Junta nevertheless carried on all their deliberations in her name; and Padilla, marching with a considerable army to Valladolid, seized the seals and public archives, and formally deposed Adrian. Charles now issued from Germany circular letters addressed to the Castilian cities, making great concessions, which, however, were not deemed satisfactory by the Junta, who, conscious of their power, proceeded to draw up a remonstrance, containing a long list of grievances. . . . Charles having refused to receive the remonstrance which was forwarded to him in Germany, the Junta proceeded to levy open war against him and the nobles, for the latter, who had at first sided with the Junta, finding their own privileges threatened as well as those of the King, began now to support the royal authority. The army of the Junta, which numbered about 20,000 men, was chiefly composed of mechanics and persons unacquainted with the use of arms, Padilla was set aside, and the command given to Don Pedro de Giron, a rash and inexperienced young nobleman." From this time the insurrection failed rapidly In December, the royalists recovered Tordesillas and the person of Queen Joanna, and in April, 1521, Padilla was defeated, taken prisoner and executed, near Villalar. "This defeat proved the ruin of the Junta Valladolid and most of the other confederated towns now submitted, but Toledo, animated by the grief and courage of Padilla's widow, still held out" Even after the surrender of the city, "Dofia Maria retired to the citadel and held it four months longer, but on the 10th Feb 1522, she was compelled to surrender, and escaped in disguise to Portugal, after which tranquillity was re established in Castile"—T. H. Dyer, *Hist of Modern Europe, bk 2, ch 3 (v 1)*—"The insurrection was a failure, and the blow which crushed the insurgents on the plains of Villalar deprived them [the Spaniards at large] for ever of the few liberties which they had been permitted to retain They were excluded from all share in the government, and were henceforth summoned to the cortes only to swear allegiance to the heir apparent, or to furnish subsidies for their master . The nobles, who had stood by their master in the struggle, fared no better. . . They gradually sunk into the unsubstantial though glittering pageant of a court. Meanwhile the government of Castile, assuming the powers of both making the laws and enforcing their execution, became in its essential attributes nearly as absolute as that of Turkey.'—W. H. Prescott, *Hist of the Reign of Philip II., bk. 6, ch. 1.*

ALSO IN: W Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V., bk. 3 (v. 2).*

A. D. 1519-1524.—The conquest of Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1519, to 1524.

A. D. 1523.—The conspiracy of Charles V. with the Constable of Bourbon against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1520–1523

A. D. 1523-1527.—Double-dealings of Pope Clement VII. with Charles.—The imperial revenge.—Capture and sack of Rome. See ITALY: A. D. 1523–1527, and 1527.

A. D. 1524.—Disputes with Portugal in the division of the New World.—The voyage of Magellan and the Congress of Badajos. See AMERICA: A. D. 1519–1524.

A. D. 1526.—The Treaty of Madrid.—Perfidy of Francis I. See FRANCE: A. D. 1525–1526.

A. D. 1526.—Compulsory and nominal Conversion of the Moors, or Moriscoes, completed. See MOORS: A. D. 1492–1609.

A. D. 1528-1542.—The expeditions of Narvaez and Hernando de Soto in Florida. See FLORIDA, A. D. 1528–1542.

A. D. 1531-1541.—Pizarro's conquest of Peru. See PERU: A. D. 1528–1531, to 1533–1548

A. D. 1535.—Conquest and vassalage of Tunis. See BARBARY STATES, A. D. 1516–1535.

A. D. 1536-1544.—Renewed war between Charles V. and Francis I.—Treaty of Crespy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532–1547.

A. D. 1541.—Disastrous expedition of Charles V. against Algiers. See BARBARY STATES, A. D. 1541

A. D. 1556.—Abdication of Charles.—Accession of Philip II. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1555.

A. D. 1556-1559.—War with France and the Pope.—Successes in Italy and northwestern France.—Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis. See FRANCE A. D. 1547–1559.

A. D. 1559-1563.—Early measures of Philip II.—His stupid and stifling despotism.—His attempt to shut knowledge out of the kingdom.—His destruction of commerce and industry.—His choice of Madrid for a capital.—His building of the Escorial.—"In the beginning of his reign he [Philip II.] issued a most extraordinary decree . . That document is a signal revelation of the policy which Philip adopted as the very soul of his Government. Determined to stop by all imaginable means the infiltration into Spain of the doctrines of the religious reformation which agitated Europe, it seems that he planned to isolate her intellect from that of the rest of the world . . . For this purpose he ordered that none of his subjects, without any exception whatever, should leave the Kingdom 'to learn, or to teach, or to read anything,' or even 'reside' in any of the universities, colleges or schools established in foreign parts. To those who were thus engaged he prescribed that they should return home within four months Any ecclesiastic violating this decree was to be denationalized and lose all his temporalities; any layman was to be punished with the confiscation of his property and perpetual exile. Thus a sort of Chinese legislation and policy was adopted for Spain There was to be on her frontiers a line of custom-houses through which the thought of man could not pass without examination. No Spaniard was to receive or to communicate one idea without the leave of Philip. . In 1560, the Cortes of Castile had their second meeting under the reign of Philip. . . . The Cortes presented to Philip one hundred and eleven petitions . . . To those petitions which aimed at something practicable and judicious he gave some of his usual evasive answers, but he granted very readily those which were absurd. For instance, he promulgated sumptuary ordinances which were ridiculous, and which could not possibly have any salutary effects. He also published decrees which were restrictive of commerce, and prohibited the exportation of gold, silver, grains, cattle and other products of the soil, or of the manufacturing industry of the country. . . . In the meantime, the financial condition of the Kingdom was rapidly

