BENN'S SIXPENNY LIBRARY, No. 2

*

THE WORLD OF GREECE & ROME

By EDWYN BEVAN
M.A., D.Litt., LL.D.

LONDON: ERNEST BENN LIMITED

BENN'S SIXPENNY LIBRARY

THE WORLD OF GREECE & ROME

By EDWYN BEVAN
M.A., D.Litt., LL.D.
Lecturer in Hellenistic History and Literature in the University of London, King's College

LONDON: ERNEST BENN LIMITED
BOUVERIE HOUSE, FLEET ST. E.C.

CONTENTS

First published 1927

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

THE WORLD OF GREECE AND ROME

CHAPTER I

PLACE OF THE GREEK CIVILIZATION IN HUMAN HISTORY

It is calculated to have been several hundreds of thousands of years ago when a strange thing happened on this planet of ours, which for millions of years before that had spun round the sun. Amongst the breeds of animals which inhabited the earth's virgin forests, one breed, whose shape in its general lines resembled that of the great apes, underwent a change (whether by merely natural evolution or by a fresh creative act need not here be discussed) which brought into being the creature we call man—a creature with faculties such as no animal upon earth had ever possessed before, a creature who could think and plan and devise tools for his purposes and communicate his thought to others of his kind in speech. Yet though men could communicate with other men who heard their living voice, they did not for a long time devise any way of communicating their thoughts to men far away, to men who would live on the earth when they were dead. So that even after men were there upon the globe, hundreds of thousands of years went by, during which the different tribes and races of men lived and died, fought and migrated, in the forests and steppes, leaving no more record of their doings and sufferings than is left by the ferment of an ant-hill. Only to-day, as we unearth bits

of the things men made thousands of years ago—dwellings and tools—or study the traces of the past in human languages, we can dimly construct in imagination some of the great movements which took place in the human race during that long roll of unrecorded centuries. It is only for the last six thousand years that man has begun to transmit thought from generation to generation by the device of writing, and at first it was only a few exceptional peoples, living beside the great rivers of Egypt and Babylonia, who did so. The bit, therefore, of human experience lit up by what we call *history* is only the extreme last bit in a process extending backwards through uncounted ages: compared with the time man has been on the planet, the pyramids are modern, and a mere six thousand years is too brief a period to give adequate basis for a forecast of what man will become in the course of another five hundred thousand years. Future centuries may see as notable advances beyond what man is now as the advance which the civilized European of to-day has made beyond the creature who chipped tools of flint in Europe ten thousand years ago. Yet when we speak of the advance made in these last six or seven thousand years, we must beware of begging the question that it has been an advance in happiness. All we can say for certain is that it has been an advance in knowledge, and in the power which knowledge gives. But surely, someone might say, increase in power must mean increase in happiness, because men become better able to achieve their purposes. It might, if men's purposes remained always the same, but with the increase of knowledge and power comes an increase of mental range, and so more far-reaching desires and purposes. Modern civilized man needs much more than primitive man to make him happy. Perhaps, although he has so much more than primitive man had, he is further from being satisfied.

Within this period, of the last six or seven thousand

years, we can distinguish a special movement of advance which began only about 2,500 years ago. That is the movement which was marked by the culture of the people who called themselves Hellenes, and whom we commonly call Greeks, round about the Mediterranean from about 600 B.C. onwards—a culture which was embodied, with new elements added to it, within the civilization of the Roman Empire, and passed on to be the begetter of modern Western civilization—the extreme point reached so far by man in knowledge and power. It is just because the modern civilization of Europe is the child of the "classical" civilization of the Greco-Roman world, after the interruption we call the Middle Ages—the carrying on of a process of thinking started by the "ancient" Greeks—that it is so important for us to know what we can of the Greco-Roman world. Even if it could be shown that the products of the Greco-Roman world were not in themselves more valuable than the products of Indian or Chinese or Old Mexican civilization, it would still be more important for us to know about the Greco-Roman world, in order to understand our own. It is also in one way more important for us to know about it than to know about the products of one or other of the later national cultures of Europe—Italian or French or German or Spanish—because each of these is only one stream into which the river of European culture has divided, and what happens in one stream need not affect the future of European culture as a whole, whereas everything that happened further back, in the one river from which all these different streams flow, necessarily affects all of them. However far the knowledge attained in future advances of European civilization may leave behind what the ancient Greeks and Romans knew, whatever great events may take place in the immeasurable future, the "classical" world can never lose its interest and importance, because there can never be any other beginning but the beginning.

We can imagine a time fifty or sixty centuries hence when the Great War, looking back, will seem only a lurid spot far away in the past, and great poets whom we read to-day will be known to only a few curious students of antiquity; but it is safe to say that every educated person will still know about Marathon and Salamis and be familiar with Homer and Æschylus, with Horace and Virgil. However many poets may come after Homer, Homer can never lose his prerogative of being the first.

The movement which began about 2,500 years ago with the development of Greek civilization was an advance made by one out of a particular group of peoples within the great mass of primitive mankind. This group of peoples, to which both the Greeks and the Romans belonged, is marked off by their speaking languages evidently derived from a common parent—the language which was spoken by some primitive people before that people split up into a number of different branches.

By what name that primitive people called itself we shall never know. Modern scholars have invented the names "Indo-European" or "Indo-German" as a label for it, which are very clumsy. Professor Giles has chosen a better sounding name. He calls them the "Wiros," because *wiro* (pronounced *weero*), or something like it, seems to have been the word for "man" in their language (Latin, *vir*).

It does not, of course, follow that all the peoples belonging to the group are in blood descendants of the Wiros. For a conquering people may impose its language upon the conquered, and even if it is a minority which intermarries with the conquered, and so contributes only a small proportion to the blood of later generations, its language may remain predominant. But even if the peoples who are found in historical times speaking languages derived from the language of the Wiros, are not Wiro in blood, or so only to a small

degree, it remains true that the Wiros must have transmitted something of their own character to all the peoples of the group, so that we may speak of them all as kindred peoples, kindred, at any rate, by moral and intellectual inheritance. The Wiros, before they divided, were probably a people of fair complexion, ranging somewhere between the forests of Northern Europe and the steppes of Central Asia, with their cattle and horses, using flint mainly for their tools, according to the processes of the New Stone Age, though with some knowledge of copper as a useful metal, and of simple agricultural methods. It is inferred that they had cows and horses, because the words for "cow" and "horse" are modifications of one same original word in different languages of the group—*cow* in Sanskrit *gâus,* in Greek *bous,* in German *ḳuh*; horse in Sanskrit *asva*, in Greek *hippos*, in Latin *equos,* which can be shown to be variations of one original word, although they do not look like it. They worshipped a sky-god, whom they called something like Dyâus. Perhaps they had a class of priests or medicine-men called *brahmans* (if the Latin word *flamen* is the same word). Some time probably before 2000 B.C. one branch of the Wiros carried their language into Persia, and thence into India. The Persian-Indian branch has certain special characteristics which cause it now to be stamped as "Aryan," from the name *arya* ("noble"), which the fair Wiro invaders of India gave themselves in distinction from the dark native inhabitants whom they subjugated. In books of the last generation you find all the Wiro languages called "Aryan" and "Aryans" used as the name of the original Wiro people; but it is more convenient to keep the name "Aryans" for the Persian-Indian branch, as is usually done to-day. About 2000 B.C. other branches of the Wiros went wandering about in Northern and Central Europe. One of these branches was the Celtic, which established itself in what is now France in the

seventh century B.C., it is thought, and in the British Islands about four centuries later. Other branches moved south over the mountain passes into the Mediterranean lands, and came to form the Greek and Italian peoples whom we know. To-day the only relic left of the tongues spoken in Europe before the coming of the Wiros is the language of the Basques in the Pyrenees.

We cannot say what there was about that one primitive people different from all others living their unrecorded lives on the planet some 5,000 years ago, different from all others who had lived through the numberless centuries before, which singled them out to be the parents of those great civilizations which were to dominate the age to come. We only know that the civilizations of ancient India and Persia, of Greece and Rome, of modern Europe and America, have all arisen among peoples speaking tongues derived from the tongue of the Wiros—peoples, that is, either Wiro in stock or schooled by Wiro conquerors. We might give in brief the sum of European history by saying that it is the story of how certain Wiro tribes, drawn from the dark forests and foggy marshes of Central Europe, pressed southward under the constant attraction of the sunnier Mediterranean lands; how some of the earlier comers developed in those lands a civilization richer than any mankind had yet attained, but had always to resist the pressure of fresh, still barbarous, Wiro cousins coming down from the north; how, in consequence of this pressure, Greco-Roman civilization lived continually under a great menace, a great strain—one limited belt of civilization with the enormous mass of barbarian peoples ready to submerge it and occasionally breaking through, there across the mountains to the north; how, under the leadership of Rome, the civilized Mediterranean Wiros for a time reversed the process, carried their power and civilization from the south to the north and civilized by conquest the Wiros

inhabiting Gaul and Spain and Britain, but failed before the mass still left uncivilized in Central Europe, so that in the end the civilized Wiros of the Mediterranean and Gaul and Spain and Britain *were* submerged by their barbarous cousins, and the knowledge and power and craftsmanship won by Greeks and Romans apparently lost to a new universal barbarism; how then the barbarous destroying Wiros gradually absorbed what was preserved of the ancient lore, and came themselves to form new great civilized states—English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Scandinavian—carrying forward what the Greeks and Romans had begun to achievements of knowledge and power beyond anything of which the ancient world had dreamed, till Wiro civilization was no longer confined to the Mediterranean lands, but covered the whole of Europe—even Tsarist Russia, so far as the ruling class went—and saw no longer outside its borders any barbarian mass which it need fear. That, in brief, is an account of what has taken place in Europe since Wiro tribes first crossed the mountains, trekking southwards between 5,000 and 4,000 years ago, up to the point which we have reached to-day. And when we compare the state of modern Europe with the state of things in the Roman Empire, and go on to infer that our own civilization is about to fall because the ancient civilization fell, we must remember two great differences: (1) The ancient Wiro civilization was confined to a narrow area outside of which was a mass of peoples, barbarian but of the same strong Wiro stock; modern Wiro civilization is spread over the whole of Europe, over the American continent, and over Australasia, and has to some extent been adopted by Asiatic peoples, effectively by the Japanese. The strain to which the ancient civilization was subjected exists no longer. (2) Modern civilization, by means of scientific organization and new means of power and communication, has made it possible for any group well organized and armed to

dominate irresistibly a disorganized mass of men enormously larger than itself. This was not so in antiquity. Romans and barbarians fought with very much the same sort of weapons—cutting blades, pointed sticks, and flung stones; a Roman Government could not turn machine-guns on to a turbulent crowd or shell them from the sky. The effect of scientific discovery is to make numbers and extent of area count for less and less against any group which possesses itself of the central government; such a group can know by electric apparatus what is going on over a vast area and co-ordinate measures in a way which may make it hopeless to concert resistance. This is exemplified in some countries already to-day. But future scientific discovery may modify the conditions further in the same direction. It is not inconceivable that some day a relatively small group of people might dominate the whole globe. The great danger ahead of us is not anarchy, but despotism. Anarchy could hardly be anything else but local and temporary, and men who had experience of it would probably welcome despotism as the lesser of two evils.

The knowledge and power which mark modern Western civilization, knowledge of the way Nature works, and consequent power to use natural forces for human purposes, have come to this civilization from a mode of thinking which we commonly call Rationalism. Rationalism is the belief that the world has a pattern so uniform that you can make a safe inference from some bit of the pattern which you see to what other bits of the pattern which you cannot see are, have been, or will be. That presupposes that your perception of the bit of the pattern which you do see is not blurred or distorted by false imaginations, like the things which a sensitive child pictures in the dusk, and the things which primitive men fancied they saw and heard in the world about them. All the advance in scientific knowledge, and all the power gained by that

knowledge which have marked recent centuries, have been due to the rationalist element in our civilization. But it was with the ancient Greeks that rationalism effectively began. If we had to say what the special quality was of that Hellenism which stood there, a new thing in the world, in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., we could not express it better than by calling it rationalism. And our rationalism to-day, though it has been carried so much further than the rationalism of the Greeks, is due to the bent which the ancient Greeks gave to the thoughts of the Wiro peoples of Europe in days to come. That is reason enough why the story of the ancient Greeks is of close concern to us to-day.

Here, however, it seems necessary to throw in a word of caution. Even if it is true that all scientific knowledge of the way Nature works is based on rationalism, that does not necessarily mean that rationalism is the whole of life, or that there is no kind of knowledge other than that which comes by rationalist inference. Only if there is, such knowledge is not *scientific* knowledge. Rationalism gives man the means to modify the natural world according to his purposes rather than tells him what his purposes should be—concerns the *means* rather than the *ends*. Rationalism is that element in our modern civilization which has given man power over Nature; but it is not the only element in our civilization. There is another element of quite a different kind—the life embodied in the Christian Church. That has come to us, not from the Greeks, but from the Hebrews, a people not belonging to the Wiro group at all. It has been of especial importance in forming the conceptions prevalent in Europe of the *ends* to which human action ought to be directed. It has worked in with the rationalism we derive from the Greeks, not always harmoniously. There is still to-day disagreement regarding the respective values and spheres of the two elements and regarding their proper adjustment. But here we touch large

questions quite beyond the range of this little volume. At present we are concerned with the contributions made by Greeks and Romans to the life of mankind.

CHAPTER II

THE GREEKS OF THE EARLY AGE

THE first Wiros, who, probably in the centuries just preceding 2000 B.C., trekked southward across the Balkan mountains into Greece, found an earlier population already there, just as the fair-haired Celts who invaded Britain found a dark-haired race, not Wiros, inhabiting our islands, with whom they mingled, and the fair-complexioned Aryans who invaded India found a dark-skinned race there, with whom they mingled. In recent years excavations in Greece and the islands of the Eastern Mediterranean, especially in Crete, have brought to light the remains of a notable civilization, earlier than the Greek civilization we know—great stone palaces adorned with paintings quite unlike Greek paintings. Its art has a character which distinguishes it from the contemporary art of Egypt, though the peoples of this civilization had continual relations, friendly or unfriendly, with the Egyptians. Sir Arthur Evans, the great archæologist whose name is especially connected with the discoveries in Crete, calls the Cretan civilization "Minoan," after the Minos, who, according to Greek legend, was a king of Crete in the remote past. The civilization as a whole is commonly called "Ægean," because it extended over the islands and coasts of the Ægean Sea. This civilization must have been destroyed by the barbarous Wiro invaders who came down from the north, very much as the Greco-Roman civilization was destroyed by the German barbarians, and in both cases the invading

peoples in time developed a new civilization of their own—the Hellenes in Greece, the Germanic peoples in modern Europe. Only there is much closer continuity between our civilization and that of the Greco-Roman world than there was between the Hellenic and the Ægean. The Middle Ages in Europe were largely nourished on the remains of the old Greco-Roman literature, and that literature gave the impulse to the new advance of modern Europe. But the Ægean books (if there were any) perished utterly before the Hellenic civilization arose, and the only traces of the great works of the Minoans left in the memory of the Hellenes were legends about mighty kings who had reigned in the land long ago.

