against, 369. (See Mohammedans.)
- Aratus, general of the Achæans, ii, 243, 246.
- Arbela, battle of, ii, 121; its importance, 127-8.
- Arbogastes, murderer of Valentinian II, ii, 316.
- Arcadius, the emperor, ii, 317; character of, 318; death of, 323.
- Archelaus, king of Macedonia, ii, 62, 65.
- Archias, Theban polemarch, i, 444.
- Archias, chief of the Exile-Hunters, ii, 161.
- Archidamus, son of Agesilaus, ii, 18; gains the "tearless battle," 26; in the defense of Sparta, 33; king (A. II), bribed by the Phokians, 45; retreats before Philip, 85; repels the Helots, 253.
- Archidamus (V), death of, ii, 246.
- Archilochus, the poet, i, 70.
- Archimedes, ii, 237.
- Architecture, primitive, i, 32; under Peisistratus, 100 sq.; under Perikles, 267 sq.; under Hadrian, ii, 272; under Justinian, 339.
- Archons, Athenian, i, 87; under Perikles, 262.
- Areopagus, the, i, 83; under Perikles, 262.
- Arctis, officer of Alexander, ii, 102-3.
- Argeus, rival of Philip, ii, 66-7.
- Argcia, i, 56.
- Argcian or Argolic confederacy, i, 59 sq.; decline of, 63.
- Argcians, their claim of supremacy, 77, 80; alliance of, with the Athenians, 349; in the battle of Koroncia, 419; in the "tearless battle," ii, 26.
- Arginuse, battle of, i, 375-6.
- Argo, i, 10.
- Argonauts, voyage of the, i, 9.
- Argos, occupation of, by the Dorians, i, 24; greater than Sparta, 59; restricted by the Spartans, 77; by Kleisthenes, 80; refuses aid against the Persians, 174; alliance of, with Athens, 254, 349; compelled to remain neutral, 435.
- Argos, son of Phrixus, i, 10.
- Argyraspides, treachery and punishment of the, ii, 188, 190.
- Ariabignes, brother of Xerxes, i, 199.
- Ariadne, empress of Constantinople, ii, 329.
- Ariarathes, defeated by Perdikkas, ii, 163-4.
- Arisbe, Alexander starts from, ii, 100.
- Aristagoras of Miletus, i, 132; leader of the Ionian revolution, 133; his desertion and death, 135.
- Aristarchus, the critic, ii, 240.
- Aristeides, character of, i, 145; at Marathon, 149, 155; chief archon, 169; strife between him and Themistokles, 170; ostracism of, 171; recall of, 188; at Salamis, 195, 200, 202;

- again a leader, 207; at Sparta, 231; placed in command of the fleet, 235; death of, 241.
- Aristodemus "the coward," 71, 183.
- Aristodemus, the envoy of Demetrius, ii, 204.
- Aristodemus the Herakleid, i, 57-8.
- Aristodemus the Messenian, i, 75.
- Aristodemus, Spartan general, i, 418.
- Aristogeiton and Harmodius, i, 102.
- Aristokrates, last king of Arkadia, i, 76.
- Aristonikis, flight and death of, ii, 159, 161.
- Aristophanes, characterization of Kleon by, i, 329; on Alkibiades, 348.
- Aristophanes Byzantinus, ii, 239.
- Aristus, Illyrian general, ii, 335.
- Arius, ii, 293; doctrine of, 294; condemnation of, 295; death of, 300.
- Arkadia, account of, i, 76; freed from Sparta, ii, 19, 20; assisted by the Thebans, 20.
- Arkadians, the, i, 57; defeat of, in the "tearless battle," ii, 26; divisions among, 32; in the battle of Mantinea, 34 sq.
- Armorium, destruction of, ii, 369.
- Arses, king of Persia, ii, 96.
- Arsinoë, daughter of Ptolemy, ii, 227; escapes to Kassandrea, 229; to Egypt, 230.
- Art in the heroic age, i, 30, 32.
- Artabanus, i, 162, 189.
- Artabazus, i, 204, 207; his desertion of Mardonius, 218.
- Artaphernes, satrap of Asia Minor, i, 131, 135-6; in the expedition against Greece, 141.
- Artaxerxes I, relations of, with Themistokles, i, 240; treaty of, with the Athenians, 260.
- Artaxerxes II, i, 397, 407; his negotiations with Antalkidas, 430; decree of, 432; decree of, repeated in behalf of the Thebans, ii, 28; death of, 96.
- Artaxerxes Ochus, king of Persia, ii, 96.
- Artemis, temple of, ii, 279.
- Artemisia, queen of Halikarnassus, i, 199; stratagem of, 200.
- Artemisium, straits of, i, 176; naval force at, 178; battle of, 183.
- Artemius, emperor as Anastasius II, ii, 356.
- Asia, the Greeks in, i, 110; political difference between it and Europe, 125; expedition of Pausanias to, 232; of Agesilaus, 410; Philip's preparations for an expedition to, ii, 86; Hellenic dream of the conquest of, 90; Alexander's entry into, 96; manner of Hellenizing, 132; Hellenism in, 237; permanence of Hellenic influence in, 253; Hellenism the first herald of Christianity in, 280.
- Asia Minor, Hellenic colonization of, i, 24; colonies in, 111 sq.; conquest of, by Cyrus, 114, 126; revolt of the Greeks in, 133; Hellenic cities of, relegated to Persia, 339; aid sent to them by Sparta, 408; their autonomy demanded, 409, 411; the Greeks of, given up to Persia, 430, 434; Alexander's conquests in, ii, 114; the Turks in, 375.
- Asopus, the, encampment of Mardonius on, i, 211.
- Aspasia, i, 244; persecution of, 297.
- Aspendus, murder of Thrasybulus at, i, 432.
- Assarokus, son of Tros, i, 16.
- Assembly, popular, the Spartan, i, 64, 66; the Athenian, 95.
- Assembly-pay, i, 263.
- Assimilation, Turkish and Hellenic, ii, 392 sq.
- Astuyages, king of Media, i, 126.
- Athamenes, the, i, 54.
- Athamas, i, 9.
- Athanasius, ii, 294 sq.; death of, 312.
- Athenais, first Grecian empress, ii, 324.
- Athene, i, 4; her revenge on Medusa, 8; statue of, 268.
- Athene Polias, i, 267.
- Athene Promachos, statue of, i, 157.
- Athenian alliance, i, 235.
- Athenian confederacy, revolt from the, ii, 40.
- Athenian constitution, the, i, 87; changes in, under Solon, 94; under Kleisthenes, 104; under Perikles, 262; after the Peloponnesian war, 361 sq.
- Athenian demagogues, i, 327.
- Athenian empire, the, expansion of, i, 247; disorganization of, 276; fall of, 380.
- Athenian fleet, united with the Persian, i, 421.
- Athenian generals, death of the, i, 376.
- Athenian operations in Asia, i, 232; during the Peloponnesian war, 311.
- Athenian supremacy, the, i, 230 sq.; culmination of, 261; causes and extent of, 274; why lost, 385.

- Athenians, the, early divisions of, i, 88; anger of Darius against, 138; their stand against the Persians, 143; in the battle of Salamis, 198 sq.; their answer to Mardonius's offers of alliance, 209; their ambassadors to Sparta, 210; the Thracian Chersonese recovered by, 224; their conduct in the Persian wars, 228; continue the war against the Persians, 234; their versatility in the organization of new alliances, 235; affairs of, in 460 B. C., 255; crushing defeat of the allies by, 256; their treaty with Artaxerxes, 260; forced to evacuate Bœotia, 278; sail against Samos, 280; their relations with the Corinthians, 287; toward Perdikkas, 289; defeat of, 335; their alliance with the Argæians, 349; expedition of, against Sicily, 352; destruction of, in Sicily, 357; successes and madness of, 367; join the Thebans against Sparta, 416; decay of the military spirit of, 425; Theban fugitives protected by, 444; the Thebans aided by, ii, 6; masters of the Ionian Sea, 9; abandon the Theban alliance, 10; their ambassadors at Sparta, *ib.*; unsuccessfully oppose Epaminondas, 23; in the battle of Mantinea, 34-5; allies of the Phokians, 43; repel Philip at Thermopylæ, 46; their successes in 365 and 364 B. C., 30; Byzantium and Perinthus rescued by, 55; form an alliance against Philip, 56; in the battle of Chæroneia, *ib.*; recognize Philip's supremacy, 57; support Argæus against Philip, 66; regain Amphipolis, 67; lose it, *ib.*; refuse the alliance of the Olynthians, 68; Philip their declared enemy, 69; expelled from the coasts of Thrace and Macedonia, 74; the odium of sacrilege attached to, 75; their apathy, 76; their feeble aid to the Olynthians, 77, 79; their peace embassy to Philip, 81; his terms accepted by, 82; their mistakes, *ib.*; declare against the Phokians, 84; effect of the destruction of Thebes upon, 95; defeated by the Macedonians, 158; embassy of, to Antipater, 172; to Polysperchon, 175; terms of, with Kassander, 180; promises of Demetrius Poliorketes to, 198; servility of the, 199; extravagant treatment of Demetrius by, 214.
- Athens, early history of, i, 87; Spartan expedition against, 108; ineffective aid given to the Ionian revolution by, 134-5; treatment of the Persian herald at, 140; national spirit of, *ib.*; alliance of, with Sparta, 141; consternation at, 146; news of the victory of Marathon at, 155; state of affairs in, at Xerxes's invasion, 169; increase of the navy of, 171; abandonment of, 187; occupied by the Persians, 189; reoccupied by its citizens, 207; again abandoned, 208; after the battle of Plataea, 230; long walls of, 256; changes at, under Perikles, 261; internal regulations at, 262; under Perikles, 270, 275; truce of, with Sparta, 279; disturbance at, during the invasion of the Lacedæmonians into Attica, 310; calamities at, during the plague, 315; disposition of, during the Peloponnesian war, 351; in 412 B. C., 361; capture of, 383; cruelties of the Thirty at, 390; again threatened by the Spartans, 393; democratical government restored, 394; rebuilding of the long walls of, 423; new confederacy formed by, 440; Theban fugitives at, 444; yields to the demand of King Kleombrotus, 446; vacillating policy of, 447; makes peace with Sparta, ii, 8; breaks it, 9; reception of a Theban herald at, 18; permanent league with Sparta, 25; decline of the naval power of, 40; revolt of Eubœa against, 77-8; embassy of Philip to, 82; peace declared at, 83; return of the ambassadors to, 84; Philip's regard for, 88-9; outbreak at, on the death of Philip, 92; under Macedonian rule, 95; surrendered to the Macedonians, 160; condition of, 194; Demetrius Poliorketes frees, 195; deplorable condition of, 198; captured by Sulla, 259 sq.; fickleness of, 263; improvements in, by Hadrian, 272; condition of, after the revolution, 412; present state of, 413.
- Athos, Mount, destruction of a Persian fleet off, i, 139; Xerxes's canal at, 164-5.
- At Meidan, the, of Constantinople, ii, 333.
- Attalus, Macedonian general, ii, 86; at the wedding banquet of Philip, 87.
- Attalus I, king of Pergamus, ii, 248.
- Attica, general account of, i, 86; arriv-

al of Xerxes in, 189; his departure from, 203; Mardonius in, 203; invasions of, during the Peloponnesian war, 308, 312.
 Attila, the "Scourge of God," ii, 327.
 Augustus, first Roman emperor, ii, 251.
 Aurelian, the emperor, ii, 279.
 Autokles, Athenian ambassador at Sparta, ii, 10, 11.
 Avars, the, bought off from their siege of Constantinople, ii, 342.

B

Babylon, treasure found in, ii, 128.
 Bacchiadae, the, i, 82.
 Bacon and Tribonian, ii, 332.
 Bagoas, Persian satrap, ii, 96.
 Baktra conquered by Alexander, ii, 134; his marriage at, 136.
 Barathron, the, at Athens, i, 140.
 "Barbarian," i, 30, 123.
 Barbarians, invasions of the, ii, 275; new invasions of the, 314, 317; the government of the empire in the hands of, 318; paralyzing effects of the incursions of, 325-6; terms made with, by Leo the Isaurian, 328; northern, invasions of, 335.
 Bardanes, emperor under the name of Philippikus, ii, 356.
 Bardas, the regent, ii, 370, 371.
 Basil I, the Macedonian, ii, 372.
 Basil the Great, ii, 312; archbishop of Constantinople, 313; character and death of, ib.
 Basilaki, the hero Tsavellas at, ii, 401.
 Basiliscus, Byzantine general, defeated by the Vandals, ii, 328.
 Belisarius, Byzantine general, ii, 331; the race-course riots suppressed by, 333-4; his victories in the West and East, 334; drives the Bulgarians from Constantinople, 336; persecution and death of, 339.
 Bellerophon, i, 8.
 Bessus, satrap of Bactria, ii, 124; murder of Darius by, 131; death of, 135.
 Blood, tribute of, ii, 394.
 Bœotia, i, 49; affinities of, with Thesaly, 50; Athenian invasion of, 109; the Persians in, 188, 207, 210; defeat of the Athenians in, 338; independence of the cities of, acknowledged, 433; Lacedæmonian garrisons placed in, 435; Spartan invasions of, ii, 6; growth of Theban power in, 7, 8; claim of Theban supremacy over, 12; established, 19. (See Thebes.)

Bœotian towns, character of the, i, 51.
 Bœotian war, the, i, 419.
 Bœotians, character of the, i, 50 sq.
 Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, ii, 387.
 Bosporian empire, the, ii, 258 sq.
 Botsaris, Marco, ii, 399.
 Brasidas at Pylos, i, 325-6; his Panhellenic character, 335; his enterprise against the Athenians, 336; captures Amphipolis, 337; death of, 340.
 Brennus, chief of the Gauls, ii, 231; death of, 232.
 Bribery of Themistokles at Artemisium, i, 184.
 Bridge over the Danube, i, 129 sq.; over the Hellespont, 166, 204, 224.
 Briscis, i, 18.
 Bukephalus, Alexander's horse, ii, 137.
 Bulgaria, ii, 330.
 Bulgarians, the, invasions of the Eastern Empire by, ii, 335; driven from before Constantinople, 336; defeat Nikephorus I and Leo V, 366; ruined by Leo, 367; political character of the modern, 411.
 Bura, destruction of, ii, 9.
 Byron, ii, 404.
 Byzantine Hellenism, ii, 342 sq.
 Byzantium, the capture of, by the Greeks, i, 233; Philip repelled from the siege of, ii, 55. (See Constantinople.)