growing worse, and the deficit resulting from the inequality of expenditure and revenue was assuming the most alarming proportions. All the ordinary and extraordinary means and resources had been exhausted . . . Yet, on an average, Philip received annually from his American Dominions alone more than 1,200,000 ducats — which was at least equivalent to $6,000,000 at the present epoch. The Council of Finances, or Hacienda, after consulting with Philip, could not devise anything else, to get out of difficulty, than to resort again to the sale of titles of nobility, the sale of vassals and other Royal property, the alienation of certain rights, and the concession of privileges . It is difficult to give an idea of the wretched administration which had been introduced in Spain, and of those abuses which, like venomous leeches, preyed upon her vitals. Suffice it to say that in Castile, for instance, according to a census made in 1541, there was a population of near 800,000 souls, and that out of every eight men there was one who was noble and exempt from taxation, thereby increasing the weight of the burden on the shoulders of the rest and as if this evil was not already unbearable, Philip was selling profusely letters patent of nobility . . In these conjunctures [1560], Philip, who had shown, on all occasions, that he preferred residing in Madrid, . . . determined to make that city the permanent seat of the Court and of the Supreme Government, and therefore the capital of the Monarchy. That barren and insalubrious locality presented but one advantage, if it be one of much value, that of being a central point . Reason and common sense condemned it from the beginning. . Shortly after having selected Madrid as his capital, Philip had laid [1563] with his own hands, in the vicinity of that city, the first stone of the foundations of the Escorial, that eighth marvel of the world, as it is called by the Spaniards."—C. Gayarré, *Philip II. of Spain, ch* 4.—"The common tradition that Philip built the Escorial in pursuance of a vow which he made at the time of the great battle of St Quentin, the 10th of August, 1557, has been rejected by modern critics. . But a recently discovered document leaves little doubt that such a vow was actually made However this may have been, it is certain that the king designed to commemorate the event by this structure, as is intimated by its dedication to St Lawrence, the martyr on whose day the victory was gained The name given to the place was 'El Sitio de San Lorenzo el Real' But the monastery was better known from the hamlet near which it stood — El Escurial, or El Escorial — which latter soon became the orthography generally adopted by the Castilians. . . The erection of a religious house on a magnificent scale, that would proclaim to the world his devotion to the Faith, was the predominant idea in the mind of Philip. It was, moreover, a part of his scheme to combine in the plan a palace for himself. . . . The site which, after careful examination, he selected for the building, was among the mountains of the Guadarrama, on the borders of New Castile, about eight leagues northwest of Madrid. . . . In 1584, the masonry of the Escorial was completed. Twenty-one years had elapsed since the first stone of the monastery was laid. This certainly must be regarded as a short period for the erection of so stupendous a pile. . . . Probably no single edifice ever contained such an amount and variety of inestimable treasures as the Escorial,—so many paintings and sculptures by the greatest masters,—so many articles of exquisite workmanship, composed of the most precious materials." It was despoiled by the French in 1808, and in 1837 the finest works of art surviving were removed to Madrid. "The Escorial ceased to be a royal residence. Tenantless and unprotected, it was left to the fury of the blasts which swept down the hills of the Guadarrama."— W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II., bk* 6, *ch* 2 (*v* 3).

A. D. 1560.—Disastrous expedition against Tripoli. See BARBARY STATES A. D. 1543–1560.

A. D. 1563-1564.—Repulse of the Moors from Oran and Mazarquiver.—Capture of Penon de Velez. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1563–1565

A. D. 1565.—The massacre of French Huguenots in Florida and occupation of the country. See FLORIDA. A D 1565, and 1567–1568

A. D. 1566-1571.—Edict against the Moriscoes.—Their rebellion and its suppression. See MOORS A. D 1492–1609

A. D. 1568-1610.—The Revolt of the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS A. D. 1568–1572, and after

A. D. 1570-1571.—The Holy League with Venice and the Pope against the Turks.—Great battle and victory of Lepanto. See TURKS A D. 1566-1571

A. D. 1572.—Rejoicing of Philip at the news of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's day. See FRANCE A D 1572 (AUGUST—OCTOBER)

A. D. 1572-1573.—Capture of Tunis by Don John of Austria, and its recovery, with Goletta, by the Turks. See TURKS A. D. 1572–1573.

A. D. 1572-1580.—Piratical warfare of England. See AMERICA A D 1572 1580

A. D. 1580.—The crown of Portugal claimed by Philip II. and secured by force. See PORTUGAL. A D 1579–1580

A. D. 1585.—Secret alliance with the Catholic League of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1576–1585

A. D. 1587-1588.—The expedition of the Armada, against England. See ENGLAND. A. D. 1587–1588, and 1588.

A. D. 1590.—Aid rendered to the Catholic League in France.—Parma's deliverance of Paris.—Philip's ambition to wear the French crown. See FRANCE: A D. 1590.