And now comes the question: "Were the Ægeans, too, Wiros, a branch of that race who had found their way into Greece and the islands at an earlier date, or were they people of another stock whom the first Wiro invaders found there?" At present that question cannot be answered. We do not know what language the Minoan Cretans talked. The tantalizing thing is that there the Minoan language is before us, locked up in a great number of inscriptions—signs we can gaze at but cannot read. That was the case with the hieroglyphs of Egypt when Shelley wrote *Alastor* and imagined that they contained "the thrilling secrets of the birth of time." Then a slab of stone which contained a hieroglyphic inscription, together with a Greek version, gave the key; perhaps some day a Minoan inscription with an Egyptian hieroglyphic version will be discovered, and scholars will be able to read the Minoan script. If so, we shall be able to say whether the Minoans talked a Wiro language or not.

The Hellenes did not begin to use writing till the Ægean civilization was a thing of the past, so that there is not much chance of any relic of it so overlapping anywhere with the Hellenic civilization as to give us an inscription in Minoan and Greek script. No

more need here be said about the Ægeans, because the Hellenic civilization with which we are concerned was something different, and we know too little about the thoughts of the Ægeans to say how far ideas or customs of the Greeks were derived by tradition from the Ægean age. No doubt something may be inferred regarding the ideas and feelings of the men of long ago from the things they made and did—from the practice, for instance, of burying weapons, ornaments, vessels with the dead we can infer that they believed in some kind of life after death, but we cannot really know much about the thoughts and feelings of men in the past till we hear them speak—bits of their discourse fixed in dead signs, but coming to life again, ages after, as we read the signs, in sounds we can understand. The first Greek voice we hear is Homer's —as Greek tradition affirmed that the author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* was called—the first bit of discourse we can hear uttered by a European man, the voice, not of a man speaking in the ordinary business of life, but of a man singing or chanting, yet putting into his song a world of what he, and those he sang to, thought and felt and did and imagined. A metrical poem can be transmitted in men's memory for many generations even without the aid of writing, and so, when the Greeks did begin to write, these poems were there as a voice out of a much earlier age, which had lasted on just long enough to get put down in writing and so preserved for ever.

The world of which Homer tells us has for its environment the countries of the Eastern Mediterranean —Greece, the Archipelago, the seaboard of Asia Minor, fading away at its rim to Egypt, mistily seen, and the lands and seas of the Western Mediterranean, peopled with things strange and monstrous, the imaginations of adventurous seafarers, and at last somewhere very far away in the west, on the shores of the great water called Okeanos, the cloudy land of ghosts. When the

Homeric poems were made, the Greeks had long forgotten the time when their Wiro ancestors trekked southwards over the Balkans; they had, so far as we can discern, no memory of any time when they had not lived in the countries they occupied now. In the poems they are shown as a group of peoples inhabiting Greece and some of the islands of the Archipelago, each under its own king, but all speaking the one language we now call Greek. There is as yet no clear distinction between these peoples and the neighbouring peoples of the Mediterranean. Homer has no name for the Greeks as such. The term Hellenes as a name for all peoples speaking Greek did not come into use till at least after Hesiod, and our term "Greeks" is simply what the Romans afterwards called them (*Græci*), possibly after some Hellenic tribe with whom the early Latins came into contact, though where the Romans got the term from is quite uncertain. Homer has names only for the several Greek peoples—Achæans, Argives, Danaans—though when the Greek peoples have combined to send contingents to fight against Troy under Agamemnon, the King of Argos and Mycenæ, and Homer wants to refer to the men of the Greek army by some general term, he calls them by one of those three names, very much as we often use the term "English" to include the Scotch and the Welsh. Later on when the Greeks, as such, came to be clearly distinguished by the one name "Hellenes," a general name had also to be found for all the other peoples who were not Hellenes. The Greeks called them *barbaroi,* from which we get our word "barbarian." Probably at first this word did not have the sense of our word "barbarous," but meant simply people whose talk sounded gibberish to Greeks—just "bar-bar-bar." Of course, in so far as the Greeks felt themselves superior to other men, it implied a kind of depreciation to say that any people were *barbaroi.* In Homer the word is applied only to the Carians of Asia

Minor, who are called *barbarophonoi*, by which probably no more is meant than they talked an unintelligible jargon.

Perhaps as early as the eleventh century B.C., Greeks from Greece and the islands established themselves in cities along the western coasts of Asia Minor. Some of these Greeks belonged to a section of the people called Æolians; they occupied the Asiatic seaboard for about sixty miles to the north of Smyrna, and the island of Lesbos; others belonged to a section called Ionians (*Iaones*), so that Ionia came to be affixed as a name to the stretch of seaboard from Smyrna southwards for about eighty miles; this included the famous cities of Miletus, Ephesus, Magnesia, and the islands of Samos and Chios. In Homer there is no note of this eastward extension of the Greeks. Yet it is possible that when the poems were put together it had already taken place, and that it was actually in order to be chanted at feasts in the palaces of the rich Æolian lords that the poems were composed in the form of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which became traditional. If so, Homer must deliberately have presented a picture of the Greek world as he imagined it in the age preceding his own.

The city of Agamemnon in Homer is Mycenæ, "rich in gold," and excavation has shown Mycenæ to have been a principal centre of the Ægean civilization in its later phase, when perhaps it had been adopted by the incoming Wiros, the Achæans. We may infer that the legends of great kings and warriors and the descriptions of their palaces embodied in Homer contain some real memory handed down of the splendid civilization which had once existed. Perhaps the tale of Troy shows real events of the Ægean age transfigured in legend. There is even a disposition to-day to believe that some of the heroes of Greek mythology, like Herakles, were actual men, whose great deeds had left an impress in men's minds. The name Herakles cannot be made much sense of, if taken as Greek—"glory

of Hera," or "glorified by Hera"—since in the myth the goddess Hera is bitterly hostile to Herakles. The name may be the Grecized form of a Minoan name belonging to some real man who gave rise to the Herakles legend. Agamemnon, again, which in Greek would mean someone who "waits very much"—an odd name to give—may be the distortion of the name of a real king in the Ægean age.

We do not yet see in Homer the self-governing city-states of the historical times. The states are monarchic states of a primitive kind, each under a king believed to be of divine descent, who carries a sceptre as the symbol of his authority, gives judgments by inspiration from the great King in the sky, offers sacrifice to the gods on behalf of his people, and commands his people in war. He has a very large power of command. The descriptive title often given in these poems to a king—"shepherd of the people"—means not only that he is concerned for the welfare of the people, but that he can lead them where he chooses—call them out, for instance, at any time to sack the towns of neighbouring kings. In battle the kings alone fight in chariots, and the great deeds are done by the kings themselves, better armed as they are than the common herd, and stimulated by a racial sense of honour, fighting with the kings on the other side. The obscure multitude of footmen only surges to and fro in the background. Yet the kings are not absolute despots like the wide-ruling monarchs of Assyria and Egypt. Homeric society is nearer to the primitive tribe, like the Angles and Saxons who invaded Britain. Although the people have no fixed constitutional rights, there is a measure of popular control. The people of a place sometimes come together in an assembly presided over by the "old men." The chiefs can harangue the assembly, the kings can announce to it what they have determined, and the people can signify by their cries approval or disapproval. We even hear of a man of

the people, Thersites, who after such an assembly of the Greek army in the plains of Troy, made a speech in criticism of the paramount king's policy, though he instantly got a thrashing from one of the subordinate kings. No doubt in practice the kings would have to take account of the popular feeling; it was not safe for them to go against it beyond a certain way.

The political system we associate with the Greeks is not yet there in Homer, the Greek rationalist theories of the universe not yet born. Yet even in Homer the coming light of Greek rationalism already shines. The presupposition of rationalism, as we saw, is to perceive the world as it really is, and if we compare Homer with other primitive epics, Indian or Celtic, we find Homer marked by a more lucid realism. The monstrous and impossible, generally speaking, is ruled out, or relegated, as in the *Odyssey,* to countries far away. Gods and goddesses play some part in the story, but they are divine beings described as just like men on a greater scale: there are no animal or semi-animal gods. It is the real world of the Eastern Mediterranean we see—its hazy, "wine-like" seas (not, that is, *coloured* like wine, according to the usual translation, but *foaming,* as the ancient wine did)—its hills covered with forest and abounding in streams, the life men really lived, as shepherds and woodmen and carpenters and gardeners and fishermen. Homer's men and gods behave and converse and feel as men really do.

Although life for Homer is full of zest and colour and adventure, there is every now and then the expression of a central sadness. The life of man has an epithet often attached to it which means "full of misery." The powers upon which man depends—the gods—are capricious and often spiteful. Sometimes a cry of bitterness breaks out against the malignant frustration of human purposes and the sore destiny of the sons of men. But it is better to fight and feast, and forget all that and the days of darkness coming.

It is thought to-day that there was more of the dark primitive religion existing at the time amongst the Greeks than Homer allowed to appear—terrors of the unknown world, propitiation of the spirits of the dead. If so, Homer deliberately excluded it from his picture. The Æolian lords for whom he sang did not like fancies which went beyond the clear sunlit world in which living men fought and feasted. They liked to have the gods themselves sometimes treated in the spirit of comedy. In all that the first light of rationalism already shows amongst the Greeks of Asia.

The other old Greek poet, whose voice has come down to us, belongs to Bœotia in Central Greece—Hesiod. The voice is a sadder one than Homer's. Hesiod's poem called *Works and Days* consists of instructions to a farmer who has to labour on the soil. The happy days of man lie far behind, and the world has become a very evil place. The kings who rule oppress the innocent in judgment and take gifts. The goddess Justice has fled away from the earth. If we are inclined to be pessimistic about our own age, we may remember that this voice we hear at the very beginning of European history was no less sad and weary nearly 3,000 years ago.

CHAPTER III

THE EXPANSION OF THE GREEKS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN LANDS

THE four or five centuries which elapsed between the time of Homer and Hesiod and the seventh century B.C., when something like a continuous narrative of the doings of the Greeks begins to be possible, are for us a dark period lit up only by later traditions and archæological remains. One important event, which

happened about 1100 B.C., was the coming from the north of another, ruder, Greek people, the Dorians. They left one settlement in Central Greece, but for the most part they passed through to establish themselves in the Peloponnesus as the ruling race over the earlier Achæan population. Only the Arcadians in the central uplands and the Achæans on the northern seaboard remained unconquered. The Dorians, although backward, were true Greeks, speaking a broad dialectical variation of the same language as Homer's. In days to come the chief city-states of the Peloponnesus were Dorian—Sparta, Argos, Corinth, Elis. From the mainland the Dorians crossed the sea to occupy a number of the islands—Crete, Ægina, Thera, and the seaboard of Asia Minor south of Ionia with the cities Halicarnassus and Cnidus, and the neighbouring islands of Cos and Rhodes.

Possibly it was among the new Greek communities established in lands with which they had no hereditary connections that the hereditary kingships shown us in Homer were first replaced by a new type of state—the city-state governed by a group of families, powerful by their acquired possessions. It is a mistake to speak of city-states as if they were quite a new thing amongst the Hellenes; they had existed for many centuries in some parts of Asia—notably amongst the Semites of Phœnicia, where Tyre and Sidon and other cities were of old renown. We should not perhaps have seen much difference in their political institutions between Tyre and, let us say, Miletus in the seventh century B.C. It was only that, as time went on, the combination of this type of state with the natural endowments of the Hellenes brought about a kind of culture different from any that had existed before.

When the Greeks had once built cities oversea they went on extending their settlements. As their ships sailed for plunder or commerce along the coasts and amongst the islands of that sunny sea, where cape be-

yond cape or island beyond island lured navigators on, they came to know the Ægean world well. The men of some city might come to see that to establish themselves permanently at this point or that would give them command of some trade route, or it might be that a city's population increased so as to press upon the limits of its territory and the surplus would go to seek new homes in some place that seemed fair and fertile. In the course of the eighth century new Greek cities, founded from the Ionian cities Chalcis and Eretria in Eubœa, sprang up in the peninsula called, after the mother-city, Chalcidice.

About the same time the Ionians of Miletus pushed right through the Dardanelles, establishing cities in Gallipoli and on the opposite coast, through the Sea of Marmora, on the south coast of which rose the great city of Cyzicus (traditional date of founding 756 B.C.). In the seventh century the Dorians of Megara founded Byzantium (now Constantinople) 658 B.C., with Chalcedon opposite to hold the passage into the Black Sea. Still farther northwards, eastwards, the coasts of the Black Sea were marked by a line of Greek cities—Odessus (now Varna), Tomi (Constantia), Olbia (near the mouth of the Dnieper), Panticapæum (Kertch in the Crimea) and others to the north, Sinope (Sinûb) and Trapezus (Trebizond) and others to the east.

Westward the Greeks went to colonize the coasts of Sicily, and of South Italy, the western coast of Italy. The states sending out colonies were here chiefly Chalcis, the Achæans of the Peloponnesus, the Locrians, and, later on, Corinth and Megara.

The earlier Wiro inhabitants of Sicily, Sikels, were conquered and absorbed, or pushed into the interior. All the eastern seaboard became Greek territory, with the Dorian Syracuse (traditional date of founding 735 B.C.) near the south-east corner of the island, the greatest Greek city of the west. In the south of Italy the Greek cities became so numerous that the region

came to be called "Great Hellas" (Magna Græcia). The Achæan Croton and Sybaris were the chief cities in the sixth century, but Sybaris was destroyed by Croton about 510 B.C., and in the fourth century the chief city was the Dorian Tarentum (traditional date of founding 708 B.C.), which still gives its name to the Gulf of Taranto to-day. On the west coast of Italy the Chalcidian colony of Cumæ was a very old one, but it was eclipsed later on by its own colony, Neapolis, "New City," which the Italians to-day call Napoli and we Naples.

Still farther to the west on the southern coast of France the great city of Massalia (Marseilles) was founded about 600 B.C. by men of Phocæa in Æolis, and Massalia in turn sent out daughter colonies along the Riviera, amongst them Nicæa (Nice) and Antipolis (Antibes).

On the eastern coast of Spain were some small Greek commercial settlements, Emporiæ and others, and on the northern coast of Africa the Dorian Cyrene (traditional date of founding 633 B.C.) with a group of smaller cities in what is now the Italian dependency of Cyrenaïca. In Egypt itself the Greeks were allowed, about 650 B.C., to establish the city of Naucratis near the outlet of the westernmost arm of the Nile.

One should notice that towards the end of the eighth century B.C. occurred the first break-through of northern barbarians into the Greek lands in the period for which we have historical records. Asia Minor was overrun by a people whom the Greeks called Kimmerioi. Either they came from South Russia or afterwards some part of them settled in South Russia, because what we call the Straits of Kertch the Greeks called the Kimmerian Bosporos. Possibly their name is connected with that of Cimbri, who broke into North Italy in 101 B.C., or with the name Cymri, by which the Welsh call themselves to-day.

CHAPTER IV

THE HELLENES IN THE SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

THUS in 600 B.C. the Greek people was planted about all over the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean. In some sense they felt themselves one people; they came to use the name Hellenes to distinguish themselves from the rest of mankind. The old epic poetry was their common heritage, and the new songs composed by poets in Greece or Lesbos or Asia Minor or Sicily, were soon carried, in writing or orally, all through the Greek cities. There were some oracular shrines, especially those of Delphi and Dodona, to which Greeks came from everywhere to inquire, and there were great sacred festivals with athletic and musical contests—the Olympian games every fourth year in Elis, the Pythian at Delphi, the Nemean in Argolis, the Isthmian on the Isthmus of Corinth, at which a great multitude of Hellenes from all the cities gathered as spectators, and any man of Greek race could compete. But the Greeks had no political unity. Every small city-state was an independent sovereign community. Its territory did not reach far enough to include more than a small number of country towns, whose inhabitants were citizens of the city and came up in person to attend its assemblies. Even the daughter-cities founded as colonies by this or the other city were independent states who owed the mother-city no more than a piety, which they were not constrained to show, and often failed to show.