C

Cæsar, the Roman general, ii, 262.
 Cambyses, king of Persia, i, 127.
 Carthage destroyed by the Arabs, ii, 353.
 Carthaginians, the, defeat of, by Gelon of Syracuse, i, 226; part of Sicily acquired by, 440; their power limited by Timoleon, ii, 41.
 Chabrias, Athenian admiral, victory of, near Naxos, ii, 6; death of, 40.
 Chæroncia, victory of Philip at, ii, 56.
 Chalkidians, the, war of the Athenians with, i, 109.
 Chalkidike, Brasidas in, i, 336; rebellion in, continued, 339; its cities restored to Athens, 341; confederation of the cities of, 436; new confederation in, ii, 77; conquered by Philip, 54, 79.
 Chalkis, capture of, by Athens, i, 109; the early importance of, 111.
 Chares, Athenian general, ii, 55.
 Charidemus, Athenian leader, ii, 76,

- 95; killed for his advice to King Darius, 108.
- Chariot-racing in Constantinople, ii, 332.
- Charlemagne, ii, 365.
- Charon, Theban liberator, i, 444.
- Cheirisophus, Spartan general, i, 399, 400.
- Chersonese, Thracian, Athenian conquest of, i, 102; recovered from the Persians by the Athenians, 224; threatened by Philip, ii, 76.
- Chersonites, the, Justinian II banished to the land of, ii, 353; he sends an army to exterminate them, 355.
- Chilbudius, Byzantine general, ii, 335.
- Chimæra, i, 8.
- Chios, destruction of, by the Turks, ii, 405.
- Chosroes, king of Persia, ii, 334.
- Christ, appearance of, ii, 282; doctrine of two natures of, confirmed, 351.
- Christianity, Hellenism in, ii, 253 sq.; the new Hellenic world organized by, 260; its relation to Hellenism, 280; compared with Judaism and Islamism, 346-7; conflict of, with Islamism, 347; state of, in the East, in the eighth century, 360; abuses of the forms and worship of, 361 sq.
- Christians, the, persecution of, ii, 285-6; primitive and corrupted worship of, 361.
- Chrysanthius, master of the theurgic art, ii, 308.
- Chryseis and Chryses, i, 18.
- Chrysostom, John, ii, 319; eloquence of, *ib.*; his reformatory course as archbishop, 320; persecution of, 321; second banishment and death of, 322; his remains brought back, 323.
- Chrysostomus, Dion, ii, 274.
- Churches, first Christian, ii, 283-6.
- Cities founded by Alexander the Great, ii, 131-2, 135, 137, 237.
- Claudius, defeat of the barbarians by, ii, 279.
- Clermont, council of Urban at, ii, 379.
- Colonies, Greek, i, 110; ii, 415.
- Colonization, Grecian system of, i, 117-18.
- Comneni, the, ii, 374.
- Comnenus, death of the last, ii, 383.
- Comnenus, John and Manuel, ii, 381.
- Comnenus, Michael Angelus, ii, 387.
- Companions, the, Macedonian, ii, 71.
- Congress at Sparta, ii, 10.
- Conrad III, ii, 381 sq.
- Constans, youngest son of Constantine, ii, 300.
- Constans II, ii, 348.
- Constantine the Great, ii, 286; conversion of, 288; wonderful manifestation to, 289; sole emperor, 291; last seven years of the reign of, 299; division of the empire by, 300; remarks on the death of, 301.
- Constantine II, ii, 300; death of, 302.
- Constantine III, ii, 347.
- Constantine IV, Pogonatus, ii, 348; Arab besiegers repelled by, 349; sixth œcumenical council convoked by, 351.
- Constantine V, ii, 364.
- Constantine VI, ii, 364.
- Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, ii, 373.
- Constantine XIII, Pelæologus, ii, 390.
- Constantinople, foundation of, ii, 297 sq.; second general council at, 316; disturbance at, caused by the banishment of Chrysostom, 321; chariot-racing in, 332; race-course revolt in, 332 sq.; the Bulgarians driven from, 336-7; first Mohammedan siege of, 348 sq.; importance of its failure, 349; its periodical character, 350; sixth œcumenical council at, 351; second Arabic siege of, 356-7; state of, in the eighth century, 359; meeting of the crusaders before, 380; events at, 384; capture of, by the crusaders, 385; recovery of, 388; fall of, 390.
- Constantius, the emperor, ii, 300; murders of, 302; death of, 308.
- Corinth, territory of, i, 56; account of, 82; Korkyra colonized by, 116; relations of, with the Korkyreans, 286; congress of the anti-Spartan alliance at, 417, 418; battle near, 418; victory of Iphikrates near, 427; occupied by the Athenians and Spartans, ii, 25; Timoleon sent to the aid of Syracuse by, 41; congress convoked by Philip at, 57; council assembled by Alexander at, 93; his visit to, 95; capture and destruction of, 251; ravaged by Roger, 382.
- Corinth, the isthmus of, i, 55; Panhellenic council at, 171, 174; honors for victories awarded at, 205.
- Corinthian alliance, i, 420; broken up, 435.
- Corinthian war, the, i, 417.
- Corinthians, the, Korkyra and Syra-

cuse founded by, i, 116; war of, with Athens, 255.
 Creed, the, established by the first Christian council, ii, 295-6.
 Crispus, ii, 292; death of, 297.
 Croesus, i, 98, 114, 123, 126.
 Cruelties of the crusaders, ii, 386; of the Turks, 392 sq.
 Crusade, the first, ii, 377 sq.; second, 381; ultimate object of, 381; third, 383.
 Crusaders, the, in Constantinople, ii, 383 sq.
 Crusades, the, ii, 377.
 Cucusus, banishment of Chrysostom to, ii, 322.
 Cumæ, i, 116, 120.
 Cyclops, the, i, 2, 29.
 Cyrus the Great, conquest of Asia Minor by, i, 114, 126; establishment of the Persian empire by, 125 sq.
 Cyrus the Younger, i, 372, 397; his expedition against Artaxerxes II, 399; death of, 400.

D

Dacia, ii, 330.
 Dæmon, the, of Sokrates, i, 394 sq.
 Daiphantus, ii, 37.
 Dandolo, ii, 383 sq.
 Danube, the, Persian bridge over, i, 129 sq.; Alexander's expedition to, ii, 93.
 Dardania, ii, 330.
 Dardanians, the, i, 15.
 Dardanus, son of Zeus, i, 15.
 Darius I, Hystaspes, i, 127; his Scythian expedition, 128; his anger against the Athenians, 139; failure of his first expedition to Greece, 139; treatment of his heralds there, 140; the second expedition, 141; death of, 162.
 Darius II, i, 360; death of, 397.
 Darius III, Codomannus, ii, 96; his inactivity after the battle of Granikus, 105; change of his tactics, 107-8; his forces at the battle of Issus, 108; their disposition, 112; the position of, as contrasted with that of Alexander, 113; his cowardly flight, ib.; submits propositions of peace, 115; at the battle of Gaugamela, 121; his flight from, 125; his escape, 127; his death, 131.
 Datis, Persian general, i, 141; destruction of Eretria by, 142.
 Debtors, sale of, i, 92; Solon's laws for, 94.

Decius, the emperor, ii, 277.
 Deiphobus, i, 23.
 Dekamnichus, ii, 63.
 Delium, i, 338.
 Delos, festival of Apollo at, i, 111; common assembly at, 249; removal of the treasury from, ib.; prosperity of, ii, 258.
 Delphi, the Amphictyonic Council at, i, 41; the oracle of, 43; the temple of, 44-5; temple rebuilt by the Alkæonidae, 103; the Persians repelled from, 188; the temple of, robbed by the Phokians, ii, 44; attacked by the Gauls, 231; during the reign of Julian, 308.
 Delphic oracle, responses of the, i, 45, 172.
 Demades, Athenian orator, ii, 49, 155; death of, 172.
 Demagogues, Athenian, i, 327.
 Demaratus the Corinthian, ii, 103.
 Demeter, ii, 215.
 Demetrius II, ii, 244.
 Demetrius Poliorketes, ii, 190; his military ability, 191; hastens to the assistance of Halikarnassus, 193; his arrival in Hellas in 307 B. C., 196; contrasted with the Phalerean, 197; seizes the Peiræus, 198; his stay in Athens, 200; his arrival in Kyprus, 201; meaning of name Poliorketes, 201; his victory over Ptolemy, 202; his career in Kyprus, 206; loss of his fleet, 207; his siege of Rhodes, 208 sq.; his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries, 214; invades the Peloponnesus, and calls an assembly of the Greeks, 215; abuses of, 215-16; recalled by Antigonus, 217; at the battle of Ipsus, 218; his departure for Athens, 220; imperious demands of Seleukus from, 221; alliance against, 222-3; king of Macedonia, 223; a captive, 225; his death, 226.
 Demetrius the Phalerean, appointed to the government of Athens, ii, 180; character of, 194 sq.; condition of Athens under, 195; contrasted with Demetrius Poliorketes, 197; deposed, 198.
 Demetrius II, ii, 244.
 Demochares, ii, 47.
 Democrats, Athenian, slaughter of, i, 390.
 Demokritus, Naxian commander at Salamis, i, 198.
 Demonax, the lawgiver, i, 77.

- Demosthenes, sketch of, ii, 47; inscription on his statue, 48; his oratory, 51; criticism of, 52; incites an alliance against Philip, 56; his ineffectual efforts against Philip, 76; his Olynthiacs, 77; his military conduct, 78; his charges against Philip, 79; his discomfiture in the embassy to Philip, 81; his accusations of his fellow ambassadors, 84; incites an outbreak on the death of Philip, 92; his sentiments respecting the movement of Agis, 131; his oration "On the Crown," ib.; reason of his banishment, 155; his flight, 159; his death, 161-2.
- Demosthenes, the elder, ii, 47.
- Demosthenes, the general of Casarcia, ii, 282.
- Demosthenes, the general, i, 323; seizes Pylos, 326; his contest for Sphacteria, 327 sq.; its capture, 333-4; his expedition to Sicily, 357; his death, 360.
- Derkyllidas, Spartan general, i, 408; his successes in Asia Minor, 409; harmost of Abydos, 422.
- Deukalion and Pyrrha, i, 5.
- Dexippus, the Goths defeated by, ii, 278.
- Diakrii, tho, i, 92.
- Dikekes, Spartan soldier, i, 182.
- Dikasteries, the, i, 262.
- Diodorus, estimate of the Persian forces by, ii, 99-100; birth and period of, 237.
- Diogenes, interview of Alexander with, ii, 95.
- Diokles the Corinthian, i, 49.
- Diomedes, i, 18, 19.
- Dion Chrysostomus, ii, 274.
- Dionysius of Halikarnassus on Demosthenes, ii, 51.
- Dionysius of Phokæa, i, 137.
- Dionysius the Elder, tyranny of, i, 440; ally of Sparta, 441; demonstration against, at the Olympic festival, 442; Gallie mercenaries sent to Sparta by, ii, 26; death of, 41.
- Dionysius the Younger, expelled by Timoleon, ii, 41.
- Dioskuri, the, i, 16; sacrifice offered to, by Alexander, ii, 135.
- Disburdening ordinance, Solon's, i, 97.
- Dium, Macedonian city, ii, 104.
- Divinity, notions of, in legendary Greece, i, 31.
- Dodona, oracle of, i, 10, 43, 54-5.
- Domestic life in the heroic age, i, 27.
- Dorians, the, i, 6, 57; in Krete, 115.
- Doric colonies, i, 113.
- Dorie invasion, i, 24, 57.
- Doris attacked by the Phokians, i, 257.
- Dorus, i, 6.
- Drako and his laws, i, 88.
- Dramales, ii, 399.
- Dramatic poetry, i, 265.
- Drypetes killed by Roxana, ii, 154.
- Durazzo, capture of, by Robert Guiscard, ii, 276.

E

- Eastern Empire, the, ii, 286 sq.
- Eastern provinces, i, 36 sq.
- Edessa, ii, 61; capture of, 381.
- Egypt conquered by Cambyses, i, 127; rebellion in, 162; Agesilaus in, ii, 39; visit of Alexander to, 119; Upper, Mohammedan conquest of, 347; religion of, assimilation to the Hellenic, 148, 255-6.
- Egyptian religion, ii, 238.
- Eion, capture of, by Kimon, i, 250.
- Ekbatana, Alexander's march to, ii, 131; his treasury and headquarters, 132; his visit to, 142.
- Elatcia, ii, 56.
- Eleians subjected by Sparta, i, 402 sq.; ii, 32.
- Elephants, first employment of, in battle, ii, 121.
- Eleusinian mysteries, ii, 215.
- Eleusis, the temple of, ii, 215; the Thirty at, i, 393; recovered, 394.
- Elis, i, 55, 58, 60, 62; ravaged by King Agis, 403.
- Elpinike, i, 283.
- Embassy to Philip, the Athenian, ii, 81-4.
- Emperors, the, ii, 265.
- Engineering corps, Philip's, ii, 72.
- Eos, i, 21.
- Epaminondas, i, 52; first appearance of, 445; sketch of, ii, 2; his friendship for Pelopidas, 5; his boldness in the congress at Sparta, 12; victory of, at Leuktra, 14 sq.; invades the Peloponnesus, 20; threatens Sparta, 21; founds Megalopolis and Messene, 22; his victorious return, 23; his renewed invasions, 25; deprived of office, 27; restored to command, 29; his naval expedition, 30; in the battle of Mantinea, 32; death of, 36; its consequences, 38.
- Epeians, the, i, 57.