A. D. 1595-1598.—War with France.—The Peace of Vervins. See FRANCE: A. D. 1598–1598.

A. D. 1596.—Capture and plundering of Cadiz by the English and Dutch.—"In the beginning of 1596, Philip won an important triumph by the capture of Calais. But this awoke the alarm of England and of the Hollanders as much as of the French. A joint expedition was equipped against Spain in which the English took the lead. Lord Admiral Howard sailed with a fleet of 150 vessels against Cadiz, and the Earl of Essex commanded the land forces. On June 21 the Spanish ships which assembled for the defence of the town were entirely defeated. Essex was the first to leap on shore, and the English troops easily took the city. The clem-

ency of the English soldiers contrasted favourably with the terrible barbarities of the Spaniards in the Netherlands. 'The mercy and the clemency that had been showed here,' wrote Lord Howard, 'will be spoken of throughout the world.' No man or woman was needlessly injured; but Cadiz was sacked, and the shipping in its harbour destroyed Essex wished to follow up this exploit by a further attack upon Spain; but Howard, who had accomplished the task for which he had been sent, insisted on returning home."—M. Creighton, *The Age of Elizabeth, bk. 7, ch. 3.*—"The results of this expedition were considerable, for the king's navy was crippled, a great city was destroyed, and some millions of plunder had been obtained. But the permanent possession of Cadiz, which, in such case, Essex hoped to exchange for Calais, and the destruction of the fleet at the Azores—possible achievements both, and unwisely neglected—would have been far more profitable, at least to England "—J. L. Motley, *Hist of the United Netherlands, ch 32 (v. 3).*

A. D. 1598.—Accession of Philip III.

A. D. 1598-1700.—The first century of decline and decay.—"Spain became united and consolidated under the Catholic kings [Ferdinand and Isabella], it became a cosmopolitan empire under Charles; and in Philip, austere, bigoted, and commanding, its height of glory was reached Thenceforth the Austrian supremacy in the peninsula—the star of the House of Habsburg—declined, until a whiff of diplomacy was sufficient to extinguish its lights in the person of the childless and imbecile Charles II Three reigns—Philip III (1598-1621), Philip IV (1621-1665), and Charles II (1665-1700)—fill this century of national decline, full as it is of crowned idiocy, hypochondria, and madness, the result of incestuous marriages, or natural weakness The splendid and prosperous Spanish empire under the emperor and his son—its vast conquests, discoveries and foreign wars,—becomes transformed into a bauble for the caprice of favorites, under their successors . Amid its immeasurable wealth, Spain was bankrupt The gold, and silver, and precious stones of the West, emptied themselves into a land the poorest and most debt-laden in Europe, the most spiritually ignorant despite the countless churches, the most notorious for its dissolute nobility, its worthless officials, its ignoble family relations, its horrible moral aberrations pervading all grades of the population; and all in vain The mighty fancy, the enthusiastic loyalty, the fervid faith of the richly endowed Spaniard were not counterbalanced by humbler but more practical virtues,—love of industry, of agriculture, of manufactures. The Castilians hated the doings of citizens and peasants; the taint of the Arab and the Jew was on the profession of money-getting. Thousands left their ploughs and went to the Indies, found places in the police, or bought themselves titles of nobility, which forthwith rendered all work dishonorable. The land grew into a literal infatuation with miracles, relics, cloisters, fraternities, pious foundations of every description. The church was omnipotent. Nobody cultivated the soil. Hundreds of thousands lived in the convents. Begging soup at the monastery gates,—such is a type of the famishing Spain of the 17th century. In economic, political, physical, moral, and intellectual aspects, a decay pervaded the peninsula under the later Habsburgers, such as no civilized nation has ever undergone. The population declined from 10,000,000 under Charles V. (Charles I. of Spain) to 6,000,000 under Charles II. The people had vanished from hundreds of places in New Castile, Old Castile, Toledo, Estremadura, and Andalusia. One might travel miles in the lovely regions of the South, without seeing a solitary cultivated field or dwelling. Seville was almost depopulated. Pecuniary distress at the end of the 17th century reached an unexampled height; the soldiers wandered through the cities begging; nearly all the great fortresses from Barcelona to Cadiz were ruinous; the king's servants ran away because they were neither paid nor fed; more than once there was no money to supply the royal table; the ministers were besieged by high officials and officers seeking to extort their pay long due; couriers charged with communications of the highest importance lingered on the road for lack of means to continue their journey. Finance was reduced to tricks of low deceit and robbery. . . . The idiocy of the system of taxation was unparalleled. Even in 1594 the cortes complained that the merchant, out of every 1,000 ducats capital, had to pay 300 ducats in taxes; that no tenant-farmer could maintain himself, however low his rent might be; and that the taxes exceeded the income of numerous estates Bad as the system was under Philip II, it became worse under his Austrian successors The tax upon the sale of food, for instance, increased from ten to fourteen per cent. Looms were most productive when they were absolutely silent. Almost the entire household arrangements of a Spanish family were the products of foreign industries. In the beginning of the 17th century, five-sixths of the domestic and nine-tenths of the foreign trade were in the hands of aliens. In Castile, alone, there were 160,000 foreigners, who had gained complete possession of the industrial and manufacturing interests. 'We cannot clothe ourselves without them, for we have neither linen nor cloth, we cannot write without them, for we have no paper,' complains a Spaniard. Hence, the enormous masses of gold and silver annually transmitted from the colonies passed through Spain into French, English, Italian, and Dutch pockets Not a real, it is said, of the 35,000,000 of ducats which Spain received from the colonies in 1595, was found in Castile the following year. In this indescribable retrogression, but one interest in any way prospered—the Church. The more agriculture, industry, trade declined, the more exclusively did the Catholic clergy monopolize all economic and intellectual life."—J. A. Harrison, *Spain, ch. 23.*

ALSO IN: R. Watson, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip III*—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain, during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.*

A. D. 1609.—Final expulsion of the Moriscoes.—The resulting ruin of the nation, materially and morally. See MOORS: A. D. 1492-1609.