It was in these small city-states that the Hellenic culture, destined to count for so much in the history of mankind, was generated. The Greek city's passion for independence, *autonomia,* existence as a separate unit, not subject to any power outside itself, not

subordinate to any larger system, in one way made the Greek people, as a whole, weak. The monarchies with wide territories could bring to bear a much greater aggregate of man-power. In the struggle with the large states the Greek cities in the end succumbed, simply because they were individually too small, and would not combine. But, while their independence lasted, the smallness of the state made its life more concentrated and more intense. In the community each man knew his fellows, and whether the political forms of the state were oligarchic or democratic, public opinion was a force that counted. When the Greek citizen identified "freedom" with existence of his city as a small separate state, he was not altogether wrong. The individual did count for more in a small community than he would count for in a miscellaneous multitude. A free state in antiquity must necessarily be a small state—not larger, in Aristotle's phrase, than allowed of all the citizens assembled hearing the voice of one herald. The combination of freedom with size in a state was the problem which the ancients never solved. They had not our scientific means of communications which allow the voice of the Prime Minister of England to reach the people of the Commonwealth on the other side of the globe in print within a few hours. Because the ancients could not solve that problem, the freedom of the little city-states perished. And even we have had to sacrifice something of democracy for the sake of extension. An individual citizen of Athens who attended the assembly in person had a larger share in determining the policy of his state than a voter in England or America has in determining the policy of his.

The intense life of these small communities from the seventh to the fourth centuries B.C. generated, it has been said, Greek culture. Yet it involved terrible evils beside the weakness which came from a splitting up of the Greek race. It raised the hatred between city

and city, still more the hatred between class and class in each city to a dangerous pitch. The intensity of such life made it self-consuming. Greek history is marked by a series of passionate acts of vengeance perpetrated by one city on another, or by one faction in a city upon another. At Athens some of the men of the old ruling families formed an association, every member of which had to take an oath: "I will be an enemy to the popular party and will try to do it every harm that I can." At Corcyra in 427 the oligarchic party assassinated some sixty persons of the opposite party in the senate house: then when the other side prevailed a few weeks later there was an orgy of murder, in which not even the temples were respected. Of course cases of such atrocity were exceptional, yet almost always in each city the oligarchic party and the democratic formed two antagonistic communities whose strife wasted the energies of the state, and the weaker of which was generally ready to co-operate with enemies outside.

Yet, when we discount this evil side of the free life of the old Greek city-states, it remains true that it produced a new kind of man. For us, looking back, his significance is to be found in the intellectual advance, in virtue of which he began to ask new questions about the universe; but to the neighbouring peoples of Egypt and Asia at the time the Greek seems first to have been noticed as a particularly good fighter. The free citizen-soldiers of these small communities were braver, better armed, more skilful in war than the subjects of the King of Egypt or the King of Babylon. And since Greeks with a disposition for adventure and gain were willing to sell their services to foreign kings, already in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. the kings of the East began to stiffen their forces with Greek mercenaries. The Greeks with whom they first came into contact were the Ionians of the seaboard of Asia Minor, and so the names by which the Greeks

were called all over the East were taken from the name "Ionians"—in old Greek *Iaŏnes*. The Persians called them *Yavana*, the Hebrews *Yawan* (in our Bibles transcribed *Javan*), the Egyptians *Uinn*. The Pharaoh Psammetichus, who delivered Egypt from the Assyrians, rested his power on his Greek and Carian mercenaries, and his son, Pharaoh Necho, dedicated in a Greek shrine the corslet he wore at the battle of Megiddo (609 B.C.). Antimenidas, the brother of the famous Lesbian poet Alcæus, fought in the army of Nebuchadnezzar, and received from the Babylonians, as the reward of valour, a sword with an ivory haft.

The Greeks, as free men, were braver than the mass of Orientals who were driven to battle to fight for their masters in causes for which they felt no personal concern. But it may be questioned whether the ancient Mediterranean peoples, Greeks or Romans, were brave as compared with the Wiro barbarians of the north, Celts and Germans. No doubt the most military of the Greeks, the Spartans, held it a point of honour to die on the field rather than fly, yet the fact that the Greeks generally thought this something so wonderful is an indication of their own temper. In the mythological story, the son of Nestor sacrifices his life in battle to save his father; Pindar calls this an "enormous (*pelorion*) action." Or, to come to the Romans, Virgil could think it quite natural to represent the action of two young men who undertake to creep out at night to reconnoitre the enemy's camp as a deed of almost incredible bravery. They set forth after the most emotional farewells, leaving the men on their own side in uncontrolled floods of tears. When the Greeks and Romans had to meet the northern races in battle, they recognized that here was a fighting courage strange to them. It became a stock characteristic attached to the Gauls that they seemed not to mind dying ("*non paventis funera Galliæ*" in Horace). Just as Oriental

kings in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. used Greek mercenaries, so the Greek kings in the third century used Gaulish mercenaries. In the Roman Empire the Mediterranean peoples more and more let Germans do the fighting for them. That was why the Roman Empire perished and was replaced by German kingdoms. Modern European civilization rests upon peoples of German and Celtic stock, and we hear of no endurance and courage shown in war by the ancient Greeks and Romans comparable to the endurance and courage shown in the Great War by men belonging to peoples of the most advanced civilization (which seems, for one thing, to show that the platitude about intellectual and material civilization necessarily softening fibre is inept).

For us the men of the ancient Greek republics are interesting because they began to ask new questions about the universe. No doubt the habit of constant discussion in those small autonomous societies quickened men's wits and ability for logical argument. In Homer already, we noted, the Greeks were seeing, better than other people, the facts of the world as they really were; and in the sixth century the Greek mind went on to ask questions about the universe. To primitive people it is generally enough to believe about the universe what their fathers have told them and to call good what their fathers have called good. It was a great step the Greeks took when they began to ask, "What is the *real* truth about the universe?" and "What is *really* good and beautiful?" Of course, the answers they gave to such questions could not satisfy us to-day, but it was because the Greeks began asking such questions that they were being discussed in the world into which we were born, and the answers we give to-day are still provisional.

The Greeks of the Asiatic seaboard, of Ionia, were the most intellectually precocious of the people, perhaps because their ancestors had not so long before

changed their environment and they were in closer touch with the great kingdoms of the East. According to tradition it was a man of Miletus, Thales, who first tried to find what the stuff of the world really was, and offered an answer quite different from the old mythological answers. The date of Thales is fixed by the eclipse of May, 585 B.C., which he is said to have foretold. To explain the origin of things man has perforce to look for analogies in the processes of coming into being which he sees. Primitive men took the analogy of animal procreation to explain how the world came into being; but Thales felt that another kind of analogy was required for the facts. He noticed how, in that Mediterranean world, the showers after a time of drought produce what seems an outburst of new life, and he said that the world and everything in it was made of water. That was the beginning of European science, because Thales's theory ruled out from the explanation of the inanimate processes of Nature the operation of causes implying life and volition. During the century after Thales speculation about the stuff the world was made of and the reason of its movement was very active amongst the Greeks of Ionia. One view was that the world was made of a kind of indeterminate stuff from which air and fire and earth got separated out; another view was that it was all air in various stages of condensation and rarefaction; another, that it was a transient solidification of fire. There was a general agreement that the movement of the world was somehow circular like that of an eddy in a river or a top. In the latter part of the sixth century the Ionian Pythagoras migrated to South Italy (which was full, as we have seen, of Greek colonists), and started there a kind of mystical philosophy, and in the fifth century it was amongst the Greeks in Italy and Sicily that the important new contributions were made to thought about the universe. Thought had not yet reached the point at which

natural science and philosophy came inevitably to be separated as distinct lines of inquiry.

Greek free thought about the universe was the beginning, as has been said, of the Western rationalist science which in recent generations has so wonderfully increased the knowledge and power of man. It may, therefore, appear strange that science having made such a start in the sixth century B.C. did not go farther than it did amongst the Greeks and Romans. Perhaps the explanation of its relatively poor achievement is to be found in one characteristic of the Greek mind—its readiness to acquiesce in what could be presented in neat, logical form. One must remember that science goes forward, as a man does in walking, by a double alternating movement. There is the act of logical imagination which frames a provisional hypothesis, leaping out beyond the facts already ascertained, and then the return to accurate observation and experiment to see whether further facts verify or disprove the hypothesis. Now the ancient Greeks were strong in the first movement, they were quick to form logical hypotheses, but they had a very inadequate idea of the second movement, verification by observation and experiment. The consequence was that certain logical theories quickly became fixed in the tradition of the different schools, and the Greeks were generally satisfied with one or other of them, just because they were logical and plausibly expressed. They did not feel the need of that long labour of minute and extensive observation and experiment which men of science feel to-day. We must remember two things: one is that the ancients did not have the instruments of precise measurement which we have to-day—not even watches, to say nothing of thermometers (though, perhaps, they did not have them because they did not feel the want of them). The other thing is that the wits of the Greeks had been trained and sharpened by verbal argument in the intense life of small societies, and the result was

a certain one-sidedness in the Greek mind—a love of abstract ideas, of words, a keen sensibility to persuasive expression, a readiness to take truth to mean what you could compel an adversary in argument to admit, and an inadequate appreciation of truth of fact. So that in course of time the scientific interest of the ancient mind became atrophied and the rhetorical interest grew. It became the chief end of education under the Roman Empire to teach the young how to use words effectively. It might perhaps be said that the ancient culture died of rhetoric.

CHAPTER V

GREEK DEMOCRACY: ATHENS

THE Greeks are our forebears not only because modern science had its beginnings in Greek rationalist thought about the universe, but because our political conceptions and standards have grown out of the heritage of the Greek states. The idea of a political community which governs itself according to the will of the majority, declared in regular assemblies of the community, and knows no sovereign save the Law, which is the embodiment of the popular will—that idea first stood clearly before men in the ancient Greek city-states. It is represented for us chiefly in the greatest of them all—Athens. But Athens in the sixth century B.C. was not yet a democratic state. Democracy was not reached anywhere amongst the Hellenes till the fifth century B.C., and within four generations after its attainment the Greek world mostly fell into subjection to monarchic powers: thus whatever virtues the ancient Greek democracy had, it had not great "survival value," as the world then was.

When the old territorial kingships, which we see

in Homer, came to an end amongst the Greeks, and the *polis* (city) from being a mere walled refuge to which the cultivators and herdsmen of a certain area could fly from enemy raiders, became the settled abode and meeting-place of a larger community, the centre of a political state, the rule of kings was nowhere replaced, in the first instance, by the rule of the people. It was replaced by the rule of a limited group of families, powerful because of their links with the old royal houses or their great possessions. Probably in most cases the kingship faded away only gradually, as the power of the great families grew, so that the king had more and more to be governed by their will. At Athens, and probably elsewhere, the king never faded away altogether. Even under the fully developed democracy of the fourth century there was still at Athens a "king," though now he had become only one of the annual magistrates, who had to do with certain acts of the civic religion and of the judicial system. In some cities the group of ruling families held their own even in the fifth and fourth centuries, when everywhere the mass of poorer citizens were eager for a condition of things in which their vote in the assembly would determine the course of the state. Some of the Greek city-states at that time were oligarchic and some democratic, or swung between oligarchy and democracy, according as the popular leaders were strong enough to drive the great families into exile, or the great families strong enough to drive out the popular leaders.

Beside oligarchy in the sixth century another type of government was to be seen in the Greek city-states, the autocratic rule of a single man, as the Greeks called such a ruler, a *tyrannos*. That was a Lydian word for "chief," which we anglicize as "tyrant." The essence of a *tyrannos*, as the Greeks used the term, was not that he was tyrannical in our sense of the word: he might or might not be. The

essence of a *tyrannos* was that he did not rule, like the old Homeric kings, in virtue of customary right, but simply by a recent act of force or usurpation, in violation of the regular law of the city. Very often the tyrant had risen to power as a popular leader in opposition to the old ruling families, and then established himself as an autocrat with a force of soldiers hired from abroad. Most of the tyrants could not stand absolute power, and became tyrannical in our sense, but some of them seem to have ruled intelligently and carried out great public works which were of benefit to the people as a whole. They commonly cared much for poetry and art, like the despots of the Italian Renaissance, so that this side of Greek culture owed a good deal to the courts of the tyrants. Yet the public opinion of the Greek world condemned such irregular power, to whatever good purposes it might be put, and regarded the assassination of a tyrant as a meritorious action.

In the story of nearly every Greek city-state there was a period in the seventh, sixth, or fifth centuries when it passed through the phase of tyranny. But there was one conspicuous exception—a state quite peculiar in the Greek world—a state which had the two names of Lacedæmon and Sparta. This state had been established by the Dorian invaders of the Peloponnesus in the valley of the Eurotas. Its institutions were in many ways archaïc: here the old hereditary kingship of Homeric times survived. Sparta had two royal families, which professed to be Achæan in blood, not Dorian, and there were always two kings, one from each house, reigning together. But their power in historical times was very much restricted by the fixed institutions of the state and the magistrates chosen from the group of Spartan families. The Spartan families as a whole formed a kind of aristocracy, for the population of the territory —a considerable bit of the Peloponnesus—attached to

Sparta was a subject population, probably largely Achæan in blood, with no citizen rights in the state. The lowest stratum of it consisted of serfs, brutally treated, called Helots. The Spartan ruling families were organized as a community for the supreme end of efficiency in war. Sparta was like a standing camp; boys of the ruling caste from early years were regimented and put through a training of terrible severity to make them insensible to fear and pain. Against the rest of Greece, the Lacedæmonian state fenced itself in: visitors were admitted only jealously, under surveillance, and were liable to be expelled. The great movements of thought and feeling which passed through the rest of the Greek world touched Sparta hardly at all, though certain kinds of grave traditional music and poetry were cultivated there. This state, with its sullen, obstinate indifference to the higher things of the mind, its rigid traditions, its concentration on fighting efficiency, makes an unlovely contrast to the light and freedom and mobility of democratic Athens. Yet it is odd that the great thinkers of Athens, weary of the disorders and confusions, the instability and caprice and unlimited changefulness of democracy, were apt to turn to the picture of an ideal city with an order fixed as that of the stars, and a strong ascetic discipline, a picture for which they certainly got some of the suggestion from Sparta.

Athens, about a generation after the state had been reorganized by Solon on the principle of careful balance between the power of the old families and the new claims of the unprivileged class, entered upon the phase of tyranny, under Pisistratus and his sons (about 560). In 510 the son of Pisistratus was expelled from Athens by a Spartan army, and a new constitution was made for the state, of a more democratic character than Solon's, by Cleisthenes. Under Pisistratus this city, dominating a territory of about the area of

Kent—the light-soiled, rather arid, clear-aired land of Attica, a promontory pushed out south-east from the mountains of Central Greece—had risen to greater importance among Greek states. A city of men akin in stock to the Ionians on the other side of the sea, Athens came to be looked at with jealous suspicion by the strong Dorian state of the Peloponnesus.