Epeius, i, 22.
 Epialtes the Athenian, banishment of, ii, 95.
 Epialtes the statesman, i, 262, 270.
 Epialtes the traitor, i, 180, 183.
 Ephesus, Spartan army in, i, 411, 413; synod at, condemns the heresy of Nestorius, ii, 326.
 Ephors, the Spartan, i, 65 sq.
 Epidamnus, relations of, with Korkyra, i, 286.
 Epidauria, i, 56.
 Epidaurians, relations of, with the Corinthians, i, 255.
 Epigoni, war of the, i, 15.
 Epiktetus, ii, 268.
 Epimenides the philosopher, i, 93.
 Epimetheus, i, 5.
 Epirots, i, 55; growing importance of the, ii, 233.
 Epirus, inhabitants of, i, 54. (See Pyrrhus.)
 Epizephyrian Lokri, i, 117.
 Erebos, i, 1.
 Erechtheus, i, 7.
 Eretria, i, 111, 134; destroyed by the Persians, 142.
 Eretrians, fate of the, i, 156.
 Erichthonius, i, 15.
 Erigyius, Macedonian general, ii, 98.
 Eteokles, i, 14.
 Ethiopians in Xerxes's army, i, 167.
 Euaenetus, Spartan general, i, 175.
 Eubœa, Athenian invasion of, i, 109; notice of, 110-11; taken by the Persians, 142; the Hellenic fleet at, 183; revolt of, 279, ii, 78.
 Eudamidas, Spartan general, i, 437.
 Eudokia (Athenais), empress of Constantinople, ii, 324; banishment and death of, 325.
 Eudoxia, wife of the emperor Arcadius, ii, 318; her persecution of Chrysostom, 321-2.
 Eugenius, usurping emperor, ii, 316.
 Eumenes, satrap of Paphlagonia, ii, 154; assisted by Perdikkas, 163-4; combination against, 165, 170; enters Kappadokia, and defeats Neoptolemus, 166; his victory over Kraterus, 167; kills Neoptolemus, 168; defeated by Antigonus, 171; besieged in Nora, 172; invades Phœnicia and Syria, 180; his desperate condition, 183; indecisive battle with Antigonus, 184-5; his stratagem, 186; conspiracy against, 187; defeated by Antigonus, 187-8; his death, and character, 189.

Eunomus, ii, 50.
 Euphranor, Athenian painter, ii, 34.
 Euripides, representation of the first tragedy of, i, 265; in Macedonia, ii, 62; anecdote of, 63.
 Euripus, the, i, 175.
 Eurotas, the, i, 56.
 Eurybiades, Spartan admiral, i, 176, 178; at Artemisium, 184; at Salamis, 187 sq.; in the council at Salamis, 191; in the battle, 196, 197.
 Eurydike, widow of Amyntas II, ii, 24, 64-5.
 Eurydike, widow of Opheltas, ii, 200.
 Eurydike, wife of Philip Arridæus, ii, 164-5; death of, 181.
 Eurymedon, double battle on the, i, 251.
 Eurysthenes, i, 53, 64.
 Eurystheus, i, 57.
 Eurytus, Spartan soldier, i, 183.
 Eusebius, Archbishop, death of, ii, 313.
 Eutropius, great chamberlain of Arcadius, ii, 318.
 Evagoras, prince of Salamis in Kyprus, i, 411, 434.
 Exenetus of Agrigentum, i, 61.
 Exile-Hunters, the, ii, 161.

F

Fallmerayer, Professor, extravagant views of, ii, 338, 359.
 Family tie, the, in legendary Greece, i, 25, 27.
 Fausta, wife of Constantine, ii, 297.
 Festivals, i, 48.
 Feudal system, the, ii, 886.
 Flamininus, Titus, ii, 249.
 Four Hundred, the, i, 365-6.
 Franks, the, ii, 279 (note).
 Funeral ceremony, i, 283.
 Funeral orations, i, 274, 282, 312.

G

Gainas, murder of Rufinus by, ii, 318.
 Galerius, the emperor, ii, 287; death of, 288.
 Gallic mercenaries, ii, 26.
 Gallienus, reign of, ii, 278.
 Gallus, the emperor, ii, 277.
 Games, the Hellenic, i, 48, 59, 124; during the Roman rule, ii, 266-7.
 Ganymedes, son of Tros, i, 16.
 Gargaphia, the fountain, i, 213.
 Gates of Kilikia, ii, 109.
 Gaugamela, battle of, ii, 121; its importance, 127.

- Gauls, the, invasions of, ii, 229; description of, 230; ravages of, 231; kingdom established by, in Thrace, 232; Galatia settled by, 1b.
- Gaza, capture of, ii, 119.
- Gè, goddess of earth, i, 2.
- Gela, Sicily, i, 225.
- Gelon of Syracuse, i, 120, 174; his conditional offer of aid against Xerxes, i, 225; the Carthaginians defeated by, 226.
- Generals, the Athenian, death of, i, 376.
- Geographical knowledge of the heroic ages, i, 30.
- George I, king of Greece, ii, 410.
- Germans, invasions of the, ii, 277.
- Germanus, Byzantine general, ii, 335.
- Gerrha, Persian shields, i, 216.
- Gerusia, the Spartan, i, 64; the Kretan, 115.
- Getæ, the, ii, 93.
- Gibbon, mistakes of, in following Prokopius, ii, 338; his opinion of Heraklius, 343.
- Glaukias, ii, 94.
- Glaukus of Chios, i, 113.
- Godfrey, ii, 387.
- God, word of, ii, 282.
- Gods and men, legends of, i, 1.
- Gods of Hellas and Egypt contrasted, ii, 256.
- Golden fleece, the, i, 10.
- Gordian knot, the, ii, 106.
- Gordius, legend of, ii, 106.
- Gorgias, an officer of Eumenes, ii, 168.
- Gorgias the Leontino, ii, 267.
- Gorgoleon, Spartan commander, ii, 7.
- Goths, the, ravages of, ii, 278; invade the Eastern Empire, 314; pacified by Theodosius I, 315; under Alaric, defeated by Stilicho, 318; in Italy, victories of Belisarius over, 334.
- Grammatikus, John, ii, 370.
- Granikus, the, ii, 100; the battle of, *ib.*, sq.; the killed at, 104.
- Gratian, the emperor, ii, 215; murder of, *ib.*
- "Great king," the, i, 128.
- Grecian fleet at Salamis, size of, i, 197; at Delos, 207; during the revolution, ii, 405.
- Greece, early changes in, i, 78; state of, following the War of Independence, ii, 407. (See Hellas.)
- Greek fire, the, ii, 350.
- Greek language, i, 122.
- Greeks, the, political principles originated by, ii, 59. (See Hellenes.)
- Greeks and Persians, comparison of, i, 227.
- Gregory the Theologian, ii, 312; character of, 314.
- Grote, defense of the Megarian decree by, i, 293; opinion of, respecting the Athenian epidemic, 314 (note); his defense of Kleon, 329 (note); his preference of Kleon over Nikias, 339 (note); on the mutilation of the Hermæ, 355-6 (note).
- Gryllus, son of Xenophon, ii, 34.
- Gylippus, Spartan general, i, 357 sq.
- Gylon, grandfather of Demosthenes, ii, 47.

II

- Hadrian, the emperor, ii, 266, 271.
- Hagion-Oros, promontory of, i, 436.
- Haliartus, i, 51.
- Hamilcar, Carthaginian commander, i, 226.
- Hannibal, alliance of Philip V with, ii, 247.
- Harmodius and Aristogeiton, i, 102.
- Harmokydes, Phokian chief, i, 211.
- Harmosts, i, 359.
- Haroun al-Rashid, ii, 265; defeat of Nikephorus by, 366.
- Harpalus, satrap of Babylonia, ii, 155; Demosthenes accused of being bribed by, 155.
- Harpies, the, i, 11.
- Hector, i, 16, 19, 20.
- Hegemon, an Athenian orator, ii, 178.
- Hegemonia, the, i, 48.
- Hegemony of Sparta, i, 388. (See Supremacy.)
- Hekabe, wife of Priam, i, 18.
- Hekateus the historian, i, 133.
- Hekatoncheires, the, i, 2.
- Helen and Paris, i, 16.
- Helena, mother of Constantine the Great, ii, 287, 297.
- Helike, destruction of, ii, 9.
- Helikon, Mount, i, 418, 419.
- Hellas, name of, i, 4; geography of, 20 sq.; condition of, on Xerxes's invasion, 169; state of, after the Persian war, i, 388; subjected to Sparta, 389; change of sentiment in, 423; freedom of the cities of, proposed by Sparta, 430; confirmed by the decree of Artaxerxes, 433; its disastrous effect upon, 434; Thebes the ruling city in, ii, 26; anarchy in, 41; decline of religious sentiment in, 42, 45; expending her last resources, 47; Philip master and general-in-chief of,

- 57; retrospective view of, 58; cause of the final submission of, 74; relations of Philip to, 89 sq.; futile effort for an anti-Macedonian alliance in, 80; affairs of, arranged by Alexander, 92-3; his final departure from, 96; misfortunes of, about 319 B. C., 174; condition of, under the successors, 193; invaded by the Gauls, 231; and Macedonia, 241; ascendancy of the Romans in, 250 sq.; moral and material degradation of, 252; affairs in, 258; miserable condition of, 263; not all subject to the jurisdiction of the Romans, 264; decline of, 273; the Goths driven out of, by Stilicho, 318; withering of ancient Hellenism in, 325; flourishing state of, in the eighth century, 359; under the Turkish rule, 392 sq.; kingdom of, 407 sq.
- Helle and Phrixus, i, 9.
- Hellen, i, 4; the sons of, 6.
- Hellenes, the, name of, i, 6; what they lacked, 402; interest of, in the conquest of Asia, ii, 90; servile condition of, 248; moral decay of, 260; during the War of Independence, 400 sq.
- Hellenic cities in Asia, treatment of, by Sulla, ii, 260. (See Asia Minor.)
- Hellenic colonies, i, 110.
- Hellenic customs, amalgamation of, with the Persian, ii, 132.
- Hellenic festivals, the, i, 48; chariot-racing at, ii, 332.
- Hellenic influence, permanence of, ii, 253.
- Hellenic literature, decline of, under the empire, ii, 325.
- Hellenic nation, the, critical position of, i, 247; continuous existence of, ii, 60; triumphant over the barbarians, 319; sole opponent of Islamism, 347.
- Hellenic religion, spread of, in the East, ii, 143, 255; amalgamation of, with the Egyptian, 238-9.
- Hellenic tongue, magnetic power of the, ii, 238; reasons for its prevalence, 255.
- Hellenic world, condition of the (379 B. C.), i, 439; ii, 233.
- "Hellenika," the, of Xenophon, i, 367; end of, ii, 33.
- Hellenism, the first, last days of, ii, 47; character of, 53; its wonderful elasticity, 60; changes in its character, under Philip, 73; not overthrown by him, 89 sq.; ancient, contrasted with the Macedonian, ii, 197; in the West, 236; in the East, 237; struggles of, 253; wonderful results of, 256 sq.; the first herald of Christianity, 280; Byzantine, 342 sq.; disappearance of, from the conquered countries, 349; during the reign of Manuel Comnenus, 383; mediæval, fall of, 386; modern, 392; under the Turkish rule, 396, 400; progress of modern, 412.
- Hellespont, the, i, 9; Xerxes's bridges across, 164.
- Helots, the, i, 68; revolt of, 253; their independence proclaimed by Epaminondas, ii, 22.
- Hephæstion, Macedonian general, ii, 132, 133, 139; death of, 142; extravagant obscurities of, 143-4.
- Heræa, Arkadian city, ii, 20.
- Heræon Teichos, the, Philip's siege of, ii, 76.
- Herakleidæ, invasion of the, i, 24, 57.
- Herakles, i, 5, 8.
- Herakles, son of Alexander and Barsine, ii, 193.
- Herakleonas, the emperor, ii, 348.
- Heraklius, overthrow of Phokas by, ii, 343; character of, ib.; death of, 348; his race extinguished, 357.
- Heraklius, brother and general of Tiberius Absimaros, ii, 353.
- Hercules, the bronze, of Lysippus, ii, 333.
- Hermæ, mutilation of the, i, 355.
- Herod, king of Judæa, ii, 254.
- Herodotus, the historian, i, 228; compared with Thucydides, 229, 368.
- Heroic age, society in the, i, 25.
- Hesiod, i, 3.
- Hetæra, i, 297.
- Hetæri, the Macedonian, ii, 71.
- Hæteria, Pheleke, ii, 398.
- Hiero, ii, 236.
- Himeræus, Athenian orator, ii, 159, 161.
- Hipparchus, son of Peisistratus, i, 102.
- Hippias, son of Peisistratus, i, 102; expelled from Athens, 103-4; at Sparta, 109; in Persia, 110; at Sardis, 132; with the expedition against Greece, 141, 143; his fate unknown, 156; the sons of, 156, 163, 203.
- Hippodrome, the, of Constantinople, ii, 333.
- Hippokleides, i, 81.
- Hippokrates, tyrant of Gela, i, 225.
- Hippokrates, the general, i, 338.
- Hippokrates, the physician, i, 315.
- Ilistiæa, the Persian fleet at, i, 186.

Histiaeus, at the bridge over the Ister, i, 130; sovereign of Myrkinus, 131; his treachery, 133; his death, 136.
 Homer, i, 33.
 Honorius, the emperor, ii, 317.
 Hopf, Carl, against Fallmerayer, ii, 338.
 Hospitality in the heroic age, i, 23.
 Hungary, crusaders destroyed in, ii, 379.
 Huns, the, invasion of Europe by, ii, 314; called in by Rufinus, 318; devastations of, under Attila, 327.
 Hussein Bey, ii, 403.
 Hydarnes, Persian general, i, 180-2.
 Hydaspes, the, ii, 137-8.
 Hydrotes, the, ii, 137-8.
 Hyllus, i, 57.
 Hypaspists, the Macedonian, ii, 71.
 Hyperbolus, ostracism of, i, 351.
 Hyperides, the funeral oration of, ii, 156; flight and death of, 159, 161.
 Hyperion, i, 2.
 Hyphasis, the, ii, 137, 138.