A. D. 1619—Alliance with the Emperor Ferdinand against Frederick of Bohemia. See GERMANY. A. D. 1618-1620.

A. D. 1621.—Accession of Philip IV.

A. D. 1621.—Renewal of war in the Netherlands.—End of the truce. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633.

A. D. 1624-1626.—Hostile policy of Richelieu.—The Valtelline War in Northern Italy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War with France in Northern Italy over the succession to the duchy of Mantua. See ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1635.—New hostile alliances of France.—Declaration of war. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

A. D. 1635-1636.—The Cardinal Infant in the Netherlands.—His invasion of France. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635-1638.

A. D. 1635-1642.—The war with France and Savoy in Northern Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1635-1659.

A. D. 1637-1640.—The war on the French frontier.—Siege and battle of Fontarabia.—French invasion of Roussillon.—Causes of disaffection in Catalonia.—In 1637, a Spanish army, 12,000 strong, crossed the Pyrenees under the command of the Duke of Medina del Rio-Seco, Admiral of Castile. "He took St Jean-de-Luz without difficulty, and was advancing to the siege of Bayonne, when the old Duke d'Epernon, governor of Guienne, . . . threw himself into it. There was little time for preparations; but the Spanish commander, on being told he would find Bayonne destitute of defence, replied that could not be said of any place which contained the Duke d'Epernon. He accordingly refrained from laying siege to Bayonne; and all his other enterprises having failed from the vigilant activity of Epernon, he abandoned St Jean-de-Luz, with some other posts in its neighbourhood, and the seat of war was speedily transferred from Guienne to Languedoc: Olivarez, in forming his plans against that province, had expected a revolt among its numerous and often rebellious inhabitants. . . . The hopes, however, entertained by Olivarez . . . proved utterly fallacious." The Spanish army, under Serbellone, invested Leucate, the first fortress reached on entering Languedoc from Roussillon, and besieged it for a month; but was attacked at the end of that time by the Duke de Halluin, son of the late Mareschal Schomberg, and driven from its works, with the loss of all its artillery, and 3,000 men. "In the following season [1638] the French, in their turn, attempted the invasion of Spain, but with as little success as the Spaniards had obtained in Guienne or Languedoc. . . . An army, amounting to not less than 15,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry, under the orders of the Prince of Condé, the father of the great Condé, and a devoted retainer of Richelieu, crossed the frontier, took Irun, and laid siege to Fontarabia, which is situated on a peninsula, jutting into the river Bidassoa. A formidable French fleet was, at the same time, stationed on the coast of Guipuscoa, to co-operate with this army," and, after failing in one attack, it succeeded in destroying the Spanish ships sent to the succor of Fontarabia. "Fontarabia being considered as the key to Spain, on the entrance to the kingdom from Bayonne, its natural strength had been greatly improved by fortifications." Its garrison held out stoutly until the arrival of a relieving army of 13,000, led by the Admiral of Castile. Nearly a month elapsed before the latter ventured to attack the besieging force; but when he did, "while the Spaniards lost only 200 men, the French were totally defeated, and precipitately driven forth from their intrenchments. Many of them were killed in the attack, and a still greater number were drowned in attempting to pass the Bidassoa. Those who escaped fled with precipitation to Bayonne. . . . But Spain was hardly relieved from the alarm of the invasion of Navarre when she was threatened with a new danger, on the side of Roussillon. The Prince of Condé . . . was again entrusted with a military expedition against the Spanish frontiers. . . . The small county of Roussillon, which had hitherto belonged to Spain as an appendage of Catalonia, lies on the French side of the higher Pyrenees; but a lower range of mountains, called the Courbieres, branching off from them, and extending within a league of the Mediterranean shore, divides Roussillon from Languedoc. At the extremity of these hills, and about a league from the sea, stood the fortress of Salsas [or Salces], which was considered as the key of Spain on the dangerous side of Roussillon and Catalonia." Salsas was invested by the French, 1639, and taken after a siege of forty days. But Olivarez, the Spanish minister, adopted measures for the recovery of the important fortress, so energetic, so peremptory, and so unmeasured in the exactions they made upon the people of Catalonia, that Salsas was retaken in January, 1640. "The long campaign in the vicinity of Salsas, though it proved ultimately prosperous to the Spanish arms, fostered in the bosom of the kingdom the seeds of rebellion. Those arbitrary measures which Olivarez enjoined to his Generals, may have gained Salsas, but they lost Catalonia. The frequent intercourse which took place between the Catalans and French soldiery, added fuel to those flames nearly ready to burst forth, and, shortly afterwards, excited the fatal insurrection at Barcelona."—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 4.

ALSO IN: T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 17.

A. D. 1639-1700.—War with the piratical Buccaneers. See AMERICA: A. D. 1639-1700.

A. D. 1640.—Revolution in Portugal.—That country resumes its independence. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637-1668.