But it was the national fight with Persia which made Athens the one city which could claim against Sparta to be the leading state of Greece. The great Semitic monarchies of Assyria and Babylon had never stretched their power far enough west to threaten the freedom of the Greek cities on the Mediterranean. But between the latter part of the eighth and the beginning of the sixth century B.C. some of the Wiro peoples of Asia established monarchies like the Semitic monarchies which had now almost had their day. One of these Wiro peoples was the Lydian in Asia Minor, with Sardis as its royal city; another was the Aryan people of the Medes, in the country which we Europeans call Persia, but which its inhabitants still call by the ancient name Iran. Since the time when Greeks had established themselves on the coasts of the Ægean, they had not come into conflict with any great despotism of the Oriental type till the rise of Lydia in the eighth or seventh century B.C. Then, one by one, the small Greek city-states of Asia Minor went down before the Lydian king. But in 546 B.C. Crœsus, the King of Lydia, himself went down before a greater Oriental power, which advanced, conquering, from the East. This was the power spread by the great Persian conqueror, Kurush, whom we call Cyrus.

The Persians, Parsa, were one amongst the Wiro, Aryan, peoples of Iran, whose homeland, Persis, was in the mountains which wall the high tableland of Iran, towards the Persian Gulf. We have extended the name "Persian" to all the Iranians, just as the ancient Persians extended the name "Ionian" to all

the Greeks. Persis (modern Fars) was only a little bit of what we call "Persia." But it was the Persians, in the proper, narrower sense, who in the second half of the sixth century B.C. under Cyrus established their dominion, not only over their Iranian brethren, Medes and Bactrians, but over Semitic Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Syria, and over Asia Minor. The son of Cyrus, Cambyses, added Egypt to the empire. Under Darius I. (521 to 485) the Persian empire was the greatest in extent the planet had ever seen, reaching from the River Indus to the Ægean seaboard. We may call the sixth century B.C. the great landmark in the history of mankind when the lordship of the earth had passed to the Wiro peoples—the Persian empire in the midst, India to the east (Wiro, the northern part of it, in speech and culture), Europe to the west, with the Greeks just reaching their maturity and the other more backward Wiro peoples to the west and north, the heirs of the age to come.

When the Persian Empire reached the Ægean it came into contact with the Greeks. From 499 to 493 the Ionian cities made a vain fight to free themselves from Persian dominion. They had had help from the Greeks on the west of the Ægean, from Athens, and the Persian king came to the conclusion that he must subdue the Greeks of European Greece as well, if the empire was to be soundly established in this quarter. In 490 a Persian force landed on the coast of Attica, where the plain of Marathon goes down to the sea. A little army of Athenians dared to engage the terrible strangers, defeated and destroyed them. As numbers go, the battle of Marathon was a petty affair, a scrap between two small bodies of men in a field, over in an afternoon: the Athenian army, we are told, numbered only a little over 10,000 men. But if the battle had gone the other way, Hellenic civilization might have been crushed in its beginnings and the whole history of Europe have been different.

Antagonism to Persia gave the Greeks for the first time a national cause which overrode the division of the people in the multitude of separate small states. Sparta felt that it ought to do its part, hesitatingly and suspiciously at first: the Spartan force arrived just too late to fight at Marathon. When in 480 a really large Persian army under Xerxes invaded Greece, accompanied by a fleet, Athens and Sparta fought side by side. The Persian fleet was destroyed in the battle of Salamis, the glory of which victory belonged to Athens, and in the following year (479) the Persian land-army was destroyed in the battle of Platæa by a Greek army under command of a Spartan king. But it was hardly possible for harmony to last long among the Greeks when the immediate danger was over.

Athens had now become the principal sea-power among the Greeks, as Sparta was the principal land-power. To carry on the war against Persia, to liberate the Greek cities of Asia Minor, Athens formed in 475 a Confederacy of the Greek island-states—the League of Delos—under her own presidency. In course of time the presidency turned into a predominance. Athens claimed to be the leader in the national cause; her enemies called her the tyrant city who held other Greek cities in bondage. The war against Persia continued spasmodically with varying success. Upon the huge empire the attacks of the Greek sea-power could not make much impression, beyond driving the Persian power back for a time from portions of the coast and securing a temporary and precarious freedom for the Ionian cities. When Egypt revolted under native Pharaohs against the Persians, Athens sent help, yet in the long run the Persians re-established their rule in Egypt.

But the internal life of Athens was raised to an extraordinary level by the exaltation of those days of power and glory. It was in the fifth century that

Athens became the unquestioned leader of the Greeks in art, in thought, in literary creation. Her constitution, too, underwent further modification through the mastery of her great statesman, Pericles, which made her fully a democracy: her people assembled in *ecclesia,* including the citizens come up from the country towns of Attica, could really determine by a majority vote what the policy of the state should be, or if an individual was brought to judgment it was before a jury chosen from the general body of his fellow-citizens. Yet the personal ascendancy of Pericles was so great that it was his policy, as a rule, which the people followed. Pericles, one may observe, is the first European man of whom it can be said that we know what he looked like. For Greek art had now reached the point at which it was possible for sculptors to reproduce the real features of a living man. A bronze portrait of Pericles was made by a contemporary artist, of which two copies in marble still exist —a bust in the Vatican, and a bust in the British Museum.

Under the rule of Pericles, the wealth which Athens drew in as tribute from the subject cities was used in part to beautify the city with buildings of superb design and execution. The great temple of Athena, the Parthenon, was completed in 438. It was decorated with sculptures by Pheidias, works as wonderful as any that have been made by man. Even the ordinary Athenian craftsman in those days, who painted a vase or executed a bas-relief for a tomb, made things of beauty which only very great artists could equal to-day.

This, too, was the time when the Athenian drama reached its perfection. Of the three great poets, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, who, with other dramatists considered at the time nearly as good, presented plays year by year in the open-air theatre of Dionysos, Æschylus died in 456 and Euripides in

406. The great comic dramatist, Aristophanes, did not begin to present plays till after the death of Pericles in 429. If out of the 282 plays composed by the three great tragedians we have to-day only 33, it is probable that these particular plays survived because they represented what was, in the judgment of later Greek scholarship, the best of their work. The Athenian dramatists spoke not only to an Athenian audience, but to the Greek world as a whole. Greeks from far away cities were amongst the audiences who listened in the Athenian theatre, and knowledge of the plays was carried overseas. At Syracuse, in Sicily, later on, we are told, there was special eagerness to learn any new thing of Euripides. Although politically the Greeks were always divided by wars and antagonisms, there had come to be, in the sphere of thought and letters, a general Greek public, amongst whom new thoughts quickly circulated.

Wars between the states of Greece filled the half-century which followed the great national victories over the Persians (from 479 to 431). Athens was most of the time at war, in 466, 463, with revolted island-states of the Delian League, in 458 with Corinth and Ægina, in 457 with the Spartans, in 456 with the Bœotians, in 448 and 447 again with the Spartans, in 445 with other revolted members of the League. The external war corresponded—it generally did in Greek states—with an internal conflict. For the aristocratic faction at Athens always admired Sparta and wanted friendship with Sparta. The Athenian fleets, on which the imperial power of Athens rested, were manned by the poorer citizens; it was they who felt pride in Athens' power and dominion. It was the *demos,* not the aristocrats, in fifth-century Athens, who were militarist and imperialist. Democracy does not always make for peace.

Then in 431 there broke out that long and wasteful war which occupied twenty-seven years of the century

and a half, which later antiquity always looked back to as the period of classical greatness for the Greek nation—the "Peloponnesian War" we call it, the great fight between Athens and the states of her empire on the one side, Sparta and her vassal states, mainly Peloponnesian, on the other. An unfinished history of the war we still have, written by the Athenian Thucydides, who had taken part in it, carrying the story up to 411. The story of the last years of the war is told by Xenophon. Pericles died in the third year of the war. It was difficult for the Spartans to bring Athens to her knees by invading Attica, for the Athenians could take shelter behind the strong walls of Athens and provision themselves from their sea empire; on the other hand, it was impossible for Athens to invade the Peloponnesus beyond raiding its coast. And so the war dragged on. The adventurous attempt made by Athens in 415 to enlarge her empire by conquering the Greeks of Sicily ended after two years in horrible disaster. At last, in 404, Athens had to surrender to the Spartans. It was allowed to continue as a free city-state, but its empire was taken away and its walls were pulled down. A legend afterwards said that the conquerors spared Athens because their feeling of what Athens meant for the Greek world was stirred by a Phocian actor chanting a chorus from the *Electra* of Euripides. That is what Milton referred to in one of his Sonnets—

> "and the repeated air
> Of sad Electra's poet had the power
> To save the Athenian walls from ruin bare."

All the time that the energies of Athens were being drained by this war, Athens went on, wonderful as it may seem, making supreme contributions to the literature and thought of mankind. All the time Sophocles and Euripides were producing great tragedies and Aristophanes great comedies. And in the public places

of the city a strange ugly man called Socrates was to be seen going about asking people questions which gave a new start to Greek thought on fresh lines—thought now not so much about what the material world was made of as about what it was good for man to do, what this consciousness which man had, what the standards by which man called things "good" or "beautiful," really implied as to the nature and destiny of man's soul. In the days before the war the young men of the Greek cities had been largely carried away by what we call the "Sophistic" movement. The new philosophy had upset many traditional beliefs, and there was a great deal of intellectual confusion. The Sophists were itinerant professors of wisdom, who for a fee undertook to teach young men how to overcome in argument. Some of them tended to bring about a general scepticism. Socrates, chiefly perhaps by the force of his strange personality, the profound convictions which underlay his apparently naïve questioning, laid the foundation for new beliefs. When the Athenian *demos* put him to death, five years after the end of the war—probably because they suspected him of being anti-democratic—a young man of aristocratic family who had followed and loved him, called Plato, began to put into writing thoughts which Socrates had evoked in his mind. After this, for centuries to come, the chief seat of Greek philosophy was in Athens.

War was soon going on again amongst the Greek states after 404. Athens had sufficiently recovered to be fighting Sparta again in 394, though for a generation Sparta stood as the predominant Greek power. About 375 the growing power was Thebes, and in the battle of Leuctra (371) the Thebans inflicted a defeat upon the Spartans which brought Sparta's hegemony to an end. The Thebans even invaded the Peloponnesus several times, though they never succeeded in actually entering the city of Sparta. Athens

in 378 was able to construct another Confederacy of Delos, in which she held the presidency over a group of island-states, though not on terms which again made her allies her subjects, as they had been at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.

One shameful feature in these wars of the Greek states was that they were now ready, even Athens, to take money from the Persian king to strengthen themselves against their rivals. The Persian court discovered that it was not necessary, as Darius and Xerxes had supposed, to conquer European Greece in order to incapacitate the Greeks for attacking the Persian empire. All that was needed was to send financial help discreetly, now to one Greek state, now to another, in order to keep up the quarrels of the Greeks amongst themselves. Greek envoys could continually be seen in the royal palace of Susa ("Shushan the palace"), come to beg support from the Great King. In 387, when Sparta still had the hegemony, a peace was concluded between the Greek states and Persia, which definitely abandoned the Greek cities of Asia Minor to Persian rule.

Soon after 360 the chief rôle began to pass to a power which had not hitherto played a great part in Greek history—the kingdom of Macedonia. It can count as a Hellenic power. The Macedonians were backward cousins of the Greeks, speaking a language not Greek, but akin to Greek. But their royal house claimed to be a genuine Greek, Achæan, in stock; the kings of Macedonia encouraged Greek artists and men of letters at their court; the Macedonian nobles largely had Greek names and more or less Greek education. The literary language of the kingdom was Greek.

But Macedonia was not a city-state. It was a sort of feudal kingdom, an aristocracy of great landholders and a stout peasantry, who made excellent soldiers. The king was not absolute and remote like an

Oriental monarch, but obliged to take account of the general will of his people in arms and on terms of familiar fellowship with them. It was the survival of an older society of primitive kingship, such as we saw in Homer. Macedonia is a kind of anticipation of the Germanic national kingdoms which succeeded the fall of the Roman Empire, and out of which the European states of to-day have grown.

Under the able King Philip II. (359 to 336) Macedonia interfered more and more in Greece; Philip had the ambition of bringing the states of Greece as a whole into his sphere of power. His great antagonist was Athens. The anti-Macedonian party at Athens was led by Demosthenes, the most forcible orator Athens ever produced. Demosthenes stood passionately for the freedom of the Greek city-states against this power, which would subordinate them to a larger system. There is a great deal to be said for the view of Demosthenes: subordination to Macedon *would* mean a sacrifice of freedom; a free state in antiquity, let it be repeated, could only be a small state; and it was under the régime of the relatively small independent city that the great works of Hellenism in art and literature and thought were produced. When, however, you looked at the evil consequence of this splitting up of the Greeks into small antagonistic communities a different view was possible. The different view is represented for us by another eloquent Athenian—eloquent on paper—Isocrates. If the passion of Demosthenes was for the separate independence of the city-state Athens, the yearning of Isocrates was for the union of the Greek nation—Panhellenism. One result of the freedom for which Demosthenes contended was that the Greeks of Asia Minor had lost their freedom altogether, abandoned to bondage under the barbarians. Isocrates dreamed of a great crusade of the united Greeks against Persia, the national cause for which the Greeks had fought at Salamis and

Platæa. And it seemed to him that the King of Macedonia might well be the leader in such a national crusade. Amongst his works is a *Letter to Philip* setting this idea before him. Aristotle also, the philosopher who came from one of the Greek cities on the confines of Macedonia to join Plato's school in Athens, and was afterwards engaged by King Philip to instruct the Crown-Prince Alexander, sometimes wondered what the Greeks might accomplish if they united their forces: he thought they might dominate the world.

The wars between Philip and Athens were ended by the battle of Chæronea in 338, when a combined Athenian and Theban army was routed by the Macedonians. Athens had to make peace and surrender again most of her possessions overseas. In the same year at a synod of the Greek states at Corinth, Philip was chosen to be Captain-General of the Greeks in the war against Persia. Then in 336 he was assassinated in Macedonia and Alexander, a young man of twenty, became king. A new synod at Corinth appointed him in turn Captain-General of the Greeks. Two years later, at the head of a Macedonian army, with contingents from the Greek states, Alexander crossed the Dardanelles.