I

Iapetos, i, 2.
 Ibrahim Pasha, ii, 401 sq.
 Iconoclasts, ii, 363.
 Ida, Mount, i, 15, 17.
 Idmon, i, 12.
 Iliad, the, i, 15.
 Ilium, i, 16; Alexander at, ii, 97. (See Troy.)
 Illyria, invasion of, by the Bulgarians, ii, 335.
 Illyrians, the, conquered by Philip, ii, 66.
 Ilius, i, 16.
 Image-worship, ii, 361-2; prohibited by Leo III, 363; restored by Irene, 365; prohibited by Leo V, 367; restored by Theodora, 370.
 Immortals, the Persian, i, 166, 180.
 India, Alexander's progress to, ii, 129 sq.; his conquests in, 137.
 Indus, Alexander at the, ii, 135 sq.
 Inferiors, Spartan, ii, 22.
 Innocent, Pope, ii, 384.
 Ino, i, 9.
 Iolafidas, ii, 37.
 Iollas, ii, 181.
 Ion, i, 265.
 Ionian colonies, i, 112.
 Ionian revolution, the, i, 131.
 Ionian Sea, the, supremacy of the Athenians in, ii, 9.
 Ionians, the, origin of the name, i, 6; Themistokles's inscriptions to, 186;

in the battle of Salamis, 198; proposed transportation of, 223; relations of, with the Athenians, 234.
 Ionic alliance, the, i, 234.
 Iphikrates, i, 424; reorganization of the peltasts by, 425; destruction of a Spartan battalion by, 426 sq.; commander of the Athenian fleet, 432; commander in the Ionian Sea, ii, 9; his fleet recalled, 13; unsuccessful against Epaminondas, 23; protector of the family of Amyntas II, 24; in Macedonia, 64.
 Iphikratides (shoes), i, 425.
 Ipsus, battle of, ii, 217.
 Irene, mother of Constantine VI, ii, 364; her tyrannical government, 365; banished, ib.
 Isaac I, Comnenus, ii, 374.
 Isæus, teacher of Demosthenes, ii, 49.
 Isagoras, i, 104, 107-8.
 Isauria, ii, 329 (note).
 Isidas, son of Phœbidas, ii, 33.
 Islam, the Mohammedan religion, ii, 344.
 Islamism and Christianity, conflict between, ii, 347.
 "Island," the, i, 215, 216.
 Islands in the Ægean, i, 111.
 Ismenias, Theban leader, i, 417; expulsion of, 438.
 Isokrates, panegyric oration of, i, 441, 443; compared with Demosthenes, ii, 49, 51, 53; his advice to Philip, 90.
 Issus, battle of, ii, 108; its results, 114.
 Ister, the, Persian bridge over, i, 129 sq.; Alexander's expedition to, ii, 93.
 Isthmian games, i, 83.
 Italy, colonization of southern, i, 117 sq.; invaded by Pyrrhus, ii, 235.
 Ithome, Mount, captured by the Spartans, i, 75; held by the Helots, 253; acropolis of Messene on, ii, 22.

J

Jason, chief of the Argonauts, i, 10 sq.
 Jason of Phæræ, ii, 18; death of, 23.
 Jerusalem, capture of, by the Mohammedans, ii, 347; by the crusaders, ii, 380; by Saladin, 383.
 Jesus Christ, Mohammed's view of, ii, 345.
 Jews, ii, 253 sq.
 Jokasta, i, 13.
 John Comnenus, ii, 381.
 John Grammatikus, the patriarch, ii, 370.

- Josephus, the historian, ii, 240, 280.
 Jovian, the emperor, ii, 311.
 Julian the Apostate, ii, 303; reasons of his hallucination, 305; reign of, 308; his admiration for Hellenic learning, 309; death of, 310.
 Justin I, ii, 329; death of, 331.
 Justin II, ii, 342.
 Justinian I, emperor, ii, 330; his accession, 331; his collection of laws, ib.; nearly dethroned by the race-course riots, 332 sq.; his successful wars, 334; nearly overthrown by the Bulgarians, 335-6; other misfortunes of the empire under, 337; his private misfortunes, 339; St. Sophia built by, ib.
 Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, ii, 352; mutilated and banished, 352-3; his return, 353; his terrible revenge, 354; assassinated, 356.
- K
- Kadmeia, the, seized by the Spartans, i, 438; recovered by the Thebans, 445; Sparta fined for the seizure of, ii, 42; Macedonian garrison in, 57; preserved on the destruction of Thebes, 95.
 Kadmus, i, 8.
 Kalauria, death of Demosthenes at, ii, 161.
 Kalais and Zetes, i, 11.
 Kallas, Macedonian general, ii, 98.
 Kallias, Athenian ambassador at Sparta, ii, 10.
 Kallias, commander at Corinth, i, 427 sq.
 Kallikrates, death of, i, 217.
 Kallikratidas, i, 373.
 Kallimachus, the polemarch, i, 149, 154.
 Kallinikus, the patriarch, ii, 355.
 Kallinikus, inventor of the Greek fire, ii, 350.
 Kallisthenes put to death by Alexander, ii, 137.
 Kallistratus, Athenian ambassador at Sparta, ii, 10, 11.
 Kanaris, the Greek admiral, ii, 406 sq.
 Karystus, in Eubœa, taken by the Persians, i, 142.
 Kara Ali, ii, 405.
 Karneian Apollo, festival of the, i, 147.
 Kassander, Macedonian general, ii, 98; commander of the royal native troops, 152; Demades executed by, 173; his contest with Polysperchon, 173 sq.; his arrival at the Peiræus, 179; his peace with the Athenians, 180; kills Olympias, 182; guaranteed the supreme command in Europe, 192; king of Macedonia, 206; driven from Athens by Demetrius, 214; alliance against Antigonos formed by, 216; his efforts to impose his rule over Hellas, 222; his death, 223.
 Kassandra, promontory of, i, 436.
 Kassandreia, foundation of, ii, 182.
 Kekrops, i, 8.
 Kephisodoros, Athenian cavalry commander, ii, 34.
 Khazars, the, Justinian II among, ii, 353-4.
 Kilidge-Arslan attacks the crusaders, ii, 379.
 Kilikia, movements of the Greeks and Persians in, ii, 109 sq.; pirates settled in, 262; the Arabs expelled from, 353.
 Kimon, son of Miltiades, i, 161, 188; his relations with Perikles, 242; captures Eion and Skyros, 250; his victory at the Eurymedon, 251; sails to Kyprus, ib.; advocates aiding the Spartans, 253; ostracism of, 254; his noble behavior, 258; his death, 259.
 Kimonian treaty, the, i, 259.
 Kinadon, conspiracy of, i, 406.
 Kineas of Konon, i, 34.
 Kingdom of Greece, ii, 407.
 Kings, year of, ii, 206.
 Kirphis, Mount, i, 46.
 Kirrha, i, 46; destruction of, 47.
 Kitium, siege of, i, 260.
 Kleander, tyrant of Gela, i, 225.
 Klearchus, commander of the ten thousand Greeks, i, 399; death of, 400.
 Kleinias, Athenian citizen, at Artemisium, i, 185.
 Kleisthenes of Sikyon, i, 80.
 Kleisthenes the Athenian, constitution of, i, 104.
 Kleitus, ii, 94; saves Alexander's life, 103; killed by him, 134.
 Kleitus, admiral of Polysperchon, ii, 180; defeat of, in the Propontis, ib.
 Kleobule, mother of Demosthenes, ii, 47.
 Kleombrotus I, i, 187.
 Kleombrotus II, abortive expeditions of, to Bœotia, i, 446, ii, 6; defeat and death of, at Leuktra, 13 sq.
 Kleomenes I, i, 52, 104, 107 sq.; refuses aid to the Ionians, 134.

- Kleomenes III, i, 68; his career, ii, 245 sq.
- Kleon, the demagogue, i, 329; opposes the Spartan proposals of peace, 330; commander against Sphakteria, 332-3; his factitious success, 334; his defeat and death at Amphipolis, 340; views of Grote concerning, 337, 339 (notes).
- Kleonymus, king of Sparta, defeated by the Romans, ii, 234.
- Kleopatra, last wife of Philip, ii, 87, 88.
- Kleopatra, daughter of Philip, ii, 87, 164; death of, 193.
- Kleophon, the demagogue, i, 369-70.
- Klytæmnestra, i, 24.
- Knidian Aphrodite, the, temple to, i, 423.
- Knidus, battle of, i, 421.
- Kodrus, last Athenian king, i, 87.
- Koës at the bridge over the Ister, i, 129; sovereign of Mytileno, 131.
- Kolehis, the Argonautic expedition to, i, 9.
- Komontorius, first king of Tyle, ii, 232.
- Konon, Athenian general, i, 373; his escape from Ægospotami, 382; his operations against the Spartans, 411; incites the Rhodians to revolt, 415-16; his victory at Knidus, 421; rebuilds the long walls, 423; honors to, ib.; arrest and fate of, 431-2.
- Koræbus, Olympic victor, i, 60.
- Koran, the, ii, 345; precepts of, 395.
- Korinna, i, 51.
- Korkyra, colonization of, i, 116; its naval strength, 286; sea-battle near, 288; revolt of the aristocrats in, 319; unsuccessful Spartan siege of, ii, 9; revenue of, in the twelfth century, 359.
- Korkyraëans, the, alliance of, with the Athenians, i, 286.
- Koroncia, battle of, i, 418; the battlefield, 420; Xenophon's narrative of, 421.
- "Kothornos," nickname of Theramenes, i, 392.
- Krannon, Thessaly, ii, 24.
- Krasus, battle of, ii, 366.
- Kraterus, Macedonian general, ii, 157, 158, 163, 166; defeated by Eumenes, 167-8; his death, 168.
- Kratesikleia, mother of Kleomenes III, ii, 245.
- Krenides, afterward Philippi, ii, 69.
- Kreon, king of Thebes, i, 13.
- Kresphontes, i, 57-8.
- Krete, syssitia in, i, 74; Dorian colonization of, 115; aid against the Persians refused by, 174; the pirates in, ii, 261; captured by Pompey, 262; taken by the Mohammedans, 368.
- Krethens, i, 10.
- Krios, i, 2.
- Krissa, i, 46.
- Kritias, one of the thirty tyrants, i, 391; his excesses, 392; his death, 393.
- Kronos, i, 2.
- Kroton, i, 119.
- Ktesias, Greek physician, i, 411.
- Kunaxa, battle of, i, 400.
- Kyklades, the, i, 111.
- Kylon of Athens, i, 89.
- Kynane, mother of Eurydike, ii, 164-5.
- Kynægeirus at the battle of Marathon, i, 154.
- Kynosura, promontory of, i, 196.
- Kynuria, i, 56.
- Kyprus, i, 116; Persian conquest of, 135; the Hellenic fleet at, 232; Kimon at, 251-2, 260; capture of, by Demetrius, ii, 201 sq.; the Arabian fleet nearly annihilated at, 364.
- Kypselus, i, 83.
- Kyrene, i, 116, 127.
- Kyzikus, Athenian victory near, i, 369; Arabic headquarters in, ii, 350.

L

- Labarum, the first Christian flag, ii, 290.
- Lacedæmonians. (See Spartans.)
- Lachares, ii, 222.
- Laconia, i, 68, 74; Theban invasion of, ii, 21; invaded by Philip, 57.
- Laconians, emigration of, i, 117.
- Laos and Oedipus, i, 13.
- Lamia, the courtesan, ii, 206.
- Lamian war, the, ii, 155.
- Laomedon, king of Troy, i, 16.
- Laomedon, satrap of Syria, ii, 153.
- Larissa, Thessaly, i, 38.
- Laskaris, Theodore, ii, 387.
- Latin empire, organization of the, ii, 386.
- Latins, treachery of the, ii, 381.
- Laws, Justinian's collection of, ii, 331.
- Lebadia, i, 50.
- Lechaëum, defeat of the hoplites of, i, 427.
- Legends of gods and men, i, 1 sq.
- Lelex, i, 7.
- Leo the Thracian, emperor, ii, 328; his disastrous expedition to Africa, ib.; his character and death, 329.

- Leo III, the Isaurian, ii, 357; defense of Constantinople by, 358-9; prohibits image-worship, 363; his death, ib.; his laws abrogated, ib.
- Leo IV, ii, 364.
- Leo V, ii, 366; slaughter of the Bulgarians by, 367; the reforms of, ib.; murdered, 368; his murderers punished, 369.
- Leo VI, the Philosopher, ii, 373.
- Leo the Mathematician, ii, 370.
- Leonidas at Thermopylæ, i, 176 sq.; death of, 182; memorial to, 205.
- Leonidas II, ii, 245.
- Leonnatus, defeat and death of, ii, 157.
- Leontiades, Theban polemarch, i, 437; tyranny of, 443; death of, 445.
- Leontius, father of Athenais, ii, 324.
- Leontius, the emperor, ii, 353.
- Leosthenes, Athenian general, ii, 156; death of, ib.; its consequences, 157.
- Leotychides, king, commander of the Hellenic fleet, i, 207; at Mykale, 222; return of, 224.
- Leotychides, son of Agis II, i, 405.
- Lesbians, the, proposed revolt of, i, 284.
- Lesbos, i, 7, 112.
- Leuktra, battle of, ii, 13 sq.; results of the, 47-9.
- Libys, brother of Lysander, i, 393.
- Licinius, the emperor, ii, 288; persecutes the Christians, 291; defeated and executed by Constantine, 292.
- Literature, early Greek, i, 122.
- Lochos, the Theban sacred, ii, 4. (See Sacred Band.)
- Lokrians, the, i, 53, ii, 19; of Amphissa, war declared against, 56.
- Lokris, revolt of, i, 279.
- Longinus, ii, 268.
- Longus, promontory of, i, 436.
- Long Walls, the, i, 256; destruction of, 335; rebuilding of, 423.
- Louis VII., ii, 331-2.
- Lucian, ii, 268.
- Lychnitis, Lake, battle near, ii, 94.
- Lydia, i, 114; conquered by Cyrus the Great, 126-7.
- Lygdamis of Naxos, i, 100, 101, 132.
- Lykidas, archon, stoned to death, i, 209.
- Lykophron, defeat of, ii, 46.
- Lykophron, tyrant of Thessaly, conquered by Philip, ii, 74.
- Lykortas, father of Polybius, ii, 250.
- Lykurgan obedience, decay of the, i, 404.
- Lykurgus, i, 64.
- Lysander, Spartan commander, i, 370; his intrigues with Cyrus the Younger, 372; defeats the fleet of Alkibiades, 373; restored to command, 380; his victory at Ægospotami, 382; captures Athens, 383-4; triumphal return of, and honors to, 388; opposition of the Spartan oligarchy to, 390, 393; his new march against Athens, 393; intrigues of, 404; his disappointment, 405; chief counselor of Agesilaus, 410; renewed intrigues of, 411; disgraced and sent to the Hellespont, 412; defeat and death of, 416.
- "Lysandria," Samian holiday, i, 388.
- Lysias, Olympiac oration of, i, 441; Demosthenes compared with, ii, 49.
- Lysimachus, satrap of Thrace, ii, 157; in the alliance against Antigonus, 192; king, 206; allied against Demetrius Poliorketes, 216; with Ptolemy, 220; Macedonia invaded by, 225; subjection of, by Seleukus, 226; misfortunes of, 227 sq.; death of, 229.
- Lysippus, the statuary, ii, 104; his bronze Hercules, 333.
- Lysis, teacher of Epaminondas, ii, 4.