A. D. 1640-1642.—Revolt of Catalonia and Portugal, with the aid of France.—French conquest of Roussillon.—After their defeat of Condé at Salces, Olivarez ordered the Castilian troops to take up their winter quarters in Catalonia; and, "commanding the Catalonians to raise and equip 6,000 soldiers for the wars of Italy, he assigned them their proportion of the expenses of the state, enjoining the states to raise it, by a decree of the king. Had the Castillian troops remained tranquil and orderly, overawing the Catalonians by their presence and their discipline, without enraging them by their excesses and their insolence, perhaps Olivarez might have carried through his bold design, and annihilated, one by one, the destructive privileges of the various provinces. But, on the contrary, they committed every sort of violence and injustice. . . . The Catalonians, stirred up to vengeance, sought retribution in chance combats, lost their dread of the Castillian troops by frequent contests with them, and were excited almost to frenzy by their violence and rapine. In the mean time, the states of Catalonia refused to obey the royal decree, and sent two deputies to remonstrate with the king and his minister. These messengers

unfortunately executed their commission in an insolent and menacing tone; and Olivarez, of a haughty and inflexible character, caused them instantly to be arrested. These tidings reached Barcelona at the moment when some fresh outrage, committed by the Castillian soldiers, had excited popular indignation to the highest pitch; and a general insurrection was the immediate consequence. The viceroy was slain upon the spot, and a negotiation was instantly entered into with France in order to procure support in rebellion. The courage of Olivarez did not fail even under this fresh misfortune: all the disposable troops in Spain were instantly directed upon Catalonia; and all the other provinces, but more especially Portugal, were ordered to arm for the suppression of the revolt. Turbulent subjects and interested allies are always sure to take advantage of the moment of difficulty. The Portuguese, hating, with even more bitter animosity than the Catalonians, the yoke of Castille, oppressed by Vasconcellos, who ruled them under the vice-queen, duchess of Mantua, and called upon to aid in suppressing an insurrection to which they looked with pleasure and hope, now instantly threw off the rule of Spain. A conspiracy burst forth, which had been preparing under the knowledge and advice of Richelieu for more than three years; and the duke of Braganza, a prince of no great abilities, was proclaimed king. . . . In the mean time the marquis de los Velez had taken the command of the army sent against the Catalonian rebels; and a willing instrument of the minister's vengeance, he exercised the most barbarous cruelties as he marched on into the refractory province. The town of Tortosa was taken and sacked by his soldiers, and the people subjected to every sort of violence. Fire, massacre, and desolation marked his progress; but, instead of inspiring crouching terror, and trembling self-abandonment, his conduct roused up lion-like revenge. Hurrying on the negotiations with France, the Catalonians accepted any terms which Richelieu chose to offer, declared themselves subject to the French crown, and pronounced the authority of Spain at an end for ever in Catalonia. A small corps of French troops was immediately thrown forward from Roussillon, and advanced to Taragona under the command of D'Espenan, a general who had shown great skill and courage at Salces. The Catalonians, with the usual bravado of their nation, had represented their army as a thousandfold stronger, both in numbers and discipline, than it really was; and the French officers were in consequence lamentably disappointed when they saw the militia which was to support them, and still more disappointed when they beheld that militia in face of an enemy. As a last resource against the large Spanish force under Los Velez, D'Espenan threw himself into Taragona, in opposition to the advice of Besançon, who was employed, on the part of France, in organizing the Catalonians. Here he was almost immediately besieged; and, being destitute both of provisions and ammunition, was soon forced to sign a capitulation, whereby he agreed to evacuate the territory of Spain with all the troops which had entered Catalonia from France. This convention he executed, notwithstanding all remonstrances and petitions on the part of the Catalonians; and, retreating at once from Taragona to the French frontier, he abandoned the field to the enemy. Had Olivarez now seized the favourable moment, . . . it is probable — it is more than probable — that Catalonia would at once have been pacified, and that her dangerous privileges would in part have been sacrificed to the desire and necessity of peace. . . . But the count-duke sought revenge as much as advantage. . . . Continued severity only produced a continuance of resistance: the Catalonians sustained themselves till the French forces returned in greater numbers, and with more experienced commanders: the tide of success turned against the Castillians; and Los Velez was recalled to give place to Leganez. . . . In various engagements . . . the Spanish armies were defeated by the French: the Catalonians themselves became better soldiers under the severe discipline of necessity; and though the Spanish fleet defeated the French off Taragona, and saved that city from the enterprises of La Mothe, the general result of the campaign was decidedly unfavourable to Spain. At the same time, the French were making progress in Roussillon; and in the year 1642 the king himself prepared to invade that small territory, with the evident intention of dissevering it from the Spanish crown. Several minor places having been taken, siege was laid to Perpignan: the people of the country were not at all unwilling to pass under the dominion of France; and another serious misfortune threatened the ministry of Olivarez. At this time was concerted the conspiracy of Cinq Mars [see FRANCE: A. D. 1641–1642] . . . and the count-duke eagerly entered into the views of the French malecontents, and promised them every assistance they demanded. The failure of the conspiracy, the arrest and execution of some of the conspirators, and the fall of Perpignan, came rapidly, one upon the other, showing the fortune of Richelieu still triumphing over all the best laid schemes of his adversaries."—G. P. R. James, *Eminent Foreign Statesmen*, v. 2: *Olivares*.