CHAPTER VI

ALEXANDER AND HIS SUCCESSORS

So at last the thing of which Isocrates and Aristotle had dreamed—a great co-operative enterprise of the Greeks in war—was come about under the leadership of the King of Macedon. Yet it was not a large army, as we reckon armies, with which the young Alexander crossed into Asia Minor in the spring of 334 to attack the huge Aryan empire, which extended from the

Dardanelles to the Indus—only an army of some 40,000 men, yet a compact, well-trained force of men of the Balkan peninsula, launched as a sputtering tank might be to-day into the midst of a disorganized crowd. It must be remembered that before the days of guns and firearms an army could travel much lighter, could protect its communications more easily, and be more independent at a distance from its base. If in each region to which it came it was stronger than any force which could be mustered in that region against it, it could often live for a time upon the country and then pass on somewhere else, devouring as it went. When Alexander, a month after his entrance into Asia Minor, had met on the River Granicus the army which the Persian satraps in Asia Minor could get together and had defeated it, he could move about freely in Asia Minor till the Persian king could get together another army capable of meeting him elsewhere. During 334 Alexander marched through the seaboard, liberating the Greek cities of Æolis and Ionia. When, in 333, he moved on to Syria he found another Persian army, under King Darius himself, waiting to arrest him near Issus in the passage between the mountains and the sea. This army, too, Alexander routed. Then, instead of turning inland to pursue Darius towards the east, he continued to follow the Mediterranean coast, conquering Syria and Egypt. There was a Persian fleet still at sea in the Mediterranean, and Alexander meant to cut it off from its connections with land by taking possession of the coast all round the Eastern Mediterranean. In Egypt during the winter 332-331, Alexander founded a new Greek city, Alexandria, on the western branch of the Nile, destined in following centuries to be the great commercial city of the Mediterranean. Then, in 331, he advanced into the interior of Asia and defeated in Mesopotamia the largest army which Darius could muster from all his dominions (called the battle of Gaugamela, or of

Arbela, though Arbela was sixty miles away). After that there was no Persian empire any more. Darius was a fugitive beyond the Tigris, killed by his followers before Alexander could capture him alive. The native land of the Persian Aryans was the tableland of Iran, ringed by mountains, beyond the Tigris. During the years 331 to 327 Alexander was marching about in this country, fighting with hill-tribes and subduing the local Iranian princes. In 327 he invaded India, but when he reached the last but one of the rivers of the Punjab his army struck and refused to go any further; so he took it down the Indus to the ocean, and thence back to Babylon through Baluchistan. In 323 he died suddenly in the palace of the old Babylonian kings in Babylon. Macedonian chiefs were commonly hard-drinkers, and Alexander had drunk hard without regard to the climate of Babylonia.

In the ten years since he left Macedonia, Alexander had marched victoriously to the extremities of the old Persian empire, even beyond, and the whole empire was now under satraps, some Macedonians, some Iranians, appointed by the Macedonian Great King. It is still a matter of dispute what plans Alexander was making for the organization and extension of the empire when he died. It seems clear, for one thing, that he had determined on fusing the Macedonian aristocracy with the Iranian—overriding in this respect the bar between Hellene and Barbarian. He himself had taken to wife Roxana, the daughter of a great Iranian noble, and he made his Macedonian marshals marry Iranian princesses. Whether, as some accounts allege, he had determined on making a general mixture of races, Greek and Asiatic, in his dominions may be doubted. The Iranian aristocracy had a great deal in common with the Macedonian—love of hunting and horsemanship and a high code of honour and valour—and Alexander's programme may not have gone beyond amalgamating the two aristocracies—

Wiros, both of them, in original stock. It is also clear that Alexander intended to organize the empire systematically for purposes of government and mercantile development. He had its roads measured and mapped, designed harbours and ways of commerce, interested himself in the vegetable products of the different regions, and built new cities at important points in the system of communications. Thirdly, whatever ideas he may have had of fusing the Greek race with others, he, the lover of Homer and the pupil of Aristotle, seems to have held fast to the supremacy of Greek culture. The new cities he founded all over Asia, as far as Bokhara and Sind, were to be Greek cities, each with a body of Greek or Macedonian colonists as the nucleus of its citizen-body, Greek speech, Greek architecture, and Greek forms of political life. They were to be in that way propagators of Hellenism over all this alien world.

The plans of Alexander, whatever they were, were confounded by his premature death. There was immediately a scramble for power amongst his Macedonian marshals. For a time there was a pretence of keeping the empire together, with a feeble-minded half-brother of Alexander's and the boy Alexander, whom Roxana bore after Alexander's death, as titular kings. But both the kings were murdered in the wild time. In 280 there was another of those irruptions of the peoples of the North. Bodies of Gauls broke over the Balkan into Greece. Some of them ravaged Greece; others turned eastward. The Greeks and Macedonians succeeded ultimately in clearing the country of them. But one large body, in 278 or 277, crossed over into Asia Minor, where they were a scourge to the Greek cities, and where their children and grandchildren continued to be a restless menace. The Greeks called them Galatai, which is the same as our word "Celt." In the end they were forced to settle down in the interior round Ancyra (Angora) and

Pessinus, and all that region came to be called Galatia, "Gaul-country." In the first century of the Christian era there were still all round what is now the capital of Turkey villages of Gauls, talking a kind of Welsh.

Fifty years after Alexander's death there had come to be three new kingdoms, occupying the greater part of what had been the empire, kingdoms with Macedonian kings, the issue of three of Alexander's marshals. Over Egypt, Palestine, and Cyprus ruled the son of Ptolemy, over the Asiatic part of the empire from the Ægean to Afghanistan the son of Seleucus, over Macedonia and Thrace the grandson of Antigonus. In the course of the third century B.C. new kingdoms came up in Asia. In Asia Minor a Greek kingdom was set up by the house of Attalus with Pergamon as its capital, and two Persian houses which had had castles in Asia Minor before the Macedonian conquest now established kingdoms in the centre and north, the house of Ariarathes in Cappadocia and the house of Mithridates in Pontus. To the east a great area of the Seleucid realm was broken away by Greeks who made themselves independent kings in Bactria and Afghanistan, and by invaders from the northern steppe who created a barbarian kingdom in Parthia, a kingdom which attempted to reproduce more or less in small the Persian empire which Alexander had destroyed, and gradually extended its dominion till in the second half of the second century B.C. it wrested Mesopotamia and Babylonia from the Seleucids.

Though Alexander's empire broke up, the work of Alexander perished far less than might have been expected. Hellenism remained the predominant culture in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, and for nearly two hundred years in Mesopotamia and Babylonia. It was rooted in these countries in two ways. One way was by the royal courts of Antioch and Alexandria. The Seleucid kings of Syria were Greeks, not Syrians, and

the Ptolemies in Egypt were Greeks, not Egyptians. Except for a strain of Persian blood in the house of Seleucus, these kings remained pure Macedonian in stock; they never intermarried with native Syrians or Egyptians. They did not even learn to speak the language of their native subjects, or when the last famous Cleopatra learnt to speak Egyptian it was thought something extraordinary. The kings and their courtiers talked Greek, dressed like Greeks, shaved clean, as the fashion of the Greek world was after Alexander, and their palaces were built and decorated by Greek art. At their courts Greek artists, philosophers, poets, men of letters, courtesans, and actors got the royal patronage.

Since the Greek houses of Seleucus, Ptolemy, and Attalus were the chief powers of the Nearer East for two centuries after Alexander, the fashion of their courts was sooner or later followed even by dynasties which were not Greek in origin. The Persian reigning houses in Pontus and Cappadocia intermarried with the Seleucids and tried to make their courts, too, centres of Greek literary culture and Greek art. Even at the Parthian court in the last century B.C. performances of the classical Greek plays by Greek actors were watched with pleasure; the coins of the Parthian kings have Greek legends, and many of the kings adopted the surname Phil-hellene. In the countries the Parthians had conquered east of the Euphrates the Greek cities continued to exist under the barbarian overlord, and the commerce of these countries remained, no doubt, largely in Greek hands; it was good policy for the overlord to conciliate the Greeks.

This brings us to the other way in which Hellenism was rooted in Asia—the new Greek cities. Though Alexander died, the cities he designed over the area of the empire were built and peopled with Greeks. If the more remote ones on the Indus or the Oxus may have soon been abandoned or lost their Greek character,

those in Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, remained Greek cities for centuries. The Seleucid kings carried on the work by founding more Greek cities to command the lines of communication—there were soon a bewildering number of Antiochs and Seleucias and Apameas and Laodiceas in their far-stretched dominions. The Attalid kings followed suit in Asia Minor. As the culture of the courts and the cities, Hellenism was the culture which had prestige in these countries after Alexander. Even the older Oriental cities like Tyre and Gaza and Damascus became transformed after the Greek type. Aramaic or Egyptian continued to be talked by the peasantry and by the poorer class in the cities, but the native tongues ceased to be used for any literature which counted: a Syrian or Egyptian who desired literary fame wrote in Greek. We have Greek poems by men who were Phœnicians and Syrians in origin. One people in that world formed a strange exception—the Jews. Besides the Jews in Palestine there was a large Jewish Dispersion throughout the Greek cities, especially in Syria and Egypt. The Jewish tradition was the one tradition which held its own against the worldly prestige of the Greek. The Hebrew Scriptures were the one body of earlier non-Greek literature which was not allowed to perish. Even amongst the Jews a certain number were for adopting Greek ways, but when the Seleucid king Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes 175 to 163) tried to turn Jerusalem by force into a Greek city like the rest, he provoked such a reaction that the Jews of Palestine, in the end, shook off the yoke of the Gentiles and set up an independent state under Jewish priest-kings (142). The Jews dispersed through the Greek cities mainly came to speak Greek as their mother-tongue, and to read their Scriptures in a Greek translation (now called the "Septuagint"). They were, as a rule, protected by the kings and hated by their Greek fellow-townsmen, because of their refusal to participate in

idolatrous festivities. But some Greeks in those days of religious confusion were attracted to this strange people, so sure that they had knowledge of the true God, and attached themselves as proselytes or semi-proselytes to the synagogues. The Jews of those times were considered to be especially formidable fighters, and the Greek kings liked to get Jewish soldiers for their armies.

This Hellenism spread over Asia and Egypt no longer produced works of literature and art equal to the great original works of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. But it kept alive the tradition of Greek art and literature and Greek ideas. If Hellenism had lost much of its creative force, it was now extended to a much larger part of mankind. In some lines advances were made in knowledge after Alexander. Especially the great university, called the Museum, founded by the Ptolemies in Alexandria, with a library comprising copies on papyrus rolls of practically every book that had ever been written by Greeks, was a centre for studies. Advances were made in medical science, mathematics, geography, mechanics, and literary scholarship. Science can prosper under a despotism more easily than great poetry and philosophy. Yet in the first generations of Greek rule in Egypt, even poetry of a high kind was cultivated at Alexandria: Theocritus of Sicily lived there for a time.

At the end of the second century B.C. a shadow had come to be thrown over this Eastern Mediterranean world, ruled by Greco-Macedonian kings—the creeping shadow of Rome. But before we speak of Rome, we must glance at what was happening in old Greece since the days of Alexander. Even under Alexander the old Greek city-states, both in Greece and in Asia Minor, had continued to be in form free republics, carrying on their political assemblies and elections in the old way, though in practice they were obliged to bow to the will of the Macedonian Great King. The

break-up of Alexander's empire at his death gave a new lease of life to Greek freedom. Many Greek cities continued to be subject to Macedonian kings—to the house of Antigonus or Seleucus or Ptolemy—but others contrived to maintain their independence. For one thing, since Macedonian rule was divided, they could trim their course between the powers, get the help of Ptolemy against Antigonus and *vice versa*. The house of Antigonus in Macedonia, as the nearer power, was the one in the best-position to maintain a supremacy in old Greece, and that the house of Antigonus always strove to do. Especially did the Antigonid kings try to keep in their hands the three citadels, which some described as the "fetters of Greece," Demetrias in Northern Greece, Chalcis in Eubœa, and the citadel of Corinth.

It must be remembered that if the king of Macedonia aspired to command Greece, he was at the same time always doing a service to the Greek world—keeping back the barbarian deluge from the north. Wild Balkan hill-peoples were always ready to raid Macedonia, and beyond those peoples were other restless barbarians, pressing them from behind, and beyond those again others, away through the unexplored parts to the unknown seas. Macedonia served in its day as the bulwark for Greece. Half its force was always spent in that effort. Again and again in the story of those days we hear how the king of Macedonia, in the midst of some transaction in Greece, had to hurry away to repel the barbarians from his northern frontier. King Demetrius II. died probably of hurts received in battle against the Dardanians in 229; King Antigonus Doson died of his exertions in the repelling of the invasion of the Illyrians in 222.

Athens no longer counted for anything as a political power after 261, though it continued to derive an immense sentimental prestige from its great past and the wonder of its buildings and adornment, and to be the

chief seat of philosophical schools. For a good part of the third century B.C. Athens was definitely controlled by a Macedonian garrison. Sparta, on the other hand, remained a free state with considerable military power; it became in character more assimilated to the monarchic states of the time after its King Cleomenes III. (235-222) had gathered the direction of things into his hands and attempted to secure for Sparta the hegemony of the Peloponnesus. In the second century the kings ruling Sparta were described as "tyrants": the ablest and most ruthless of them was Nabis (205-192).

The other two powers of old Greece in those days were powers which had never played a prominent part before Alexander — the Ætolian League and the Achæan League. They are interesting as an attempt to form free Greek states with an area larger than that of the old city-state, states which might hold their own even against a large territorial monarchy like Macedonia, by means of the federal principle. The Ætolians were a people of highlanders, backward, as compared with the other Greeks, in culture, living in little towns among the mountains of Central Greece, quick to fight and quick to pillage. The Achæans, a remnant of the old Greek population before the Dorian invasion, had lived a quiet, uneventful life in a number of little country towns in the agricultural country on the northern seaboard of the Peloponnesus. Both these peoples were organized in federations with a central meeting-place, in which people from the little towns came together and elected the "generals" who were presidents of the federation for the year. Since the popular assembly met only once or twice a year, and the current business of the federation was transacted by the executive in power for each year, the two Leagues were not democratic in the sense in which Athens had been. Also since a large number of the cities forming the League were far away from the

place of meeting, only the wealthier townsmen could afford to attend the annual assemblies.

In the third century B.C. both the Ætolian League and the Achæan League enlarged their area by bringing into their systems city-states outside the Ætolian and Achæan countries. The rise of the Achæan League as a military power, with an ambition to expand, was due to the clever politician Aratus, who was general of the League for the first time in 245, although his native city, the Dorian Sicyon, had never belonged to the League till 250.

After the definitive establishment of the house of Antigonus in Macedonia, the history of old Greece is made up of the endless rivalries and fightings between those four powers—Macedonia, Sparta, the Ætolian League, the Achæan League. Each of these powers was hostile to the other three, but compelled to ally itself, now with one, now with another of them, in order to defeat the enemy which happened to be the most odious or the most formidable at the moment. The Achæans, for instance, were hostile by tradition to Macedonia, as the chief enemy of Greek freedom; they hated the Ætolians, feeling that they themselves were a respectable, sober-going Greek people, and the Ætolians disreputable, half-barbarous brigands; they clashed with the Spartans because each wanted to be the leading power of the Peloponnesus. Yet in 241 the Achæan League allied itself with the Spartans against the Ætolians; in 224 with Macedonia against the Spartans. The groupings and re-groupings of these four powers during 150 years, according to the exigencies of the general struggle, make a miserable story. Once, in 217, in a lull of the fighting, there was a conference attended by representatives of all the Greek powers at Naupactos; the young Philip V., of Macedonia, was present in person. An Ætolian, Agelaos, stood up and called the attention of the assembled Greeks to the great struggle then going on

between Rome and Carthage in the west. He warned them that, if the Greeks went on fighting amongst themselves, it would not be long before they would, none of them, have power to manage or mismanage their own affairs any more, because they would all alike be subject to Rome or to Carthage, whichever proved victorious. Every one was impressed; every one agreed that Agelaos had spoken wisely; but, when it came to practice, no Greek state was willing to see its rivals steal an advantage, and so the fighting went on, and what Agelaos had said came true. Seventy years later Macedonia was a Roman province, and all the Greeks of old Greece had become subject to Rome. We must now go many centuries back and see how this power had arisen in Italy to dominate the Mediterranean world.