M

- Macedonia, Grecian colonies in, i, 120; and the Olynthian confederacy, 436; Spartan army sent to the aid of, 437-8; cities recovered by, 439; civil wars in, ii, 24; Theban supremacy over, 26; rise of, 38 sq.; historical account of, 61; a Hellenic country, 65, 72; its extension by Philip, 89; anarchy in, 231; and Hellas, 241.
- Macedonian army, reorganization of the, ii, 69 sq.
- Macedonian hegemony, advantages of the, ii, 52 sq.
- Macedonian Hellenism, how different from the first, ii, 58; history of, 61 sq.
- Macedonian language, the, ii, 61.
- Macedonians, the, original state of, ii, 61; disturbance by, in the council of the generals, 150; defeat the Athenians at sea, 158; descent of, at Rhamnus, ib.; defeat of, 168.
- Mænalian range of mountains, ii, 34.
- Magna Græcia, i, 119.
- Magnetes, the, i, 37.
- Mahmoud, Sultan, ii, 401.
- Malea, promontory of, i, 36.

- Mallus, Alexander at, ii, 109.
 Mankind, origin of, i, 3.
 Mantias, Athenian admiral, ii, 67.
 Mantinea, i, 77; destroyed by the Spartans, i, 435; restoration of, ii, 20; battle of, ii, 31 sq.
 Manuel Comnenus, ii, 381; defeats the Hungarians, ii, 385.
 Marakanda, Alexander's sacrifice and banquet at, ii, 135.
 Marathon, the Persians on the plain of, i, 143; description of, 150; the battle of, 152 sq.; importance of the victory, 156; tombs and memorials at, 157-8.
 Marcian, emperor, nominal husband of Pulcheria, ii, 326; resists Attila, 327; death of, ib.
 Marcus Aurelius, ii, 273.
 Mardonius, abortive expedition to Greece under, i, 139; new invasion urged by, 162; left in command by Xerxes, 202, 203; his offer of alliance with the Athenians, 208; his advance and renewed offer, 209; retreats, 210; his test of the Phokians, 211; in the battle of Plataea, 212 sq.; death of, 217.
 Marriage in the heroic age, i, 23.
 Marselles, i, 115.
 Mary, the Virgin, doctrine of Nestorius concerning, ii, 326.
 Massalia, i, 115; ii, 236.
 Masistius, death of, i, 212.
 Mauricius, the emperor, ii, 342.
 Mavrokordatos, ii, 400.
 Maximus, the plenipotentiary of Trajan, ii, 271.
 Maximus, usurping emperor, ii, 315; defeated and killed, 316.
 Maximus, master of the theurgic art, ii, 308.
 Mazæus, Persian officer, at Gaugamela, ii, 126.
 Medea, i, 12.
 Medes, the, conquered by the Persians, i, 125.
 Medusa, i, 8.
 Megabates, Persian admiral, i, 132; at Artemisium, i, 184 sq.
 Megabazus, Persian general, i, 131.
 Megakles and Agariste, i, 82; archon eponymos, 89; and Peisistratus, 100.
 Megakreon of Abdera, saying of, i, 168.
 Megalopolis, foundation of, ii, 22; defeat of the Arkadians near, 26; oration of Demosthenes in favor of, 51; attacked by King Agis, 130.
 Megara, account of, i, 84; at war with Athens for Salamis, 91; alliance of, with Athens, 255; Athenian decree against, 284; Grote's view of, 285.
 Megaris, i, 56.
 Meleagrus, Macedonian general, ii, 150; death of, 152.
 Meleagrus, brother of Ptolemy, ii, 231.
 Melians, the, i, 351.
 Mellon, Theban liberator, i, 444.
 Memnon, son of Tithonus, i, 21.
 Memnon the Rhodian, his advice to the Persians, ii, 100; proclaimed hegemon of Lower Asia and of the fleet by Darius, 106; death of, 107.
 Memphis surrendered to Alexander ii, 119.
 Menelaus, king of Sparta, i, 16.
 Menelaus, brother of Ptolemy, engagement of, with Demetrius Poliorketes, ii, 201.
 Menætius, i, 4, 17.
 Menyllus, Macedonian general, ii, 160.
 Mercenaries, Athenian use of, i, 425.
 Mesolonghi, fall of, ii, 400 sq.
 Messeno, foundation of, ii, 22; declared autonomous, 28, 38.
 Messenia, Spartan wars with, i, 74; conquest of, 76.
 Messenian wars, the, i, 74.
 Messenians, the, expulsion of, from Naupaktus and Kephallenia, i, 403; recalled by Epaminondas, ii, 22.
 Methone, foundation of, i, 120; seized by Philip, ii, 46, 74.
 Methymne, capture of, by Kallikratidas, i, 374.
 Metropolis, relations of a Grecian, i, 287.
 Miaules, Greek admiral, ii, 402; before Mesolonghi, 403.
 Michael I, ii, 366.
 Michael II, ii, 368.
 Michael III, ii, 370; his debasement, 371; murdered, ib.
 Michael VI, ii, 374.
 Michael VII, mention of, ii, 375.
 Michael Angelus Comnenus, ii, 387.
 Miletus, i, 112; Persian siege and capture of, 136 sq.
 Milo, the athlete, i, 61.
 Miltiades the elder, i, 101-2.
 Miltiades the younger, at the bridge over the Ister, i, 130; at Athens--character of, 143; his plan for attacking the Persians, 143; sole commander, 149; in the battle of Marathon, 151 sq.; honors to, 153; dishonorable conduct of, 158 sq.; trial and death of, 160.

- Mindarus, Lacedæmonian admiral, i, 369.
 "Minerva," Greek newspaper, ii, 403.
 Minstrels, ancient, i, 31.
 Mithridates, son-in-law of Darius, killed by Alexander, ii, 103.
 Mithridates, king of Pontus, ii, 254; peace of, with Sulla, 259.
 Mithridatic war, the, ii, 258.
 Moawiyah, the caliph, siege of Constantinople by, ii, 343 sq.
 Mohammed, teachings of, ii, 344.
 Mohammed II, ii, 390.
 Mohammedanism, rise of, ii, 343; doctrine of, 344.
 Molossians, the, i, 54.
 Molossus, Athenian general, ii, 78.
 Monastic life, excessive growth of, ii, 361, 374.
 Mora, a Lacedæmonian battalion, i, 427.
 Mosleman, followers of Mohammed, ii, 344.
 Moslemas, commander in the second siege of Constantinople, ii, 357.
 Müller, O. K., on the Spartan laws, i, 74.
 Mummius, the Roman general, ii, 251.
 Mundus, Illyrian general, ii, 334.
 Munychia, strengthening of, i, 231; held by the Macedonian garrison, ii, 195.
 Murder, primitive punishment of, i, 88.
 Museum, ii, 239.
 Music, in the Greek sense, i, 90.
 Mussulman, origin of the word, ii, 344.
 Mykale, battle of, i, 222; victory of George Sachtoures at, 223 (note).
 Myriandrus, ii, 110.
 Myrkinus, i, 131.
 Myrmidons, the, i, 17.
 Myronides, i, 259.
 Mythological age, the, i, 1.
 Myths, contradictions of the, i, 7.
 Mytilene, i, 112.
- N
- Napoleon, i, 354; and Alexander, analogy between, ii, 90, 146.
 Naupaktus, i, 58; the Messenians expelled from, 403.
 Navigation, ii, 240.
 Naxos, early power of, i, 132; failure of the Persian expedition against, ib.; subdued by the Persians, 142; revolution of, 251; Athenian victory near, ii, 6.
 Naxos in Sicily, i, 352.
 Nearchus, voyage of, ii, 139; appointed satrap of Pamphylia, 153.
- Nektanabis, king of Egypt, ii, 39.
 Neleus and Pelias, i, 10.
 Nemesis, i, 23.
 Neodamodes, enfranchised Helots, i, 408.
 Neoplatonists, ii, 305 sq.
 Neoptolemus, son of Achilles, i, 23.
 Neoptolemus, prince of the Molossi, ii, 69.
 Neoptolemus, satrap of Armenia, defeated by Eumenes, ii, 166; killed by him in battle, 168.
 Nephelæ, i, 9.
 Nero, the emperor, in Greece, ii, 265; murdered, 266; the Christians persecuted by, 285.
 Nestor, i, 17.
 Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, ii, 326.
 Niausa, battles of, ii, 399.
 Nice (Nikæa), council of, ii, 295.
 Nikæa, council of, ii, 295; the crusaders reduce, 380; new empire established at, 387.
 Nikæa in India, ii, 137.
 Nikæa, daughter of Antipater, ii, 164.
 Nikanor, Munychia held by, for Kasander, ii, 173; superseded, 174, 180.
 Nikephorus I, ii, 365; defeat and death of, 366.
 Nikias, i, 328; yields the command to Kleon, 332; his arguments against him, 339; Grote's opinion of, ib. (note); peace of, 341; opposes the expedition to Sicily, 353; one of its commanders, 354; his operations, 357; his death, 358; execution of his brother and son, 391.
 Nikokles, king of Salamis, i, 434.
 Nikokles, an Athenian orator, ii, 178.
 Nikomachus, father of Aristotle, ii, 65.
 Nora, ii, 171.
 Norman army, the, ii, 385.
 Normans, the, ii, 375.
 Nureddin, ii, 382.
- O
- Oceanus, i, 2, 3.
 Octavius, ii, 263.
 Odeon, the, i, 267.
 Odysseus, i, 17 sq.; stratagem of, 22; possessions of, 26.
 Oedipus, i, 13.
 Oenœ, Athenian fortress, i, 309.
 Oenophyta, battle of, i, 256.
 Oeta, Mount, i, 36; passage of the Persians over, i, 180.
 Ogyges, i, 5.

- Oligarchical governments established by Sparta, i, 389.
- Oligarchical system in Greece, i, 78; at Athens, 87-8, 104, 361.
- Olympia, i, 59 sq.
- Olympic oration of Lysias, i, 441; of Isokrates, 443.
- Olympiads, the, i, 60.
- Olympian Zeus, temple of, i, 62, 101.
- Olympias, wife of Philip, ii, 69; reputation of, 87; proceedings of, with Perdikkas, 164; puts Philip Arridæus and Eurydike to death, 181; killed by Kassander, 182.
- Olympic games, i, 59.
- Olympiodorus, general of the Athenians, ii, 222; his efforts to free his country, 225.
- Olympus, Mount, i, 36, 37.
- Olynthiaes, the, ii, 77.
- Olynthian confederacy, the, i, 435 sq.; defeat of a Spartan army by, 433; dissolution of, 439; new, ii, 77; end of, 79.
- Olynthian war, the, ii, 77-9.
- Olynthians, the, subdued by Philip, ii, 54, 77; their alliance refused by the Athenians, ii, 68; come to terms with Philip, ib.
- Olynthus, confederacy formed by, i, 436; captured by Philip, ii, 79.
- Onchestus, i, 51.
- Oneium, Mount, ii, 25.
- Onetor, guardian of Demosthenes, ii, 48.
- Onomarchus, Phokian general, ii, 45; death of, 46.
- Oracles, i, 42.
- Orchomenus, Arkadia, ii, 20.
- Orchomenus, Bœotia, i, 50; ii, 7, 8; held by the Phokians, 46.
- Orestes, king of Macedonia, ii, 63.
- Ornbasius, the physician of Julian, ii, 308.
- Oropus, i, 51.
- Orpheus, i, 10.
- Orsippus, Megarian general, i, 84.
- Ossa and Pelion, i, 36.
- Ostracism, origin and mode of, i, 105 sq.; last instance of, 351-2.
- Otho, king of Greece, ii, 409.
- Othrys, Mount, i, 3, 36.
- Ozolian Lokrians, i, 58.
- Palæologus, Michael, ii, 388; Constantine, 390.
- Palladium, the, i, 22.
- Pallene, promontory of, i, 436.
- Palmyra, ii, 282.
- Panaktum, i, 341, 343-4.
- Panarkadian federation, ii, 20.
- Panathenæa, the, i, 101.
- Pandora, i, 5.
- Pangæus, Mount, gold-mines of, ii, 69.
- Panormus, i, 55.
- Paphlagonia, ii, 383.
- Paralii, the, i, 92.
- Paralus, son of Perikles, i, 317.
- Paris, i, 16, 19, 21.
- Parmenio, Macedonian general, ii, 86, 97, 98; Tralles seized by, 106; lotter of, to Alexander, 109; his advice as to the battle of Gaugamela followed, 122; death of, 132.
- Parnassus, plain of, i, 44.
- Paros, siege of, by Miltiades, i, 159.
- Parysatis, queen of Persia, i, 397.
- Pasargadæ, the, i, 126.
- Patroklus, i, 17, 19, 20.
- Pattala, Alexander at, ii, 138.
- Paul, St., ii, 282; in Greece, 283; allusion to, 352.
- Paulus Æmiliius, ii, 72.
- Pausanias, king of Macedonia, ii, 24, 63.
- Pausanias, king of Sparta, i, 394, 405-6; retreat, sentence, and escape of, 416.
- Pausanias, murderer of Philip, ii, 88.
- Pausanias, Peloponnesian commander, i, 210; in the battle of Plataæ, 212 sq.; his inscription on the tripod, 219; execution of Theban prisoners by, 221; treachery of, 232; death of, 236.
- Peace of Antalkidas, the, i, 429; decreed by Artaxerxes, 432; disastrous results of, 434; advantages of, to Sparta, 439.
- Peace of Nikias, i, 341.
- Pedasus, i, 18.
- Pedeis, the, i, 92.
- Peers, Spartan, i, 406.
- Pegasus, i, 8.
- Peiræus, the, strengthening of, i, 231; the fortifications of, destroyed, 385; Thrasybulus in possession of, 393; the walls leading to, rebuilt, i, 423.
- Peirithous, i, 28.
- Peisander, government of the Four Hundred established by, i, 365-6.
- Peisander, Spartan admiral, i, 421; defeat and death of, 422.