A. D. 1643.—Invasion of France from the Netherlands.—Defeat at Rocroi. See FRANCE: A. D. 1642–1643.

A. D. 1644-1646.—The war in Catalonia.—Sieges of Lerida.—In 1644, Philip IV., "under the prudent and sagacious counsels of Don Louis de Haro, was directing his principal efforts to the recovery of Catalonia. . . . Don Philip de Sylva, an officer of experience and determination, was put at the head of the Castilian troops, and immediately advanced to the siege of the strong town of Lerida, the king himself being nominally in command of the army. The French troops in Catalonia were at that time commanded by La Mothe Houdancourt, who no sooner heard of the advance of the Spanish troops towards Lerida than he marched with great rapidity to the relief of that place;" but approached the enemy with so much carelessness that he was attacked by Sylva and totally defeated, with a loss of 3,000 men and 12 guns. He then, for a diversion, laid siege to Tarragona, and lost 3,000 more of his men, without accomplishing the reduction of the place; being forced, in the end, to retreat to Barcelona, while Lerida was surrendered to the Spaniards. "La Mothe having been recalled and imprisoned, . . . the Count de Harcourt was withdrawn from Savoy, and put at the head of fresh forces, for the purpose of repairing the disasters of the former general." Harcourt began operations (April, 1643)

by laying siege to the strong fortress of Rosas, or Roses, which commanded the principal entrance to Catalonia from Roussillon The fortress surrendered the following month, and "the Count de Harcourt, . after capturing some places of minor import, passed the Segre, encountered the army of Cantelmo in the neighbourhood of Llorens, and, gaining a complete victory, made himself master of Balaguer" After these successes, the Count de Harcourt was called away from Catalonia for a time, to act against the insurgents at Barcelona, but returned in 1646 and undertook the siege of Lerida He was now opposed by the Marquis de Leganez, whom he had successfully encountered in Italy, and whom he was foolishly disposed to regard with contempt While he pressed his siege in careless security, Leganez surprised him, in a night attack, and drove him in utter rout from his lines "This signal disaster caused the Count de Harcourt to be recalled, and in order to recover all that had been lost in Catalonia, the Prince de Condé was appointed to command in that province, while a considerable part of the army of Flanders was ordered to proceed towards the frontiers of Spain to serve once more under his command" But Condé, too, was to pay the penalty for despising his enemy He reopened the siege of Lerida with ostentatious gaiety, marching into the trenches with music of violins, on the 14th of May In little more than a month he marched out again, without music, abandoning the siege, having lost many men and obtained no sign of success —G P R James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV*, *v* 1, *ch* 3

A. D. 1645-1646.—French successes in Flanders.—Loss of Dunkirk. See NETHERLANDS A. D 1645–1646

A. D. 1647-1648.—Campaign against France in the Netherlands.—The defeat at Lens. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES) A D 1647–1648

A. D. 1647-1654.—The revolt of Masaniello at Naples and its termination.—Attempts of the Duke of Guise and the French. See ITALY A. D. 1646–1654.

A. D. 1648.—Conclusion of Peace with the United Provinces. See NETHERLANDS A. D. 1646–1648.

A. D. 1648-1652.—Subjugation of Catalonia.—"During the four years which [in France] had been filled with the troubles of the Fronde, Spain endeavored, and with success, to reconquer the province which had abandoned her In 1650, Mazarin had recognized the peril of Catalonia, and had endeavored to send assistance in war and money. It was possible, however, to do but little. In 1651 the Spanish besieged Barcelona After Marchin's desertion they hoped to capture it at once, but it was defended with the courage and constancy of the Catalonian people. La Mothe Houdancourt was again put in command of the province. He had been unsuccessful there when France was strong, and it could hardly have been expected that he could rescue it when France was weak. He succeeded, however, in forcing his way into Barcelona, and defended the city with as much success as could, perhaps, have been anticipated from the scanty means at his command. The inhabitants endured, with constancy, the danger and want caused by the siege, rather than surrender themselves to Spain. Some French ships sailed for the rescue of the place, but they acquitted themselves with little valor. Provisions were sent into the town, but the commander claimed he was not in condition for a conflict with the Spanish fleet, and he retreated. Endeavors were made, both by the French troops and those of the Catalonians, to raise the siege, but without success In October [1652], after a siege of fifteen months, Barcelona surrendered Roses was captured soon after Leucate was betrayed to Spain by its governor for 40,000 crowns He intended to enlist under Orleans, but learning the king had reëntered Paris, he made his peace, by agreeing to betray no more The Spanish granted an amnesty to the people of Catalonia The whole province fell into their hands, and became again a part of the kingdom of Spain The loss of Catalonia was chiefly due to the turbulence and disloyalty of Condé Had it not been for the groundless rebellion which he excited in the autumn of 1651, and which absorbed the energies of the French armies during the next year, Catalonia might have been saved for France and have remained a part of that kingdom It was a national misfortune that Catalonia was lost This great and important province would have been a valuable accession to France Its brave and hardy population would have become loyal and industrious Frenchmen, and have added to the wealth and power of that kingdom For the Catalonians it was still more unfortunate that their lot should thus have been determined They were not closely related to the people of Aragon or Castile They were now left to share in the slow decay of the Spanish kingdom, instead of having an opportunity for development in intelligence and prosperity as members of a great and progressive nation"—J B Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, *ch* 15 (*v* 2)