CHAPTER VII

THE BEGINNINGS OF ROME

In Italy, too, when the first Wiros trekked into the country over the Alps, they must have found an earlier non-Wiro population. Many people believe that the Ligurians, who lived in historical times at the north-west corner of Italy and along the French Riviera, were a remnant of this earlier non-Wiro population; others hold that the Ligurians were themselves Wiros, the first-come into Italy of the Wiro peoples. In any case, about 1400 B.C. the "Italiot" group of Wiros began to trickle into the peninsula—the group, that is, to which the Umbrians and Latins and Samnites belonged, in their languages nearer to the Celts than to the Greeks. In the eighth century B.C. the different peoples inhabiting Italy all spoke Wiro tongues, with the doubtful exception of the Ligurians and the certain exception of the Etruscans.

The Etruscans are one of the mysterious peoples of history. They were not Wiros, and yet they had not come into Italy till about 1000 B.C. According to Herodotus, they came by sea from Asia, and a good deal of expert opinion to-day accepts this as true; some modern historians think, on the contrary, that the evidence points to their having come from Central Europe by land. We have a considerable number of Etruscan inscriptions, which use an alphabet borrowed from the Greeks; but Etruscan is still an unknown tongue. In the eighth century the Etruscans were the most advanced in material civilization of the peoples in Italy; it was they alone who built great cities of stone: in what is now Lombardy they had made a system of irrigation for the waters of the Po. Their vessels of bronze or earthenware, following the style of the Greek vases they imported, show a capacity for art; we see a society of great nobles, opulent and luxurious. Yet there was something dark and coarse about the Etruscans: in their art they liked to portray the torments of hell, and to see men fight and kill each other was an amusement to the Etruscan nobles at their feasts. It was from the Etruscans that the ancient world got gladiatorial shows, and the practice of triumphal processions in which the conqueror made a parade of the conquered.

The region occupied by the Etruscans, or Tuski, was that between the Arno and the Tiber, still called, after them, Tuscany. Southwards, between the Tiber and the Liris, the plains and the foothills of the Apennines were inhabited by one of the Italiot peoples, the Latini, kinsmen of the Sabini, or Sabelli, who lived in the hills north and east of them. The Latins were shepherds, herdsmen, small cultivators, without cities and without any central government, only refuges, constructed of wood and earth, called *oppida,* built on some bit of higher ground, where the people of the neighbourhood could gather in case of need—a con-

dition of things very like that of their distant Wiro cousins in Britain and Central Europe. Yet although they were divided into about forty small, separate communities, the Latins had a sense that they formed one people distinct from others. Some time before 700 they had come to meet together periodically to offer federal worship to Jupiter Latialis on the highest hill near a group of villages called Alba Longa.

On the Tiber, facing the country of the Etruscans, there was a group of low hills, on which some Latins had established settlements. The chief settlement was on a hill called Palatinus, probably after Pales, a goddess specially worshipped by Latin shepherds. The settlement was important because it overlooked the point where the Tiber could most easily be crossed by raiders from the other side. In the course of the seventh century the Palatine settlement and the other Latin settlements on neighbouring heights came to unite in the federation of the "Seven Hills," the Septimontium. (These seven, it should be said in passing, were only part of the seven hills which were later on reckoned as the hills of Rome.) The federation strengthened its position by annexing the Aventine Hill, on which was a village still inhabited by men belonging to the pre-Latin population of the land, Ligurians. It came into rivalry with Alba Longa, which claimed to be the federal centre of the Latin people as a whole, with the result that the larger and looser Alban federation was broken up, and the Latins fell into a state of dangerous disunion. The menace from the Etruscans grew graver. As a precaution the Latins of the Septimontium established a post at Ostium to watch the lower reach of the Tiber.

But towards 650 the Etruscans began a career of conquest. To the south they subjugated, not the Latin country only, but the country inhabited by other Italiot peoples, beyond the Liris, beyond the Vulturnus, the *hinterland* of the Greek colonies, Cumæ and Naples.

The Greeks in the seventh century were still pushing forward as colonists in the Western Mediterranean. Inevitably they came into collision with the Etruscans. Etruscan pirates preyed on Greek commerce. The Etruscans formed an alliance against the Greeks with the Carthaginians.

Carthage was a city founded on the North African coast by Canaanites from Tyre. The Phœnicians of the Syrian coast were Semites, like the Israelites and the Arabs, not Wiros. They had been a great seafaring trading people for centuries, and, like the Greeks, founded cities in the Western Mediterranean, in Africa and Spain; Carthage (*i.e., Kart-hadasht,* "New City") became the leading one. After Nebuchadnezzar destroyed Tyre in 574, the Phœnicians of the mother-country sank as a people, but the Phœnicians of the African colonists, united round Carthage, aspired to dominate the traffic of the West, and then they, too, were brought into collision with the Greeks. After the expansion of the Etruscans, allied with the Carthaginians in the sixth century, the forward colonial movement of the Greeks in Italy was arrested.

It was no doubt grievous to the Latins to be a subject people under Etruscan kings. Yet it was one of the cases in which the rule of an alien people is educative. The Latins now learnt to gather together into cities (*urbes*), to build in stone; Etruscan science drained the *campagna;* pasture lands became arable. It was important for the Etruscan masters of the land to make the "Seven Hills" which commanded the passage over the Tiber a strong position. Some time before 600 the federated group of villages was turned into a city, and the Etruscans gave the city a new name—Rumon, which became afterwards Roma, Rome. Perhaps the name is Old Latin and meant "River-town"; perhaps it is Etruscan, in which case it is no use guessing. Rome soon embraced more than the old Septimontium. In the course of the sixth century two other hills were

added—the Quirinal, on which there was an older settlement of Sabines, and the Capitol. The Capitol became the citadel; on its summit a temple was built to the triad, Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. The new city was fortified with a stone wall.

In the end the Etruscans were driven out of the Latin country. The well-known Roman legend about the expulsion of the Etruscan king, Tarquin the Proud, and the foundation of the republic (traditional date, 510-509 B.C.) is not history. What probably happened is that towards the end of the sixth century B.C. a rising of the Latins against their Etruscan masters coincided with a war between the Etruscans and the Greeks of Cumæ. A combined Latin and Greek army defeated the Etruscans at Aricia (according to Greek historians in 524). Rome, the headquarters of Etruscan rule in the Latin country, the Etruscan king probably held till after the success of the combined Greeks and Latins was clear. Then the Latin aristocracy of Rome, too, joined the national cause and freed the city from the Etruscans.

Rome inherited from the Etruscans not only stone buildings and public works, but the imperialist idea. Under Etruscan kings it had been the ruling city of the Latin country, and Rome did not want to lose its dominant position because the Latins were free. It wanted still to dominate Latium. But the struggle to do that involved conquest beyond, and that again further conquest, till Rome saw all Italy united under its rule. Yet the process could not come to an end there. Circumstances pressed Rome to extend its rule across the sea—first to Sicily, then to Gaul and Spain and the Eastern Mediterranean, till all the countries round the Mediterranean, Gaul, and Britain, were ruled from Rome. It took Rome more than six centuries after the driving out of the Etruscans to reach its largest expansion; then its power of expansion and absorption ceased—the German peoples beyond the

Rhine, the Iranian kingdoms beyond the Euphrates, still left big with menace on the frontier. It was not a process which went forward according to any human plan or programme. The farmer aristocrats who took counsel together in Rome, when the Etruscans were gone, can have imagined it as little as we imagine conquering the moon. They only wanted to make sure that their will would be predominant in the familiar Latin country between the Tiber and the Liris. The process went forward because circumstances always made it seem necessary to make another advance in order to safeguard what had been already won—with misgivings often and attempts at compromise, very much as the British power went forward in India.

In the struggle with the Etruscans, Rome suffered materially. At one time the Etruscan chief, Lars Porsenna of Clusium, succeeded in temporarily reoccupying the city and demolished its fortifications. Rome did not have a stone ring-wall again till 378. It no doubt had earthwork defences in the interval, but its best defence was, like that of unfortified Sparta, its army. The Etruscans were a declining power in the fifth century after their Italian empire had been cut in two by the loss of Latium.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONQUEST OF ITALY

The other Latins resisted the attempt of Rome to restore its hegemony. It came to fighting, and the Romans decisively defeated their Latin cousins in the battle of Lake Regillus (496). In 493 (of course, all dates in Roman history at this time are merely traditional and approximate) Rome concluded an alliance with the Latin League on the footing of complete

equality. Allied military action was concerted, if necessary, by meetings of the Roman and Latin leaders at the headquarters of the Latin League near Aricia. The Romans and the Latins of the League had need of each other because of the enemies surrounding both. These enemies were the Sabellian hill-peoples, who in the fifth century were coming down to conquer the low-lying fertile plains—Sabines, Æquians, Volscians. With the Sabines fighting went on continually for the first half of the fifth century; after that there seems to have been peace for 150 years. With the Æquians and Volscians the Romans and Latins had repeated wars throughout the fifth century. To the north Rome had a standing enmity with the Etruscan town of Veii, each desiring to control the navigation of the Tiber. On this front, too, war was often going on during the fifth century with intervals of truce. None of these wars led to large changes of frontier; it was a question of raids on one side or the other. But already the aristocracy of Rome showed a disposition to make diplomatic alliances: against Veii they made alliance with a rival Etruscan city, Cære; against the Æquians and Volscians with another hill-people, the Hernici.

The legend which connects the cessation of kingship in Rome with the expulsion of the Etruscans may be true, though at Rome, too, as at Athens, there continued to be a "king," reduced in this case to the character of a high priest, with merely religious functions. In the fifth century the commanders of the citizen army were the heads of the state; they had the name of *prætors—i.e., præ-itores,* "those who go in front, who lead"—were elected annually for a year only, and were two, or perhaps three, in number. At the end of the third century the number of prætors had been increased to six, and the two chief ones, who gave their names to the year, came to be called *consuls*. The power belonged at the outset to a group of noble families, described as *patricians,* because the members of

the *senate—i.e.,* Council of Old Men—who were all chosen from amongst these families, were called *patres* ("fathers"). The part of the people of Rome who were not patricians were described by the term *plebs*—"that which *fills up*" the city. How this distinction between patricians and plebs had come about is a vexed question; one theory is that there was originally a difference of race between the two, but that is now generally thought unlikely. At the beginning of the fifth century the plebs already had certain political rights. The assembly, which was, to start with, a meeting of the citizen army, the *comitia centuriata,* included both patricians and plebeians, and it was this assembly which elected the annual magistrates, decided the question of war or peace, and said "Yes" or "No" to laws presented to it by the consuls. But no plebeian could be a magistrate, and the assembly had no control over the executive government, which was carried on by the prætors in consultation with the senate. The plebeians were dissatisfied with their status, and during the fifth century, whilst Rome was fighting for its existence with the peoples round, an internal struggle was going on as well. By a series of temporary expedients and compromises the plebs acquired gradually more equality and power. Near the beginning of the century the plebs secured the institution of certain officers of its own, called *tribunes of the plebs.* About 450 the Valerian Laws ordained that resolutions passed by the plebs in its own tribe assembly (*plebi-scita*) should become law. A little later marriages between patricians and plebians were made legal, and the chief commands in the state were opened to plebeians.

Towards the end of the fifth century Rome and the Latins passed from defensive warfare against the Æquians and Volscians to a forward policy. The Æquian country was occupied about 392. The Volscian power was broken in the early years of the fourth

century, and a Latin colony established at Circeii in their country.

It should be noticed here that one reason why the Romans spread their power farther and farther is that they knew, better than other peoples, how to bind firmly to their state territory already conquered. One means was that of *colonies*. A certain number of Roman citizen-soldiers were planted as a little city community, a miniature of Rome, at the strategic points of the territory to be held. The citizens of a colony continued to be citizens of Rome, and, when they came to Rome, might vote in the assembly. Other colonies were planted by Latins and Romans together, and called "Latin" colonies. They had the same rights as the old Latin cities allied with Rome.

At the end of the fifth century Rome also made a forward move over the Tiber. In 396 Veii was taken and destroyed. But a few years afterwards Rome was overtaken by a serious disaster. At this moment came the second great break-through of the barbarian peoples of the north in the period for which there are historical records. Large bodies of Gauls, Celts, poured over the Alps into Italy. They passed through the country, marauding and destroying. One body stormed Rome, unfortified as it was, except the Capitol. After the Gauls had vainly besieged the Capitol for a few months, the Romans bought them off by a large payment of blackmail (about 390). So far as Rome went the disaster was transient. But in North Italy the Gauls settled down upon the country. All the rich plains watered by the Po and its tributaries became a strange land to the Italians, a country of Gauls talking their Welsh, Gallia Cisalpina ("Gaul this side of the Alps"). And to the older peoples of Italy these northern barbarians, established so near, continued for many generations to be a terror.

To the Etruscans the loss of the territory on the Po was a new weakening. The Romans, having destroyed

Veii, soon after conquered Southern Etruria. In the latter half of the fifth century the Etruscans had also lost Campania, which had been conquered by the most formidable of all the Sabellian mountain peoples, the Samnites. As a people the Etruscans had had their day.

After the Gallic disaster the Romans built a new stone wall round the city. The fourth century saw their power grow. About the middle of it the Volscians were finally crushed and their territory annexed. But the Romans had also to quell the resentment of their Latin allies. In 358, after a good deal of fighting, the alliance was restored, but on terms more favourable to Rome.

The Latin question, however, was not yet settled. It did not get settled till Rome had made another move forward—into the fertile Campanian country, at the invitation of the people of Capua, who were hard pressed by the Samnites. This brought the Romans and Samnites into collision for the first time. The Samnites were defeated in 341, and Rome annexed Campania. The Latins were thus enclosed by Rome, north and south, and made their last desperate effort to shake off the Roman yoke. They addressed a series of demands to Rome, one of which was that, of the two prætors at the head of the Roman state, one should always be a Latin. It came again to war, and this time, when the Latins had been defeated, Rome determined to have done with the Latin question for ever. The Latin League was abolished, except for the continuance of annual sacrifices on the Alban Mountain (338). Each Latin city was connected with Rome by a separate treaty, but the political and social connections of the Latin cities between each other were broken. The citizens of the more privileged Latin cities were made full citizens of Rome, so that they could marry Roman women, and if any one of them came to Rome he could vote in the assembly. But the citizen of one Latin city might not marry a woman belonging to

another. When this arrangement was once established, the Latins do not seem to have felt it an evil one: in the great struggles coming the Latins held faithfully by Rome.

A great war with the Samnites, the stalwart highlanders who were serious rivals with the Romans for the hegemony of Italy, followed within the next two generations. In the first phase (327-312) the Samnites fought without allies and were beaten. In the second (312 to 290) the Etruscans and Umbrians and some of the Gauls joined against Rome—a great union of Italian peoples to contest the claim of one city to rule. Rome had to fight on several fronts at once, but it had the advantage of the inner lines. It won in virtue of efficient strategy, which enabled it to beat the Etruscans separately and then turn upon the Samnites and Umbrians and defeat them decisively in the battle of Sentinum (295). In 290 the Samnites had to accept the Roman supremacy. Eight years later a last attempt of the Etruscans to revolt, in alliance with the Gaulish tribe called Boii, was crushed (282). In the same year the Romans advanced into Southern Italy, defeated the Lucanians and Bruttians, who were besieging the Greek city of Thurii, and put a Roman garrison in other Greek cities—Locri, Croton, Rhegium on the Straits of Messina.