P

- Preonians, the, ii, 67.
- Pagasæ captured by Philip, ii, 74.
- "Paidonomos," the, i, 69.

- Peisistratidæ, the, at Athens with Xerxes, i, 189.
- Peisistratus, i, 98; tyrant of Athens, 99; his flight and return, 100; his government, 101; his death, 102.
- Pelagus, i, 7.
- Peleus, i, 17.
- Pelias, i, 10.
- Pella in the Olynthian confederacy, i, 436; capital of Macedonia, ii, 61, 72.
- Pelopidas, leader of the Theban liberators, i, 444; one of the governors of Bœotia, 445; sketch of, ii, 5; victory of, at Tegyra, 7; in the battle of Leuktra, 15, 16; his successes in Thessaly, 24, 25; in Macedonia, 26; his mission to Persia, 28; seized by Alexander of Phœæ, *ib.*; liberated by Epaminondas, 29; death of, 31; in Macedonia, 64.
- Peloponnesian war, the, preliminaries of, i, 276; events before, 284; history of, 291 sq.; responsibility for, 293; first two years of, 307; savage character of, 321; renewal of, 339; progress of, 369; end of, 383 sq.
- Peloponnesus, the, Doric invasion of, i, 24; circumnavigated by the Athenian fleet, ii, 9; disastrous earthquakes and rains in, *ib.*; invasions of, by Epaminondas, 20, 25; included in the Achæan confederacy, 247.
- Pelta, the, i, 425.
- Peltasts, reorganization of the, by Iphikrates, i, 425; destruction of a Spartan battalion by, 427; in the Macedonian army, ii, 70.
- Pelusium, Alexander at, ii, 119.
- Peneius, the, i, 37.
- Penelope, i, 26.
- Penestæ, the, compared with the Helots, i, 63.
- Penthesileia, i, 21.
- Perdikkas II, of Macedonia, relations of, toward the Athenians, i, 289, 435; his reign, ii, 62.
- Perdikkas III, ii, 24, 30; death of, 46; his reign, 64-5.
- Perdikkas, Macedonian general, ii, 98; regency of, 149; his punishment of the insurgents, 151; goes to the aid of Eumenes, 163; offers of marriage to, 164; marches to Egypt against Ptolemy, 165; his death, 169.
- Periander of Corinth, i, 83.
- Perikleian age, the, i, 270.
- Perikles, i, 242; sketch of, 243; antagonism between him and Kimon, 245-6; opposes granting aid to the Spartans, 253; his advice to the Athenians, 256; constructs the Long Walls, 257; proposes the recall of Kimon, 259; changes at Athens under, 261; internal regulations of, 262; object of the laws of, 264; public works of, 267; energy of, 268; age of, 270; object of, 271; funeral oration of, 275; reduces Samos, 280; funeral oration of, 282; his decree against the Megarians, 285; slanders of his opponents, 296; his relations with Aspasia, 297 sq.; his opposition to the Spartan envoys, 303; last days of, 316; his political career, 318.
- Perilaus, Sikyonian commander, i, 223.
- Perinthus, ii, 55.
- Periœki, the, i, 67; freed by Epaminondas, ii, 22; made citizens of Sparta, 246.
- Perrhæbians, the, i, 37.
- Persepolis, treasure found at, ii, 129.
- Perscus, legendary hero, i, 8.
- Perscus, son of Philip V, ii, 250.
- Persia, establishment of the empire of, i, 125; Spartan negotiations with, 429; the Asiatic Greeks given up to, 430, 434; refuses aid to Sparta against the Thebans, ii, 9; Hellenic ambassadors sent to, 28; state of, on Alexander's invasion, 96; the army of, 99 sq.; wars of, with the Eastern Empire, 326, 334.
- Persian rescript, the, ii, 28.
- Persian invasion, the first, i, 138; the second, 162.
- Persian wars, the, i, 125 sq.; results of, 226 sq.
- Persians, the, i, 126; on the plain of Marathon, 143 sq.; retreat of, after the battle, 154-5; march of, under Xerxes, 165; expulsion of, 212 sq.; their conduct in the war, 227; Spartan war against, 407; fatal mistakes of, ii, 99.
- Persis (Persia proper), i, 125.
- Peter the Hermit, ii, 377; the crusade preached by, 378.
- Peukestas, satrap of Persis, ii, 183; fear of, at the approach of Antigonus, 186; his treachery, 188.
- Phædriades rocks, i, 46.
- Phalækus, Phokian general, ii, 81; surrenders to Philip, 85.
- Phalangites, the Macedonian, ii, 71.
- Phalaux, the Macedonian, ii, 71.

- Phalaris, tyrant (of Agrigentum), i, 225.
- Phalerum, i, 423.
- Phalerum, the Athenians transfer their ship-yard from, i, 231.
- Pharnabazus, Alkibiades put to death by, i, 398; his contest with Derkyllidas, 409-10; his army captured by Agesilaus, 414; joint commander with Konon, 421.
- Pharos, the tower of, ii, 240.
- Pharsalus, Thessaly, ii, 24.
- Pheidias, works of, i, 62, 268; trial and death of, 301.
- Pheidippides, the courier, i, 147.
- Pheidon, king of Argos, i, 59, 62.
- Pheleke, Hætæria, ii, 398.
- Phemius, i, 31.
- Piere, power of Jason established at, ii, 18; taken by Philip, 74; treaty of peace concluded at, 84.
- Phila, wife of Demetrius, ii, 224; suicide of, 225.
- Philip (II) of Macedonia, ii, 24; hostage at Thebes, 26, 64; his accession, 45, 65; extends his dominions, 46; avenger of the Delphian god, *ib.*; orations of Demosthenes against, 51 sq.; his Hellenic character, 52; ends the second Sacred War, 54; master of the Amphiktyonic Council, 55; peace concluded by, *ib.*; commander in the third Sacred War, 56; his victory at Chæroneia, *ib.*; master of Hellas, 57; chosen general-in-chief of, against Persia, *ib.*; his early career, 65; his accession and extension of his power, 66 sq.; his reorganization of the army, 69; his marriage with Olympias, *ib.*; master of all Thessaly, 74; large naval force acquired by, 75; his expedition to Thrace, 75; his sickness, 76; in the Olynthian war, 77 sq.; splendid celebration of his victory, 80; Athenian proposals of peace to, 81; his reply to the ambassadors, 81-2; his terms accepted, 82; in Thrace, 83; Hellenic envoys before, *ib.*; ends the Phokian war, 85; preparations for his expedition to Asia, 86; assassination of, 87; his position in history, 88.
- Philip IV, son of Kassander, ii, 223.
- Philip V, son of Demetrius III, ii, 247 sq.
- Philip II of France, ii, 334.
- Philip Arrideus chosen king, ii, 150; death of, 181.
- Philippeion, coin, ii, 69.
- Philippi, origin of, 69; battles of, ii, 263, 277.
- Philippic, the first, ii, 51, 75.
- Philippikus, the emperor, ii, 356.
- Philippus, Alexander's physician, ii, 109.
- Philippus, the emperor, ii, 277.
- Philippus, Theban polemarch, i, 444.
- Philo Judæus, ii, 280.
- Philokles, i, 265.
- Philolaus, legislation of, i, 49, 50.
- Philomelus, Phokian general, the Delphian temple robbed by, ii, 44; the troops mustered by, 45; death of, *ib.*
- Philopœmen, ii, 248.
- Philosophy, schools of, i, 113.
- Philotas, Macedonian general, ii, 98; death of, 132.
- Philotas, the taxiarch, ii, 153.
- Phineus, the soothsayer, i, 11.
- Phliasiens, the, Spartan power established over, i, 439.
- Phœbias, Sikyonian village, ii, 25.
- Phœbidas, Spartan general, i, 437; seizure of Thebes by, 438.
- Phœnicia, Alexander's conquest of, ii, 116 sq.
- Phœnicians, the, in the battle of Salamis, i, 193.
- Phokæa, i, 112, 137.
- Phokæans, the, i, 114.
- Phokian war, the, ii, 43 sq.; recapitulation of, 73; end of, 85.
- Phokas, the emperor, overthrow of, ii, 342.
- Phokians, the, at Thermopylæ, i, 177, 181; in the army of Mardonius, 209; distrusted by the Persians, 211; allies of Sparta against the Thebans, ii, 8; decree of the Amphiktyonic Council and alliance against, ii, 43; rob the Delphian temple, 44; victories of, over Philip, 46; defeated by him, *ib.*; sentence against, 54; recapitulation of their proceedings, 73; excluded from the treaty of peace, 83, 84; their punishment, 85.
- Phokion, sketch of, ii, 53; defends Byzantium against Philip, 55; tries to restrain the Athenians, 56; his successes in Eubœa, and recall, 78; his efforts to pacify the people of Athens, 155; refuses the command of the army, 157; his embassy to Antipater, 159; his trial, 176; his fortitude, 178; death of, 179; comments on the trial of, *ib.*
- Phokis, importance of, i, 49; laid waste by the Persians, 188; revolt of, 279;

- resolutions of the Amphiktyonic Council against, ii, 54; sentence upon, 85.
- Phokus, son of Phokion, ii, 179.
- Phormio, Athenian admiral, i, 320.
- Phrygia ravaged by Agcsilaus, i, 413, 414.
- Photius, the patriarch, ii, 371.
- Phrynichus, the tragic poet, i, 133.
- Phthiotis, i, 37.
- Phylake, i, 17.
- Phyle, Thrasybulus at, i, 393.
- Phyllidas, Theban liberator, i, 444.
- Piacenza, council of Urban II at, ii, 379.
- Pinarus, the, ii, 112.
- Pindar, eulogy of the Athenians by, i, 51, 52; his house spared on the destruction of Thebes, ii, 95.
- Pindus, Mount, i, 55.
- Piracy in the heroic age, i, 30.
- Pirates, the, ii, 261 sq.
- Pisatis, i, 59.
- Pittakus, i, 112.
- Plague, the, at Athens, i, 312 sq.; at Constantinople, ii, 337, 364.
- Plataea, i, 51; its separation from Thebes, 51-2; battle of, 212 sq.; booty taken at, 219; honors awarded to the victors, 221; war of, against Thebes, 303; taken by the Peloponnesians, 319; destruction of, 320; rebuilt by the Lacedaemonians, 435.
- Plataeans, the, in the battle of Marathon, i, 149; palm of bravery at Plataea awarded to, 221.
- Plato, ii, 65.
- Pleistoanax, king of Sparta, i, 279.
- Pleurias, Illyrian king, ii, 86.
- Pliny the Younger, ii, 271.
- Plutarch, his account of Lysander's disgrace, i, 412.
- Phytagoras, son of Evagoras, i, 434.
- Poetry, dramatic, i, 265.
- Poets, early Greek, i, 122.
- Pollis, Spartan admiral, defeat of, ii, 6.
- Pollux, i, 10.
- Polybiades, Spartan general, i, 439.
- Polybius, ii, 252.
- Polybus of Corinth, i, 13.
- Polydamas, i, 43.
- Polygamy, i, 28.
- Polykrates of Samos, i, 86, 115, 128.
- Polynikes, i, 14.
- Polyphron and Polydorus, brothers of Jason of Phæra, ii, 23.
- Polyperchon, successor of Antipater, ii, 173; his enmity to Phokion, 175; deputations sent to, ib.; invasion of Attica by, 179; his critical position, 180; his failure to reduce the Peloponnesus, ib.; his alliance with Olympias and with the Æakides, 181; supports Herakles, son of Alexander, but kills him, 193.
- Pompey, the Roman general, ii, 261; philanthropy of, 262.
- Pontus, kingdom of, ii, 254, 383.
- Porphyrogenitus, meaning of, ii, 373.
- Popular assembly, the Spartan, i, 66.
- Porus, defeat and capture of, by Alexander, ii, 137.
- Poseidon, i, 2.
- Potidæa, revolt of, i, 289; the Athenians masters of, 319; surrendered by Philip to the Olynthians, ii, 69; new city on its site, 182.
- Priam, i, 16 sq.
- Probuli, board of, i, 362.
- Probus, the emperor, ii, 279.
- Prokopius, statement of, concerning Justin I, ii, 330; exaggerations of, 338.
- Prometheus, i, 4; moral of the legend of, 6.
- Propontis, the, i, 11.
- Prokles, i, 58, 64.
- Providence, work of, ii, 256.
- Propylæa, the, i, 267.
- Protogenia, i, 6.
- Psammethichus of Corinth, i, 84.
- Ptolemais, daughter of Ptolemy, ii, 221.
- Ptolemies, edifices of the, ii, 239.
- Ptolemy (son of Lagus), joins Perdikkas in the royal chamber, ii, 150; appointed satrap of Egypt, 153; goes to the Macedonian camp, 170; threatens Antigonus, 192; accuses him of violating the treaty, 193; his forces in Kyprus, 201; defeated by Demetrius, 202-3; his power, 205; worshiped by the Rhodians, 213; alliance of, against Demetrius, 216; with Lysimachus, 220; peace of, with Seleukus and Demetrius, 221; his fleet in Hellas, 225; his death, 228.
- Ptolemy, nephew of Antigonus, ii, 193.
- Ptolemy of Alorus, ii, 25, 26; death of, 30, 64.
- Ptolemy Keraunus, ii, 227; king of Thrace and Macedonia, 229; death of, 231.
- Ptolemy Philadelphus, ii, 239.
- Ptolemy IV, Philopater, ii, 247.
- Public works under Perikles, i, 267.
- Pulcheria, the Eastern Empire ruled by, ii, 323; death of, 327.