A. D. 1650-1651.—Alliance with the New Fronde in France.—Defeat at Rethel. See FRANCE A D 1650–1651

A. D. 1652.—Campaign on the Flemish frontier.—Invasion of France.—Recovery of Gravelines and Dunkirk. See FRANCE A D 1652

A. D. 1657-1658.—War with England in alliance with France.—Loss of Dunkirk and Gravelines. See FRANCE A D 1655–1658, and ENGLAND A D 1655–1658

A. D. 1659.—The Treaty of the Pyrenees.—Territorial cessions to France.—Marriage of the Infanta to Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A D 1659–1661

A. D. 1665.—Accession of Charles II.

A. D. 1667.—Conquests of Louis XIV. in the Netherlands.—The War of the Queen's Rights. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES) A D 1667

A. D. 1668.—Towns in Flanders ceded to Louis XIV.—Triple alliance and the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D 1668.

A. D. 1668.—Peace with Portugal.—Recognition of its independence. See PORTUGAL. A. D. 1667–1668.

A. D. 1673-1679.—The War of the Coalition to resist Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672–1674, and 1674–1678; also, NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1690-1696.—The War of the League of Augsburg or the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV. See FRANCE A D. 1689–1690, to 1695–1696

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick.—French conquests restored. See FRANCE A D 1697

A. D. 1698-1700.—The question of the Succession.—The Treaties of Partition.—The will of Charles II.—As the 17th century approached its close, the king of Spain, Charles II , was near ing the grave "His days had been few and evil. He had been unfortunate in all his wars, in every part of his internal administration, and in all his domestic relations He was child less, and his constitution was so completely shattered that, at little more than thirty years of age, he had given up all hopes of posterity His mind was even more distempered than his body . His sufferings were aggravated by the thought that his own dissolution might not improbably be followed by the dissolution of his empire. Several princes laid claim to the succession The King's eldest sister had married Lewis XIV The Dauphin would, therefore, in the common course of inheritance, have succeeded to the crown But the Infanta had, at the time of her espousals, solemnly renounced, in her own name, and in that of her posterity, all claim to the succession [see FRANCE A D 1659–1661] This renunciation had been confirmed in due form by the Cortes A younger sister of the King had been the first wife of Leopold, Emperor of Germany She too had at her marriage renounced her claims to the Spanish crown, but the Cortes had not sanctioned the renunciation, and it was therefore considered as invalid by the Spanish jurists The fruit of this marriage was a daughter, who had espoused the Elector of Bavaria. The Electoral Prince of Bavaria inherited her claim to the throne of Spain The Emperor Leopold was son of a daughter of Philip III , and was therefore first cousin to Charles No renunciation whatever had been exacted from his mother at the time of her marriage. The question was certainly very complicated. That claim which, according to the ordinary rules of inheritance, was the strongest, had been barred by a contract executed in the most binding form The claim of the Electoral Prince of Bavaria was weaker But so also was the contract which bound him not to prosecute his claim. The only party against whom no instrument of renunciation could be produced was the party who, in respect of blood, had the weakest claim of all. As it was clear that great alarm would be excited throughout Europe if either the Emperor or the Dauphin should become King of Spain, each of those Princes offered to waive his pretensions in favour of his second son; the Emperor in favour of the Archduke Charles, the Dauphin in favour of Philip, Duke of Anjou. Soon after the Peace of Ryswick, William III. and Lewis XIV determined to settle the question of the succession without consulting either Charles or the Emperor. France, England, and Holland, became parties to a treaty [called the First Partition Treaty] by which it was stipulated that the Electoral Prince of Bavaria should succeed to Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands. The Imperial family were to be bought off with the Milanese, and the Dauphin was to have the Two Sicilies. The great object of the King of Spain and of all his counsellors was to avert the dismemberment of the monarchy. In the hope of attaining this end, Charles determined to name a successor. A will was accordingly framed by which the crown was bequeathed to the Bavarian Prince Unhappily, this will had scarcely been signed when the Prince died. The question was again unsettled, and presented greater difficulties than before A new Treaty of Partition was concluded between France, England, and Holland It was agreed that Spain, the Indies, and the Netherlands, should descend to the Archduke Charles In return for this great concession made by the Bourbons to a rival house, it was agreed that France should have the Milanese, or an equivalent in a more commodious situation The equivalent in view was the province of Lorraine. Arbuthnot, some years later, ridiculed the Partition Treaty with exquisite humour and ingenuity Everybody must remember his description of the paroxysm of rage into which poor old Lord Strutt fell, on hearing that his runaway servant, Nick Frog, his clothier, John Bull, and his old enemy, Lewis Baboon, had come with quadrants, poles, and inkhorns, to survey his estate, and to draw his will for him When the intelligence of the second Partition Treaty arrived at Madrid, it roused to momentary energy the languishing ruler of a languishing state The Spanish ambassador at the court of London was directed to remonstrate with the government of William, and his remonstrances were so insolent that he was commanded to leave England Charles retaliated by dismissing the English and Dutch ambassadors The French King, though the chief author of the Partition Treaty, succeeded in turning the whole wrath of Charles and of the Spanish people from himself, and in directing it against the two maritime powers Those powers had now no agent at Madrid Their perfidious ally was at liberty to carry on his intrigues unchecked, and he fully availed himself of this advantage" He availed himself of the advantage so successfully, in fact, that when the Spanish king died, November 3, 1700, he was found to have left a will, bequeathing the whole Spanish monarchy to Philip, Duke of Anjou, second son of the Dauphin of France "Lewis acted as the English ministers might have guessed that he would act With scarcely the show of hesitation, he broke through all the obligations of the Partition Treaty, and accepted for his grandson the splendid legacy of Charles. The new sovereign hastened to take possession of his dominions"—Lord Macaulay, *Mahon's War of the Succession* (*Essays*)

ALSO IN H Martin, *Hist of France · Age of Louis XIV* (*tr. by M L Booth*), *v.* 2, *ch.* 4.—J W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht*, *ch.* 6–10.—J Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain*, 1621–1700, *v* 2, *ch.* 9—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain*, *v* 1, *introd*, *sect.* 3.