All Italy south of the Gaulish country was now under Rome, except the Greek colony of Tarentum. In the general decline of the Italian Greeks, Tarentum, which claimed a Spartan as its founder, was still rich and powerful. During the fourth century B.C. the rising city of Latin "barbarians" had been coming into closer contact with the Greeks, with the people who had advanced beyond the rest of mankind in knowledge and culture. In 327 the Romans had fought with the Greeks of Naples, and, having received their surrender the following year, made an alliance with Naples on the footing of formal equality. Compared

with the Greeks, the Romans were at this time rude and primitive. They had few or no books, and used writing, the signs which the Greeks had brought to Italy, only for inscriptions—the text of treaties, epitaphs, brief priestly records of things to be remembered year by year. They had no literature, though no doubt a certain number of songs, orally handed down, in the rough old Italian metre. But the ideas of the Greeks were beginning to infiltrate—not, in the first instance, Greek philosophy, which the worthy city fathers would have been quite incapable of understanding, but the lively stories which the Greeks told about their gods. The Roman gods had met a purely practical need, gave little scope to poetical imagination. The Romans had a vague sense that every operation and work depended for its success on some unseen power, and so they simply named the unseen power in each particular case after the operation or the thing, and performed some act to make the power favourable. A goddess Cunina had to watch over the baby in its cradle (*cuna*), a goddess Potina make it drink properly (*potare*), a god Fabulinus enable it to talk (*fabulari*); a god Janus looked after doors (*januæ*). There was a special deity for each agricultural operation, called after the operation; a god Æsculanus for money of bronze (*æs*); and so on. But the Romans did not tell stories about these gods. They had a few greater gods, perhaps thought of more personally—the chief god Jupiter (that is, Father Dyu, the old Wiro sky-god Dyâus); his mate Juno; Minerva, the goddess of handicraftsmen; Mavors, originally an agricultural or vegetation deity, though he later on turned into Mars, the god of war; Venus, an old Italian agricultural goddess. But even of these gods the Romans had, so far as we know, no traditional stories to tell. The important thing for the Romans was what was done, the proper ritual act, the right formula. They had a profound belief in the real power of such things, and no doubt

in the matter of religious ceremonies they had a fairly elaborate tradition, handed down in the different priestly corporations and strictly observed. But after intercourse with the Greeks—Romans visiting the Greek cities of the coast, Greeks coming to Rome for trade—the Romans began to pick up the Greek mythology and fasten it on to their own gods. In the case of Apollo they borrowed from the Greeks an altogether new deity with his Greek name, but in the case of most of the Greek deities they identified each of them with one or other of their own—Zeus was Jupiter (and that was true enough, because Zeus, too, was the old Wiro Dyâus), Athena was Minerva, Ares was Mars, Aphrodite was Venus, and so on. And then they began to tell about Minerva the stories which the Greeks told about Athena, how she sprang from the head of Jupiter, about Venus how she rose from the sea, and so with the rest. In Roman religion the practice for the most part continued to be traditional Roman, but the ideas came to be almost entirely Greek.

Whilst the Romans were so far behind the Greeks on the intellectual side of civilization, on the moral side they had a strength which the Greeks lacked. These primitive farmer-statesmen, by the very conservative rigidity with which they observed the correct traditional formula, observed the traditional moral code with a far more conscientious fear than the quick-witted, critical, changeable Greeks. This meant chiefly that the word of a Roman, given on oath, could be much more depended on than the word of a Greek, and that Romans were much more honest in public office because they really believed that it would be dangerous to offend the unseen powers. And in the matter of law and government, though the Romans had not much intellectual theory, till they picked up the Greek theories later on, they had an informal instinct, rather like the English, of the best thing to do. They showed a practical sagacity in organizing

their empire in Italy, greater than that shown by any Greek people.

And now the first great conflict between these two peoples, Romans and Greeks, occurred. Tarentum, which had been fighting the barbarians of Italy for centuries, was not going to give way so easily to the upstart Latin power on the Tiber. In 281 B.C. it called in Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, a cousin of Alexander the Great's, who hoped to make conquests in the west, as Alexander had made in the east, one of the stormy adventurer kings of that troubled time. Pyrrhus came to Italy with troops armed and drilled in the Macedonian way, Greek military science, and some of the elephants which Alexander had brought from India. When the Romans met this new kind of enemy in 280 they were beaten; they were beaten again in 279. But Pyrrhus' success really hung on the question whether the hold of Rome on the peoples of Central Italy remained firm. In spite of the defeats, it did, so that Pyrrhus' victories were of the kind called after him, "Pyrrhic." When Pyrrhus, having overrun Sicily, returned to Italy, he was decisively defeated by the Romans at Beneventum (275). That was the end of his western adventure. Three years later Tarentum was surrendered to Rome. All Italy south of the Gaulish country was now Roman.

The Roman organization of their empire in Italy showed sagacious discrimination. The subject communities were ordered in a series of grades, according to their degree of local autonomy and the extent to which their citizens could participate in the citizenship of Rome. Roman statesmanship invented the *municipium*, which meant an Italian non-Roman city, whose citizens had the social rights of Roman citizens—they might marry Roman women and have commercial relations with Romans—but not the political ones—they could not vote or hold office in Rome. Tusculum is said to have been the first *municipium* (381 B.C.).

The Italian peoples had lost their freedom; they had to supply men to fight for Rome, and pay tribute to the Roman state. On the other hand, the endless wars between the different communities had given place to the Roman peace: commercial intercourse was extended by the Roman roads, and there was always the prospect for the subject peoples of obtaining some day the Roman citizenship. The story of how Roman power grew shows how foolish the phrase is which one sometimes hears that "force settles nothing." It was force put forth in bitter battle, the anguish and death of innumerable young men, which settled whether the Romans or Latins were going to rule Latium, whether the Romans or Samnites were going to rule Italy, whether the Romans or Carthaginians were going to rule the Western Mediterranean. Yet the story also shows how true it is that nothing is settled by force *alone:* the Roman victories in battle would have led to nothing durable if Rome's hold on the subject peoples had not been confirmed by the discriminating sagacity of Roman statesmanship.

CHAPTER IX

ROME AND CARTHAGE

The question whether Rome or Carthage was to rule the Western Mediterranean probably did make a great difference to the future of mankind. From its base on the African coast this Semitic seafaring mercantile power had for centuries been striving for spheres of power overseas. In the fifth and fourth centuries there had been repeated fighting between the Carthaginians and the Greeks of Sicily for the possession of the island, and the Carthaginians succeeded in establishing themselves strongly in the western part of it. The Carthaginians also, when the First Punic War broke out, possessed the coast regions of Sardinia

and Corsica and the Lipari Islands, so that the very sea which washed the shores of Latium was dominated by this alien power.

The critical moment came in 264, when a body of Italian mercenaries who had, quite unjustifiably, seized the Greek city of Messana (called Messina to-day) on the Sicilian shore opposite Rhegium, appealed to Rome for help. The Carthaginians threw a garrison into the city, and Rome had to make the momentous decision whether to send a force across the sea into Sicily to fight Carthage. There was no immediate danger to Rome, but states have often gone to war, not because they are directly attacked, but in order to prevent some other state getting a position of advantage from which it might attack them in the future. Rome began the First Punic War as such a " preventive " war. The wars against Carthage are called " Punic " because that is a Latin form of the Greek word we transcribe as " Phœnician."

The First Punic War (264-241) was a fight for Sicily. At the outset the Roman army seemed to make satisfactory progress; then it appeared impossible to dislodge the Carthaginians from their strongholds in the west of the island, unless the Romans created a fleet and wrested the command of the sea from the enemy. For the first time, the Romans in 260 took to the sea, and, strange to say, they inflicted defeats on the experienced Carthaginians. Yet even this did not serve to dislodge the Carthaginians. In 256 the Romans actually landed a force in Africa to strike at Carthage itself, but this force met with disaster the following year. On the top of this came disasters at sea, 255 to 249, and till 246 the war seemed to drag on inconclusively. In 242 the Romans made a fresh effort at sea, which turned out successful (battle of the Ægates Islands, 242). After that Carthage accepted the Roman terms—to evacuate Sicily and the Lipari Islands and pay a heavy indemnity (241). Sicily became the first of

the Roman oversea possessions—a "province," as it was called. Soon after the conclusion of peace the mercenary troops of Carthage mutinied, amongst them those holding Sardinia. This gave the Romans an opportunity to oust Carthage from Sardinia and Corsica as well. From 238 to 225 Rome was conquering Sardinia, from 237 to 231 Corsica.

Two other questions were serious ones for Rome: one was that of the Gauls in the north of Italy, the other was that of the control of the Adriatic. From 238-236 Rome was fighting the Gauls again, who laid siege to Ariminum. This Gallic attack broke down. There came another more serious one in 226, but the Gauls were severely defeated in the battle of Telamon (225). After that Rome advanced conquering to the Alps. Roman armies crossed the Po and in 222 took the Gaulish town of Mediolanum (Milan), the headquarters of the great Insubrian tribe. The control of the Adriatic depended on Rome's getting command of the opposite eastern coast. Unlike the Italian coast, which is almost harbourless, the east coast of the Adriatic is a succession of creeks and islands, admirably useful to a naval power. There were now nests of Illyrian pirates, and in 229-228 Rome was fighting the Illyrians, the ancestors of the modern Albanians. Rome succeeded in forming an Illyrian kingdom under its protection. In 219 the Illyrian king revolted, but the Romans regained their supremacy, and the king took refuge with Philip V. of Macedonia. It was another momentous move across the sea, when the Romans got a foothold in the Balkan peninsula.

In 218 came the Second Punic War (218-201), the most terrible the Roman Republic ever fought with a foreign enemy. Since the peace of 241 Carthage had been strengthening its position by creating a large Carthaginian dominion in Spain, inhabited still by primitive barbaric peoples. The occasion of the outbreak of war was the storming of the Spanish town

Saguntum by the Carthaginian general Hannibal. Rome declared war, and Hannibal marched with his army and his elephants (African ones this time) right through Southern Gaul, over the Alps, into Italy, and was at once joined by the bulk of the Gauls. Hannibal was a general of genius, and inflicted a series of appalling defeats upon the Roman legions—Battle of Trebia (218), of the Trasimene Lake (217), of Cannæ (216). After Cannæ the Romans almost gave up hope of saving the city from capture. Yet Hannibal was too prudent ever to attempt a siege of Rome. The man-power at the disposal of Carthage was really inferior to the man-power at the disposal of Rome, and Hannibal was fighting at a great distance from his home base. His gambler's throw could succeed only if Rome were deserted by its Italian subject allies or if Macedonia joined in. But although the Gauls joined Hannibal from the beginning, and most of Southern Italians after Cannæ, the solid fabric of Roman power in Central Italy held together. Hannibal in 215 made an alliance with Philip V. of Macedon, but the Romans were able to keep Philip occupied by stirring up the states of Greece hostile to him. Although Hannibal remained in South Italy till 203, he had long been unable to do anything effectual, and meantime Roman armies were conquering the Carthaginian dominion in Spain. In 203 Hannibal was recalled home to take command against Scipio, who had landed with a Roman army on the African coast. Scipio (called afterwards Africanus) won the Battle of Zama (202) against him, and Carthage was obliged to make a peace which ended for good its position as a great power. All its oversea dominions, in Spain and the islands, were transferred to Rome, and in Africa itself the Numidian kingdom, neighbour to Carthage, became a kind of Roman protectorate. The whole of the Western Mediterranean was now within the Roman sphere of power. In Spain two new " provinces " were constituted.

CHAPTER X

THE ADVANCE INTO THE EAST

THE contemporary Greek historian, Polybius, insists that with the Roman victory over Carthage, Mediterranean history, which had hitherto consisted of the separate histories of a number of different states, becomes one whole. It is absorbed in the history of Rome. About 200 B.C. Rome was at a parting of the ways. To the west and north there were wide countries—what are now France, Spain, Portugal, Britain—inhabited by young semi-barbarous Celtic peoples; to the east, beyond the Adriatic, the countries inhabited by Greeks or by people who had taken on the Greek civilization, with great industrious cities like Alexandria and Corinth and Ephesus, a rich and complicated life marked by material luxury and literary culture and fine art. Rome at that moment could either direct its energies to bringing under its direction, developing and educating the strong, fresh peoples of the west and north, or to making itself the predominant power in the old and partly decrepit world of the Hellenistic east. It chose at the beginning of the second century B.C. to turn eastwards. A distinguished modern scholar, to whose recent book this sketch is indebted, Léon Homo, holds that Rome at that critical moment made the wrong choice. Rome did also, it is true, make some forward moves during the second century B.C. in Spain and Gaul, though so much of its energy was diverted elsewhere; but, later on, when Spain, as a whole, and Gaul and Britain were brought under the government of the Roman Empire, Italian man-power had been largely exhausted by the long period of civil wars, when Rome could no longer do what it might have done had it pursued the conquest of Spain and Gaul and Britain in 200 B.C. The lure of the Greek east was too strong.

Since the days when patricians strove with plebeians in Rome, the Roman aristocracy had greatly changed. As many plebeian families became rich and powerful, and the plebeians got equal political rights with patricians, the old distinction became unimportant. A new aristocracy came into being based on wealth and a record of holding high office in the state. In practice, a certain set of families, some patrician, some plebeian, came to monopolize the highest commands. And not only had the composition of the Roman nobility changed, but its character was changing too. After the Second Punic War, Rome drew in on a larger scale wealth from abroad. Many Romans and Italians took to oversea trade, and went as merchants to other lands. In the nobility many men became great capitalists. With these changes the morale of the Roman nobility changed too. The old simplicity and honesty were going in the second century B.C.; duplicity and ruthlessness in exploiting the subject peoples became ever commoner. For good and for evil the influence of Greek literature spread in Roman society. Some of the great nobles at the beginning of the second century were ardent Philhellenes, and studied Greek books under Greek masters. Since the middle of the third century the beginnings of a Latin literature had appeared, composed partly of rude translations from Greek works, partly of imitations. The authors were, in many cases, Greeks who had become domiciled in Rome, like Livius Andronicus, who translated the *Odyssey,* and, perhaps, Ennius, who made an epic, in the metre of Greek epic poetry, about the Second Punic War. In proportion, of course, as the Roman upper class fell under the spell of the great products of Hellenism, it seemed more desirable to them to play a great part in the Greek world.

But it was not sentiment chiefly which made Rome turn eastwards in 200 B.C. The alliance of Philip with Hannibal had suggested danger from that quarter

which might become awkward in future contingencies if Rome did not use the opportunity to neutralize it now. Hence another preventive war deliberately entered on. Rome had had one brush with Philip during the Second Punic War, the "First Macedonian War" (214-205 B.C.). In 200, Rome attacked Macedonia (the "Second Macedonian War"). After trying unsuccessfully to invade Macedonia from the west, through the mountains, in 198 the Roman army attacked from the south, from Thessaly. In 197 the Philhellene pro-consul, Flamininus, defeated Philip at Cynos-cephalai, and Rome took the old place of Macedonia as the predominant power in Greece. At the Isthmian Games of 196, Flamininus proclaimed that the Greek states which had been subject to Macedonia should be free. The multitude of Greeks present sobbed with emotion, but the Romans, of course, knew that if the Greeks were left to themselves they could be trusted to go on cutting each other's throats. In 194 the Roman forces really evacuated Greece.