- Purification, the, of the Macedonian army, ii, 151.
- Pydna, the castle of, ii, 181.
- Pylos, seizure of, i, 323; fortification of, 324.
- Pyrrha and Deukalion, i, 5.
- Pyrrhus of Epirus, ii, 222; his march to Macedonia, 223; the kingdom of Demetrius almost seized by, 224; Macedonia invaded by, 225; his expedition to Italy, 233 sq.; his character, 233-4; his victories, 235; forced to return to Epirus, *ib.*; his death, 242.
- Pythagoras, i, 113, 119.
- Pythia, the, i, 44-6; treatment of, by Philomelus, ii, 44.
- Pythian games, i, 48; ii, 54-5.
- Pythodorus, the torch-bearer of the Eleusinian mysteries, ii, 215.
- Pythokles, an Athenian, ii, 178.
- Python, Macedonian general, ii, 155; satrap of Lesser Media, 182; defeat of, 182-3; death of, 190.
- R
- Race-course, the, in Constantinople, ii, 332-3; revolt of the factions of, 333.
- Redshid, ii, 402.
- Reformation, work of, ii, 302; under Leo V, ii, 367; under Theophilus, 369; abolition of, 370.
- Reformers, persecution of, under Michael III, ii, 370.
- Religious ceremonies, i, 1 sq., 40.
- Revolutionary movements, i, 278.
- Revolution, Greek, ii, 398.
- Rhamnus, invasion of, by the Macedonians, ii, 158.
- Rhea, i, 2.
- Rhodes, siege of, ii, 208 sq.
- Rhœkus of Samos, i, 113-14.
- Robbery, i, 30.
- Robert Guiscard, invasion of, ii, 375; death of, 376.
- Roger II, ii, 382.
- Roman civil wars, ii, 262 sq.
- Roman empire, the, early decline of, ii, 275.
- Roman rule, end of the, ii, 323 sq.
- Roman successes, ii, 247.
- Roman supremacy, ii, 258 sq.
- Romans, the, growing power of, ii, 234; the Hellenic cities ask the aid of, *ib.*; their war with Pyrrhus, 235; ascendancy of, in Hellas, 250; savage treatment of the Greeks by, *ib.*; dangerous wars of, 254; Hellenic possessions fall under, 255.
- Romulus Augustulus, last Roman emperor, ii, 329.
- Roxana, Queen, ii, 150; Statira killed by, 151; death of, 192.
- Rufinus, ruler of the East, ii, 317; murder of, 318.
- Russians, the, defeated by Basil I, ii, 372.
- S
- Sachtoures, George, i, 223 (note).
- Sacred Band, the Theban, ii, 4; in the battle of Tegyra, 7; in the battle of Leuktra, 15; destruction of, 56.
- Sacred War, the first, i, 46; the second, ii, 42; end of, 54 sq.; new, 56 sq.; the second, recapitulation of, 73.
- St. Sophia, temple of, rebuilt by Justinian, ii, 339; view of, 340.
- Sakæ, the, at Marathon, i, 151, 153.
- Sagartii, the, in Xerxes's army, i, 167.
- Salamis, capture of, by Solon, i, 91; reference of the Delphic oracle to, 173; the Greek fleet at, 186, 187; debates at, 190; battle of, 196; results of the, 201; honors conferred on the victors, 205.
- Samians, the, arouse Chios to insurrection, ii, 405.
- Samos, i, 115, 128; revolution of, 279.
- Sardis captured and burned by the Ionians, i, 135; Greek spies at, 172.
- Sarissa, the, ii, 70.
- Sarissophori, the, ii, 70, 72.
- Saronic Gulf, the, i, 56.
- Sarpedon, i, 17.
- Satrapies, i, 127; distribution of, ii, 152; new distribution of, 170, 192.
- Satyros, teacher of Demosthenes, ii, 50; kindness of Philip to, 81.
- Science in legendary Greece, i, 33.
- Sculpture at Athens under Perikles, i, 277; under Hadrian, ii, 272.
- Scythia, expedition of Darius Hystaspes into, i, 123.
- Scythians, invasions of the, ii, 278.
- Seisachthia, Solon's, i, 94.
- Seleukus appointed chiliarch, ii, 152; his power, 192; at the battle of Ipsus, 217; his growing power, 220; sends proposals of marriage to Stratonike, 221; his generosity toward Demetrius, 226; death of, 229.
- Selim I, ii, 394.
- Seljuks, the, ii, 374; capture of Edessa by, 381.
- Senate, the Athenian, under the Thirty, i, 390.

- Serapis, ii, 256.
 Sestos, capture of, i, 224; Alexander's army at, ii, 97.
 Seven against Thebes, the, i, 13.
 Ship-building, ii, 240.
 Sipyrtius, ruler of Arachosia, ii, 190.
 Sicily, colonization of, i, 116 sq.; condition of the colonies in, 224-5; war against the Carthaginians in, 225; Athenian expedition to, 352; its destruction, 357; under Dionysius the Elder, i, 440, ii, 387; civil war in, ii, 41; taken by the Mohammedans, 363, 371.
 Siege of Troy, i, 15; of Tyre, ii, 117; of Rhodes, 203.
 Sieges, ancient, i, 31; laying of, 254.
 Sikinnus, slave to Themistokles, i, 194, 202.
 Sikyon, account of, i, 80.
 Sikyonia, i, 56.
 Simmius, Theban philosopher, ii, 3.
 Simonides of Keos, i, 153.
 Sinon, strategy of, i, 23.
 Siris, battle of, ii, 235.
 Sisyphus, i, 8.
 Sithonia, promontory of, i, 436.
 Skamander, the, Xerxes's army at, i, 166.
 Skyros, capture of, by Kimon, i, 250.
 Slaves in the heroic age, i, 25, 26; in Thessaly, 39.
 Slavs, the, ii, 411.
 Smerdis, i, 127.
 Smyrna, i, 111.
 Social life of Sparta, i, 67.
 Social War, the, ii, 40.
 Society in the heroic age, i, 25.
 Sogdiana conquered by Alexander, ii, 134.
 Sokrates, life and teachings of, i, 394; death of, 396.
 Solon, character of, i, 89; his capture of Salamis, 91; his legislation, 94; his interview with Croesus, 93; his death, 99.
 Sophists, the, ii, 267.
 Sophokles, i, 265; at Samos, 280.
 Sosikles, Corinthian envoy, i, 110.
 Sosthenes, a Macedonian commander, ii, 231; death of, 232.
 Sostratus, the famous artisan, ii, 240.
 Spain, the Arabs in, ii, 349.
 Sparta, i, 24; origin of the dual monarchy of, 58; constitution of, 64; social life of, 67; compared with Athens, 73; growth of the influence of, 77; political intrigues of, 85; expedition sent by, against Athens, 108; refuses aid to the Ionians, 134; treatment of the Persian herald at, 140; leadership against the Persians conceded to, 174; earthquake and revolt of the Helots at, 253; deliberations at, preceding the Peloponnesian war, 291; her policy wholly selfish, 335; alliance of, with the great king, 359; anti-Hellenic spirit of, 362; hegemony of, 388 sq.; extent of its power, 389; its incapability proved, 393; blows inflicted upon, 397; aid sent to Cyrus the Younger by, 399; early decline of its rule, 402; change in the political character of, 403; war of, against the Persians, 407; general revolt from, 415; alliance against, 417; abolition of the naval supremacy of, 421; sends aid to Amyntas II against the Olynthians, 437-8; mistress of Thebes, 438; Olynthian confederacy dissolved by, 439; new alliance against, 440; negotiations with Persia, 429; the peace of Antalkidas confirmed at, 433; failure of an army sent to Thebes by, 446; peace with Athens, ii, 8; broken, 9; congress at, 10; effect of the battle of Leuktra at, 17, 19; revolution against, 19; threatened by Epaminondas, 21; permanent league with Athens, 25; exultation at, over the "tearless battle," 26; nearly captured by Epaminondas, 32; opposes the terms of peace, 33; unfortunate condition of, 39; fined by the Amphiktyonic Council, 42; humbled by Philip, 57; position of, about 330 B. C., 130; condition of, in the time of the successors, 194; attempted reforms of Agis IV at, 244.
 Spartan battalion, destruction of a, i, 426.
 Spartan discipline, the, i, 69.
 Spartan embassy, the first, i, 296; the second, 302; final, 303.
 Spartans, the, i, 67; their military discipline, 71; lukewarm behavior of, 147; arrival of their army after the battle of Marathon, 156; at Thermopylae, 177 sq.; after the battle, 187; heralds sent to Athens by, 208; faithlessness of, 209; sudden march of, 210; oppose the fortification of Athens, 230; position of, following the treachery of Pausanias, 234; strengthening of Thebes by, 257; submit proposals of peace, 326; their victories barren, 421; their spirit under misfortune, 429; despotic proceedings of, 435; de-

- feat of, by the Olynthians, 438; general indignation against, 440 sq.; humiliation of, ii, 6 sq.; defeat of, at Tegyra, 7; at Leuktra, 13; defeated by Antipater, 130.
 Sparti, the race of, ii, 3.
 Spercheus, the, i, 36.
 Sphacteria, i, 319; capture of, 331.
 Sphinx, the, i, 13.
 Spintharus, Tarentine philosopher, ii, 3.
 Spithridates, Persian renegade, i, 412.
 Spithridates at the battle of Gramkus, ii, 103.
 Statira killed by Roxana, ii, 154.
 Stephen, patriarch and saint, ii, 373.
 Stephen the Savage, general of Justinian II, ii, 355.
 Stilicho, ruler of the West, ii, 317; drives the Goths out of Hellas, 318.
 Stratokles, the vote passed by, concerning Demetrius Poliorketes and Antigonus, ii, 199.
 Stratonike, daughter of Demetrius, ii, 221.
 Struthas, defeat of the Lacedæmonians by, i, 432.
 Sublime Porte, naval power of, ii, 405.
 Successors, the, ii, 149 sq.; great object of the, 233.
 Sulla in Hellas, ii, 259 sq.
 Supremacy, Athenian, i, 230 sq.; culmination of the, 261.
 Supremacy unattainable by any Hellenic city, ii, 41; the struggle for, among the successors, 163.
 Supremacy, naval, of the Athenians, i, 232.
 Supremacy, papal, ii, 386.
 Susa, treasure found at, ii, 123.
 Sybaris, i, 117; destruction of, 119; Thuri founded in place of, 223.
 Syennesis, Kilikian admiral, i, 199.
 Symplegades, the, i, 11.
 Synod at Nikæa, ii, 387.
 Syracuse, i, 116, 120; under Gelon, 225; democratical government established in, 352; destruction of the Athenian fleet at, 357; under Dionysius the Elder, i, 440; freed by Timoleon from Dionysius the Younger, 41; subjected by the Romans, 236.
 Syria conquered by the Mohammedans, ii, 347; invaded by the general Heraklius, 353; by Constantine V, 364; the crusaders institute a kingdom in, 380.
 Sysitis, the Spartan, i, 66, 72.
- T
- Tachos, king of Egypt, ii, 39.
 Tagus, title, i, 39.
 Tanagra, i, 51; battle of, 256.
 Tarentines, the, at war with the Romans, ii, 234; assisted by Pyrrhus, 235.
 Tarentum, foundation of, i, 117.
 Tarsus, ii, 282.
 Tartarus, i, 2, 3.
 Taxeis, the, ii, 101.
 Tearless battle, the, ii, 26.
 Tegæa, i, 76, 77; union of, with Mantinea, 20; Epaminondas at, 32, 34.
 Tegyra, battle of, ii, 7.
 Telamon, i, 10, 17.
 Teletias, Spartan general, i, 438.
 Terbelis, Bulgarian ally of Justinian II, ii, 354.
 Temenus, i, 57, 58.
 Tempe, vale of, i, 37; forces sent to, against Xerxes, 175.
 Ten, Athenian oligarchy of, i, 393.
 Ten Thousand, retreat of the, i, 400.
 Teskeres, ii, 395.
 Thales, i, 113, 114.
 Thasians, the, Ioso Mount Pangæus, ii, 69.
 Thasos, i, 121; capture of, 252.
 Theagenes, a Herakleid, i, 8.
 Theagenes, despot of Megara, i, 84.
 Thearides of Syracuse, i, 442.
 Theatre, admission to the, at Athens, i, 266.
 Theban fugitives in Athens, i, 444.
 Theban power, rise of, ii, 1; culmination of, 28 sq.
 Thebans, the, i, 49 sq.; submit to Persia, 140; at Thermopylæ, 177, 181, 182; in the battle of Plataea, 216 sq.; their punishment, 220; victory of, over Lysander, 416; prominence attained by, 417; in the battle of Koroneia, 418; forced to submit to the decree of Artaxerxes, 433; character of, ii, 1; their resistance to the Spartans, 6; victory of, at Tegyra, 7; their ambassadors in the congress at Sparta, 10 sq.; their victory at Leuktra, 13 sq.; reinforcements sought by, 18; their supremacy over Bœotia established, 19; league of Athens and Sparta against, 25; efforts of, for recognition of their supremacy, 28; their supremacy in the Peloponnesus, 30; fleet equipped by, ib.; effect of the death of Epaminondas upon, 37; peace concluded by, 38; the Amphik-

- tyonic Council selfishly used by, 42; second Sacred War incited by, 43; defeated by the Phokians, 46; in the battle of Charoneia, 56; ask the intervention of Philip in the Sacred War, 83, 86; revolt of, 94; defeated and enslaved by Alexander, 95.
- Thebes, the Seven against, i, 13; government of, 49; siege of, by the allies, 220; loss of power by, 253; restored by the Spartans, 257; attack of, against Plataea, 303; Spartan occupation of, 437; liberation of, 443 sq.; abortive Spartan expedition against, 446; the ruling city in Hellas, ii, 26; opposition to Epaminondas at, 27; declared by Persia the head city of Hellas, 28; stato of, after the battle of Mantinea, 39; joins the alliance against Philip, 56; subjected and chastised by him, 57; stay of Philip at, as a hostage, 65; destroyed by Alexander, 94; ravaged by Roger II, 382.
- Themistokles, character of, i, 145; strife between him and Aristides, 170; wisdom of his policy manifested, 171; his interpretation of the Delphic oracle, 173; at Tempe, 175; at Artemisium, 178, 183; bribed by the Eubœans, 184; his inscriptions on the rocks, 186; at Athens, 188; in the council, at Salamis, 191; his stratagems, 194, 202; in the battle, 198; his avarice shown at Andros, 204; honors to, 206; rejection and restoration of, 207; thwarts the plans of the Spartans, 231; plans of, for strengthening the Peiræus and Munychia, 232; neglect of, by the Athenians, 235; death of, 237; letter of, to King Artaxerxes, 240.
- Theodora, wife of Justinian I, ii, 331; death of, 339.
- Theodora, wife of the emperor Theophilus, ii, 369; her cruel conduct as regent, 370.
- Theodora, Khazar wife of Justinian II, ii, 354.
- Theodore Laskaris, ii, 387.
- Theodoros of Samos, i, 113-14.
- Theodosius the Great, ii, 315; second general council convened by, 316; defeats the usurpers Maximus and Eugenius, *ib.*; death of, *ib.*; character of, 317; his family extinct, 327.
- Theodosius II, the Small, ii, 323; his marriage with Athenais (Eudokia), 324; death of, 327.
- Theodosius III, temporary emperor, ii, 357.
- Theognis, the poet, i, 85.
- Theokritus, ii, 237.
- Theoktistus, ii, 370.
- Theophilus, archbishop of Alexandria, ii, 321.
- Theophilus, the emperor, ii, 368; character and career of, 369; his successors, 370.
- Theopompus, Spartan commander, ii, 7.
- Theoria, a, i, 442.
- Theoric funds, the, ii, 77.
- Theotokos, attribute of the Virgin Mary, rejected by Nestorius, ii, 326.
- Theramenes at the Arginusæ, i, 376; his treachery to the generals, 377; his embassy to Lysander, 383-4; his effort to moderate the excesses of the Thirty, 391; his death, 392.
- Thermopylæ, i, 36; description of, 175-6; Hellenic forces at, 176; battle of, 179; the dead at, 186; memorials at, 205; occupied by the Athenians against Philip, ii, 46, 75.
- Thespians, the, at Thermopylæ, i, 177, 181-2; expelled by Epaminondas, ii, 19.
- Thesprotia, i, 54.
- Thessalians, the, i, 24, 37-8; submit to the Persians, 175; alliance of, with the Athenians, i, 255.
- Thessalonike, daughter of Philip, ii, 182; murdered by her son, 223.
- Thessaly, i, 24; account of, 36 sq.; Jason of Phœræ tagos of, ii, 18; freed by Pelopidas, 24; again released from Alexander, 31; anarely in, 41; conquered by Philip, 46, 74; the Phokian war ended in, 85.
- Thetes, i, 25-6.
- Thetis, i, 17, 21.
- Thimbron, Spartan general, i, 408; defeat and death of, 432.
- Thirty, the, at Athens, i, 385, 389; cruelties of, 390; overthrow of, 392; their hostility to learning and philosophy, 394.
- Thomas, Byzantine general, revolt of, ii, 368.
- Thrace, Grecian colonies in, i, 120-21; Xerxes's army in, 168; Philip's expeditions to, ii, 75, 83; Alexander secures his dominion over, 93; made a kingdom, 206; the Gauls in, 232.
- Thrakidæ, the, ii, 44.
- Thrasylbulus, Athenian general, i, 366; flight of, 392; overthrow of

- the Thirty by, 393; democratical government restored by, 394.
- Thrasybulus, tyrant of Syracuse, i, 352.
- Three thousand, the Thirty's list of, i, 391; new oligarchy constituted by, 393.
- Thucydides, the historian, compared with Herodotus, i, 229; his report of the speeches of the envoys, 237; his account of the deliberations at Sparta, 292; views of, on the origin of the Peloponnesian war, 294; banishment of, 337; use of his history by Demosthenes, ii, 49.
- Thuoydides, son of Melesias, i, 270.
- Thudippus, an Athenian orator, ii, 173.
- Tiberius II, ii, 342.
- Tiberius Absimarus, the emperor, ii, 353.
- Tigranes, defeat and death of, at Mykale, i, 222-3.
- Timæa, queen, i, 405.
- Timæus, ii, 237.
- Timandra, Alkibiades buried by, i, 393.
- Timokrates, agent of Tithraustes in Hellas, i, 415.
- Timoleon, Syracuse freed by, ii, 41.
- Timotheus, Athenian admiral, ii, 9, 30.
- Tiribazus, satrap of Ionia, i, 431 sq.; promulgates the decree of Artaxerxes, 433.
- Tiryus, i, 56.
- Tisamenus, son of Orestes, i, 53.
- Tissaphernes, treaty with Sparta concluded by, i, 360; his relations with Alkibiades, 364; successor of Cyrus the Younger, 407; unites with Pharnabazus, 409; outwitted by Agesilaus, 412; defeated by him, 413; deposed and put to death, 414.
- Titans and Titanides, the, i, 2.
- Tithraustes sent to kill and supersede Tissaphernes, i, 414; concludes an armistice with Agesilaus, *ib.*; excites war in Hellas, 415; replaced, 431.
- Titus Flamininus, ii, 249.
- Tolmides, i, 273.
- Traditions, i, 7, 9.
- Trajan, the emperor, ii, 270.
- Treasure-houses, ancient, i, 32.
- Triballi, the, ii, 93.
- Tribonian, the legislator, ii, 331; compared with Bacon, 332.
- Tribunals under Perikles, i, 263.
- Tribute paid to Athens, i, 248.
- Tribute of blood, ii, 394.
- Trinity, the, heresy of Arius concerning, ii, 293 sq.; doctrine of, proclaimed by Theodosius the Great, 316; why rejected by Mohammed, 344.
- Tripod, the prophetic, at Delphi, i, 44; the Platæan, 219.
- Tripolitza, ii, 35.
- Triremes, first construction of, i, 83; general adoption of, 117.
- Troy, legend of, i, 15; Xerxes at, 166.
- Tsavellas, the hero, ii, 402 sq.
- Turkish language, the, ii, 393.
- Turkish rule, ii, 392.
- Turks, the, in Asia Minor, ii, 375; conquest of Constantinople by, 390; oppression of the Christians by, 394-5.
- Tyle, Gallie kingdom in Thrace, ii, 232.
- Tyre, capture of, ii, 117 sq.
- Tyrtæus, i, 70, 75-6.

U

- Union, lack of, in Hellas, i, 402.
- Uranus and Gæa, i, 2.
- Urban II, pope, the crusade approved by, ii, 378; councils summoned by, at Piacenza and Clermont, 379.
- Urban IV, ii, 389.

V

- Valens, the emperor, ii, 312; defeated and killed by the Goths, 314.
- Valentinian I, ii, 312; death of, 314.
- Valentinian II, ii, 316.
- Valentinian III, death of, ii, 327.
- Valerianus, reign of, ii, 273.
- Vandals, the, of Africa, defeat Leo's expedition, ii, 328; victories of Belisarius over, 334.
- Venetians, the, sinister motives of, ii, 354.
- Vespasian, the emperor, ii, 266.

W

- War of Independence, last battle of the, ii, 14 (note); sketch of the, 392 sq.
- Western provinces, i, 53.
- Wicker shields, the Persian, i, 216.
- William the Conqueror, ii, 375.
- "Wooden walls," i, 172, 189.
- Women in the heroic age, i, 26; Spartan, 71; of ancient Hellas, 297.

Wordsworth, Bishop, on the state of Athens, ii, 412.

Worship, objects of, i, 32.

X

Xanthippus, i, 143; character of, 144; prosecution of Miltiades by, 160; again a leader, 207; commander at the capture of Sestos, 224.

Xanthippus, son of Perikles, i, 299.

Xenophanes of Kolophon, i, 113.

Xenophon, the "Hellenika" of, i, 367; the "Anabasis" of, 400; real commander of the Ten Thousand, *ib.*; his subsequent career, 401; in the battle of Koroncia, 419; his narrative of it, 421; his account of the seizure of Thebes, 443.

Xerxes, preparations of, for a new invasion of Greece, i, 162 sq.; his march, 165; enumeration of his army, 166; at Thermopylæ, 179, 186; in Athens,

189; overlooking Salamis, 193, 198; Themistokles's messages to, 194, 202; his cowardice, 201; his retreat, 203-4; capture of his tent at Plataea, 219; at Sardis, 223; letter of, to Pausanias, 233.

Xyston, the Macedonian, ii, 70.

Y

Yermuk, the, Mohammedan victory at, ii, 347.

Z

Zabergan, Bulgarian chief, ii, 335 sq.

Zakynthus, the Athenian fleet at, ii, 9.

Zalcukus, i, 117.

Zelcia, the Persian army at, ii, 99.


Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, ii, 282.

Zeno, the Isaurian, emperor, ii, 329.

Zetes and Kalais, i, 11.

Zeus, i, 2, 3; temple and statue of, at Olympia, 62.

THE END.



WORKS ON ANCIENT HISTORY.

A HISTORY OF GREECE. From the Earliest Times to the Present. By T. T. TIMAYENIS. With Maps and Illustrations. 2 vols. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.50.

"While I cheerfully acknowledge my obligations to Gibbon and Grote—the most eminent of modern historians—a careful study of the Greek writers has led me to differ from them on many important matters. The peculiar feature of the present work, therefore, is that it is founded on Hellenic sources. I have not hesitated to follow the Father of History in portraying the heroism and the sacrifices of the Hellenes in their first war for independence, nor, in delineating the character of that epoch, to form my judgment largely from the records he has left us."—*Extract from Preface.*

A GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE, from the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great. With a Sketch of the Subsequent History to the Present Time. By G. W. COX. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.50.

"One of the best of the smaller histories of Greece. Perhaps the most striking peculiarity of the work is the importance the author attaches to mythology as a key to the characteristics of early civilization. In these theories he follows Curtius and rejects Grote."—*Dr. C. K. Adams's Manual of Historical Literature.*

HISTORY OF HERODOTUS. An English Version, edited, with Copious Notes and Appendices, by GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A. With Maps and Illustrations. In four volumes, 8vo. Vellum cloth, \$8.00; half calf, \$16.00.

"This must be considered as by far the most valuable version of the works of 'The Father of History.' The history of Herodotus was probably not written until near the end of his life; it is certain that he had been collecting materials for it during many years. There was scarcely a city of importance in Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Persia, Arabia, or Egypt, that he had not visited and studied; and almost every page of his work contains results of his personal inquiries and observations. Many things, laughed at for centuries as impossible, are now found to have been described in strict accordance with truth."

WILLARD'S GENERAL HISTORY, from B. C. 800 to A. D. 1876.

Outlined in Diagrams and Tables; with Index and Genealogies. For General Reference, and for Schools and Colleges. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.00.

HISTORY OF ROME. By Dr. THOMAS ARNOLD. Large 8vo. Cloth, \$3.00.

Dr. Arnold's colossal reputation is founded on this great work. Without going all lengths with Niebuhr, he rejects the fabulous portion of Roman history; and, while giving the old legends in their original form, he points out their fallacy, and subjects every part of his work to a rigid criticism, based on extensive learning and sound judgment.

HISTORY OF THE ROMANS UNDER THE EMPIRE. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B. D., Rector of Lawford; Chaplain to the House of Commons. Beautifully printed. 7 vols. Small 8vo. Cloth, \$14.00.

THE SAME. New edition. 7 vols. in four. 12mo. Cloth, \$7.00.

"A work that has justly taken high rank in the historical literature of modern England. Some of his chapters must long be regarded as admirable specimens of elegant literary workmanship. The author begins his history with the gradual transfer of the old Republic to the imperialism of the Cæsars, and ends it with the age of the Antonines. It therefore exactly fills the gap between Mommsen and Gibbon."

Works on Ancient History.—(Continued.)

MONTESQUIEU'S CONSIDERATIONS ON THE CAUSES OF THE GRANDEUR AND DECADENCE OF THE ROMANS. A New Translation, together with an Introduction, Critical and Illustrative Notes, and an Analytical Index. By JEHU BAKER. Being incidentally a Rational Discussion of the Phenomena and the Tendencies of History in general. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.00.

"Mr. Jehu Baker has rendered a great service to English-speaking people by producing a new and admirable translation of Montesquieu's 'Considerations on the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans.' But Mr. Baker has by no means confined himself to the simple work of translation. Many foot-notes have been added throughout the volume, and each chapter is followed by an extended and elaborate note. In this work Mr. Baker has in general been most judicious. The additions are thoroughly in harmony with the spirit and the treatment of the original. The central thought which the book seeks to enforce is that of a progressive movement pervading the history of the world. Admirably as this was shown by Montesquieu himself, the last hundred and fifty years have afforded many striking illustrations of its truth, and of these Mr. Baker has made good use. A very few instances of inexactness of statement in his author are also explained or corrected in the notes, and a careful analytical index greatly increases the value of the work for purposes of reference."—*Boston Courier*.

DIGEST OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY. By THOMAS DEW. 8vo. Cloth, \$2.20.

"So nearly what its title indicates that any considerable description is unnecessary. In method, however, it is somewhat unusual. Each paragraph begins with a question, which it is the purpose of the paragraph to answer."—*Dr. C. K. Adams's Manual of Historical Literature*.

MANUAL OF ANCIENT AND MODERN HISTORY. By W. C. TAYLOR, LL. D., M. R. A. S. Revised by C. S. HENRY, D. D. 8vo. Cloth, \$3.50; or, in separate volumes, \$2.00 each.

ANCIENT HISTORY.—Containing the Political History, Geographical Position, and Social State of the Principal Nations of Antiquity, carefully digested from the Ancient Writers, and illustrated by the Discoveries of Modern Scholars and Travellers.

MODERN HISTORY.—Containing the Rise and Progress of the Principal European Nations, their Political History, and the Changes in their Social Condition; with a History of the Colonies founded by Europeans.

Dryness is generally characteristic of condensed historical outlines; in the present case it is avoided by the vigorous style of the author, and the introduction of interesting anecdotes and episodes that serve to relieve the mind, and bring out in clear light the peculiarities of individual or national character.


The American edition has been revised throughout by Dr. Henry, and enlarged by the introduction of an admirable chapter on American history.

HISTORY OF THE WORLD, from the Earliest Records to the Fall of the Western Empire. By PHILIP SMITH, B. A. New edition. 3 vols., 8vo. Vellum cloth, gilt top, \$6.00.

"These volumes embody the results of many years of arduous and conscientious study. The work is fully entitled to be called the ablest and most satisfactory book on the subject written in our language. The author's methods are dignified and judicious, and he has availed himself of all the recent light thrown by philological research on the annals of the East."—*Dr. C. K. Adams's Manual of Historical Literature*.

New York: D. APPLETON & CO., 1, 3, & 5 Bond Street.





PUBLIC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 456 925 5