But another power now struck in—the Macedonian Seleucid King who ruled Syria and Asia Minor, Antiochus III. With the resources of his Asiatic Empire, he thought himself the proper person to seize the inheritance which the rival House of Antigonus had been compelled to relinquish. In 192 he invaded Greece in alliance with the Ætolians. The Ætolians had fought as allies of Rome against Philip; now they joined Antiochus against Rome. But the army of Antiochus in Greece crumpled up before the Roman attack and he withdrew to Asia. Then the Romans made another advance eastwards. Just as they had felt it necessary to paralyze Macedonia in order to make their position on the Adriatic safe, so now, in order to make their position in Greece safe, they felt it necessary to follow up Antiochus into Asia Minor. In 191 a shattering defeat was inflicted on Antiochus near Magnesia-on-Sipylus. The Romans did not venture at

this date to make a province of a country so far away; so they compelled Antiochus to evacuate all Asia Minor north of the Taurus, and made over the Seleucid dominions there to their friend, King Attalus of Pergamon.

After the death of Philip, he was succeeded by his son, Perseus, whom the Romans regarded as unfriendly to them. They determined to destroy the Antigonid kingdom for good. Perseus had given no adequate *casus belli*; he was willing to make every possible concession, short of self-annihilation, to stave off the Roman attack. But Rome was implacable, and Perseus had to fight—the "Third Macedonian War" (171-168). The Battle of Pydna in 168 left Perseus with no further possibility of defence. He was sent to Italy, to die obscurely. Macedonia was split up into four separate republics under Roman control.

The spirit of the Roman aristocracy and Roman people had now become "imperialist" in the ugliest sense. They did not undertake themselves the government of the Greek states; they were satisfied if the men in power in each state were utterly subservient to the Roman will. Rhodes, an old friend of Rome's, was humiliated and punished simply because it had attempted mediation between Rome and Perseus, whom Rome had resolved to destroy. The Achæans had been allies of Rome since 198, yet there were a certain number of men amongst them who wished to regard it as a friendship between two free states, a relation which might save self-respect. That Rome would not tolerate. In 165 a thousand Achæans of the upper class, indicated by the pro-Roman party as too independent in spirit, were swept off as hostages to Rome, amongst them the historian Polybius. The Greek and Hellenistic monarchic states in Asia and Egypt the Romans were content for the time being to leave alone, so long as they were weak. And the Romans could do a good deal to keep them weak by encouraging revolts

which disintegrated them, such as the Jewish revolt against Antiochus IV. in Palestine, or promoting the feuds within the royal families, to which the royal families were in any case only too prone.

In Macedonia and Greece the last fights for independence were fought in the middle of the second century. Macedonia revolted in 149 under a leader who pretended to be of the Antigonid family: when the Romans beat down this revolt the following year, Macedonia as a whole was made into a province. In 147 the docility of the Achæans reached its limit at a new demand of Rome, and they fought rather than give way. It was hopeless, of course, and they were crushed in a year. All Greece was put under the Roman Governor of Macedonia. It was because the Romans in 147 were again fighting in Africa that the Achæans dared to resist. Since 203, Carthage had existed as a mercantile town without any empire, and had shown itself as submissive as it well could be to the will of Rome. But the Romans, in their new consciousness of mastery, determined to annihilate Carthage altogether (*"delenda est Carthago"*). When they made this plain, the Carthaginians put up the best fight they could—the "Third Punic War," 149-146. Scipio Africanus the younger, son by adoption of the victor of Zama, took Carthage in 146, and its old territory became the Roman province of Africa. Where the great Phœnician city had stood there was only a field of ruins. Another famous mercantile city of the Mediterranean was Corinth. That had been a member of the Achæan League which had fought Rome. In the same year in which they destroyed Carthage the Romans destroyed Corinth as well. The site of Corinth too remained desolate for a century, after which a new Corinth, with a new population, partly Italian, was brought into being by Julius Cæsar.

During the first half of the second century the Romans were also going forward in the north and

west. The conquest of North Italy, the Gaulish country, was completed between 200 and 191. In 178 and 177 the Romans were working their way round the north end of the Adriatic, fighting in Istria. The conquest of Dalmatia came in 155. In the Second Punic War the Romans had temporarily lost Sardinia and Corsica. The conquest for good of these islands was completed by 150. In order to make a land connection with their provinces in Spain, the Romans needed to have a strip of territory along the coast of Gaul from the Alps to the Pyrenees. This, too ("Gaul beyond the Alps"), they conquered in the second century, having a useful ally in the Greek city of Massalia (Marseilles). Probably soon after 118, what is now the south of France was constituted as the province called Narbonensis, from the Roman colony, Narbo (Narbonne), planted to hold the country. Across what is Spain and Portugal, too, the Roman armies pushed forward. In 138 B.C., for the first time, they reached the shore of the Atlantic. The Gaulish country in North Italy became rapidly Romanized, and learnt to speak Latin instead of its Welsh tongue. In the last century B.C. two of the greatest Latin poets, Catullus and Virgil, and the historian Livy came from this country. They may well have had some Celtic blood.

CHAPTER XI

THE END OF THE REPUBLIC

ROME at the opening of the last century B.C. was an imperial state whose territory reached from Portugal to Asia Minor, for the old Seleucid dominions in Asia Minor which had been given to the King of Pergamon in 190, were bequeathed in 133 by the last King of Pergamon to Rome. And Rome was still a republic. That is not contradictory to what was said earlier in

this little book—that in antiquity a free state could only be a small state. For the Roman dominion as a whole was not a free state; the great mass of its inhabitants had no share at all in determining the policy of the state, and had simply to obey the will of the few hundred men who formed the Senate of Rome. In regard to the empire as a whole, the Roman great families were a despotic oligarchy. As regards the people of Rome, the power of the Senate was limited by a certain measure of popular control. But the people of Rome itself was changing its character, becoming composed of new elements drawn in from all over the Mediterranean world, for if a Roman master set free his Greek or Gaulish or Asiatic slaves, they became Roman citizens. And as the riches of the world flowed to Rome, the people of Rome became restless, eager for pleasure and public shows, and free distributions of food. The old republican forms which had fitted the Roman State when it had been small and simple, no longer fitted the city, which had become the despot state of the Mediterranean lands; the republic as it was in reality was something very different from the picture of it in the imagination of idealists.

In the last century B.C. the old system broke down altogether. The Roman nobility had become corrupt, individual selfishness driving out the sense of public duty, and had shown gross dishonesty and incompetence in the government of the provinces. Ambitious men rose to power by assuming the rôle of democrats, getting the favour of the mixed multitude which now constituted the "people of Rome" in their attack on the ruling oligarchy. The two factions, the supporters of the nobility and the democrats, divided Rome in two. But the struggle was not confined to assemblies of the people within the city of Rome. The power in any state ultimately rests with those who can dispose of its armies. In the Rome which fought Pyrrhus and

Hannibal the generals had felt themselves servants of the state, obedient to the constituted authorities, and their citizen armies had followed them, as being that. Now armies recruited in Italy, but employed often in regions far away, attached their loyalty to their personal leader, not to the state. When that happened the fate of the republic was sealed. Roman generals of the one faction could use Italian armies to fight Italian armies levied by generals of the other. The civil war between the faction of Marius and the faction of Sulla filled the years between 88 and 81 B.C., each side, as it prevailed in turn at Rome, massacring the partisans of the other. The civil war between Julius Cæsar and the party of Pompeius occupied the years 49 to 45, and swept all round the Mediterranean; it ended in Cæsar, as "Dictator," establishing a monarchy in everything but name. The further series of civil wars which followed Cæsar's assassination by a group of the Roman nobility in 44, ended only when Cæsar's great-nephew and adopted son, known after 27 B.C. as Imperator Cæsar Augustus, made the Roman State for good—though even now not in name—a military monarchy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. GENERAL.—*Cambridge Ancient History* (which has now reached vol. vi., covering period up to 301 B.C., and contains full bibliographies for each chapter.)—G. B. Grundy: *A History of the Greek and Roman World.* (Methuen, 1926.)—T. R. Glover: *Democracy in the Ancient World.* (Cambridge, 1927.)

II. GREECE.—Adolf Holm: *History of Greece.* (Eng. trans. Macmillan, 1894-1898.)—J. B. Bury: *A History of Greece.* (Macmillan, 2nd ed., 1913.)—L. Whibley: *A Companion to Greek Studies.* (Cambridge, 3rd ed., 1916.)—G. Glotz: *The Ægean Civilization.* (Eng. trans. Kegan Paul and Co., 1925.)—W. Ridgeway: *The Early Age of Greece.* (Cambridge, 1901, etc.)—H. M. Chadwick: *The*

Heroic Age. (Cambridge, 1912.)—P. N. Ure: *The Origin of Tyranny.* (Cambridge, 1922.)—G. B. Grundy: *The Great Persian War.* (John Murray, 1901.)—B. W. Henderson: *The Great War between Athens and Sparta.* (Macmillan, 1927.)—T. R. Glover: *From Pericles to Philip.* (Methuen, 1917.)—D. G. Hogarth: *Philip and Alexander.* (John Murray, 1897.) W. W. Tarn: *Hellenistic Civilization.* (Arnold, 1927.)—*The Legacy of Greece*, edited by R. W. Livingstone. (Oxford, 1921.)—H. R. James: *Our Hellenic Heritage.* (Macmillan, 1921.)—A. E. Zimmern: *The Greek Commonwealth.* (Oxford, 4th ed., 1924.)—W. R. Halliday: *The Growth of the City-State.* (Liverpool, 1923.)—W. S. Ferguson: *Greek Imperialism.* (Constable, 1913.)—E. A. Freeman: *A History of Federal Government.* (Macmillan, 2nd ed., 1893.)—J. L. Myres: *The Political Ideas of the Greeks.* (Arnold, 1927.)—Gilbert Murray: *Ancient Greek Literature.* (Heinemann, 1898.)—J. A. Symonds: *Studies of the Greek Poets.* (Black, 3rd ed., 1893.)—M. P. Nilsson: *A History of Greek Religion.* (Eng. trans. Oxford, 1925.)—J. Burnet: *Early Greek Philosophy.* (Black, 3rd ed., 1920.)—A. E. Taylor: *Plato, the Man and his Work.* (Methuen, 1926.)—W. D. Ross: *Aristotle.* (Methuen, 1923.)—E. Gardner: *Handbook of Greek Sculpture.* (Macmillan, ed. 1920.)—G. Glotz: *Ancient Greece at Work: An Economic History of Greece from the Homeric Period to the Roman Conquest.* (Eng. trans. Kegan Paul and Co., 1926.)

III. ROME.—Theodor Mommsen: *The History of Rome.* (Eng. trans. by Dickson, Bentley.)—W. E. Heitland: *The Roman Republic.* (Cambridge, 2nd ed., 1923.)—P. E. Matheson: *The Growth of Rome.* (Oxford, 1922.)—Sir John Sandys: *Companion to Latin Studies.* (Cambridge, 1921.)—Sir Charles Oman: *Seven Roman Statesmen.* (Arnold, 1902.)—W. Warde Fowler: *Julius Cæsar.* (Putnam's "Heroes of the Nations" Series.)—J. L. Strachan-Davidson: *Cicero.* (Putnam's "Heroes of the Nations" Series, 1894.)—J. B. Firth: *Augustus Cæsar.* (Putnam's "Heroes of the Nations" Series.)—A. H. J. Greenidge: *Roman Public Life.* (Macmillan, 1901.)—R. A. L. Fell: *Etruria and Rome.* (Cambridge, 1924.)—Cyril Bailey: *The Religion of Ancient Rome.* (Constable, 1907.)—W. Warde Fowler: *The Religious Experience of the Roman People.* (Macmillan, 1911.)—J. W. Mackail: *Latin Literature.* (John Murray, 2nd ed., 1906.)—W. N. Sellar: *The Roman Poets of the Republic.* (Oxford, 1881.)—T. R. Glover: *Virgil.* (Methuen, 5th ed., 1923.)—*The Legacy of Rome.* (Edited by C. Bailey. Oxford, 1923.)

BENN'S SIXPENNY LIBRARY

EDITED BY WILLIAM ROSE, M.A., Ph.D.

ALREADY PUBLISHED

No.
1. A HISTORY OF ENGLAND by D. C. Somervell.
2. WORLD OF GREECE AND ROME by Edwyn Bevan.
4. ROMAN BRITAIN by Gordon Home.
12. A HISTORY OF RUSSIA by Prince Mirsky.
15. A HISTORY OF CHINA by Professor Soothill.
16. THE PAPACY by A. L. Maycock.
18. A HISTORY OF INDIA by Edward Thompson.
51. ENGLISH LITERATURE by Professor C. H. Herford.
52. FRENCH LITERATURE by Maurice Baring.
53. ITALIAN LITERATURE by Professor E. G. Gardner.
54. SHAKESPEARE by G. B. Harrison.
56. RUSSIAN LITERATURE by Professor J. Lavrin.
59. MYTHS OF GREECE AND ROME by Jane Harrison.
87. THE ENGLISH NOVEL by J. B. Priestley.
101. MODERN SCIENTIFIC IDEAS by Sir Oliver Lodge.
102. THE AGE OF THE EARTH by Professor Arthur Holmes.
103. THE ATOM by Professor E. N. da C. Andrade.
104. CHEMISTRY by Percy E. Spielmann.
105. RELATIVITY by James Rice.
106. THE EARTH, SUN AND MOON by Professor G. Forbes.
107. THE STARS by Professor G. Forbes.
113. RACES OF MANKIND by Professor H. J. Fleure.
114. MAN IN THE MAKING by R. R. Marett.
140. SIR ISAAC NEWTON by V. E. Pullin.
141. THE BODY by Dr. R. C. Macfie.
145. THE WEATHER by C. E. P. Brooks.
151. RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD by Rev. C. C. Martindale.
152. THE MIND AND ITS WORKINGS by C. E. M. Joad.
161. DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL IDEAS by F. J. C. Hearnshaw.
165. THE LIFE OF CHRIST by Dr. R. J. Campbell.
166. CATHOLICISM by Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.
167. PROTESTANTISM by Dean Inge.
177. TRADE by Sir Ernest J. P. Benn.
179. MONEY by Hartley Withers.
251. NELSON by Major-General Sir George Aston.
252. OLIVER CROMWELL by Hilaire Belloc.

FURTHER TITLES

13. HISTORY OF ITALY by Mrs. G. M. Trevelyan.
19. ISLAM by Sir E. Denison Ross.
70. ENGLISH POETRY by John Drinkwater.
109. EVOLUTION by Professor E. W. Macbride.
110. HEREDITY by F. A. Crew.
117. INTRODUCTION TO BIOLOGY by Professor Dakin.
143. THE STRUCTURE OF MATTER by Dr. W. A. Caspari.
153. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS by Ernest Jones.
170. EDUCATIONAL THEORIES by Sir John Adams.
175. INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMICS by Lionel Robbins.