A. D. 1700.—Accession of Philip V.

A. D. 1701-1702.—The Bourbon succession, and the European League against it.—"Louis XIV having . . . resolved to accede to the will, Philip of Anjou was proclaimed King by the Spaniards, and made his solemn entry into Madrid on the 14th of April 1701. Most of the European powers, such as the States of Italy, Sweden, England, Holland, and the kingdoms of the North, acknowledged Philip V.; the King of

Portugal and the Duke of Savoy even concluded treaties of alliance with him Moreover, the situation of political affairs in Germany, Hungary, and the North was such that it would have been easy for Louis XIV, with prudent management, to preserve the Spanish crown on the head of his grandson, but he seemed, as if on purpose, to do everything to raise all Europe against him It was alleged that he aimed at the chimerical project of universal monarchy, and the reunion of France with Spain Instead of trying to do away this supposition, he gave it additional force, by issuing letters-patent in favour of Philip, at the moment when he was departing for Spain, to the effect of preserving his rights to the throne of France The Dutch dreaded nothing so much as to see the French making encroachments on the Spanish Netherlands, which they regarded as their natural barrier against France, the preservation of which appeared to be equally interesting to England It would have been prudent in Louis XIV to give these maritime powers some security on this point, who, since the elevation of William, Prince of Orange, to the crown of Great Britain, held as it were in their hands the balance of Europe. Without being swayed by this consideration, he obtained authority from the Council of Madrid to introduce a French army into the Spanish Netherlands, and on this occasion the Dutch troops, who were quartered in various places of the Netherlands, according to a stipulation with the late King of Spain, were disarmed *This circumstance became a powerful* motive for King William to rouse the States-General against France He found some difficulty, however, in drawing over the British Parliament to his views, as a great majority in that House were averse to mingle in the quarrels of the Continent, but the death of James II altered the minds and inclinations of the English Louis XIV having formally acknowledged the son of that prince as King of Great Britain, the English Parliament had no longer any hesitation in joining the Dutch and the other enemies of France. A new and powerful league [the Second Grand Alliance] was formed against Louis. The Emperor, England, the United Provinces, the Empire, the Kings of Portugal and Prussia, and the Duke of Savoy, all joined it in succession. The allies engaged to restore to Austria the Spanish Netherlands, the duchy of Milan, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, with the ports of Tuscany; and never to permit the union of France with Spain."—C. W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period* 7.

ALSO IN: Lord Macaulay, *Hist of Eng*, *ch.* 25 (*v.* 5).—J. H. Burton, *Hist of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch.* 5 (*v.* 1).—W Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough, ch* 9 (*v.* 1).—The same, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 1-7.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1701-1702.

A. D. 1702.—The War of the Succession: Cadiz defended.—The treasure fleet lost in Vigo Bay.—The first approach to Spain of the War of the Succession—already raging for months in Northern Italy and the Spanish Netherlands—was in the form of an expedition against Cadiz, undertaken in the autumn of 1702 by the English and Dutch. "King William was the first to plan this expedition against Cadiz and after his decease the project was resumed. But had King William lived he would certainly not have selected as chief the Duke of Ormond, a princely nobleman, endowed with many amiable qualities, but destitute of the skill and the energy which a great enterprise requires. Under him Sir Henry Bellasys commanded the English and General Spaar a contingent of Dutch troops, amounting together to 14,000 men. Admiral Sir George Rooke had the direction of the fleet. Their proceedings have been related at full length in another history [Lord Mahon's (Earl Stanhope's) 'War of the Succession in Spain']—how the troops were set on shore near Cadiz in the first days of September—how even before they landed angry dissensions had sprung up between the Dutch and the English, the landsmen and the seamen—and how these dissensions which Ormond wanted the energy to control proved fatal to the enterprise No discipline was kept, no spirit was displayed Week after week was lost.

Finally at the close of the month it was discovered that nothing could be done, and a council of war decided that the troops should reembark On their return, and off the coast of Portugal, an opportunity arose to recover in some part their lost fame The Spanish galleons from America, laden with treasure and making their yearly voyage at this time, were bound by their laws of trade to unload at Cadiz, but in apprehension of the English fleet they had put into Vigo Bay. There Ormond determined to pursue them On the 22nd of October he neared that narrow inlet which winds amidst the high Gallician mountains The Spaniards, assisted *by some French frigates, which were the escort* of the galleons, had expected an attack and made the best preparations in their power They durst not disembark the treasure without an express order from Madrid—and what order from Madrid ever yet came in due time?—but they had called the neighbouring peasantry to arms; they had manned their forts, they had anchored their ships in line within the harbour, and they had drawn a heavy boom across its mouth None of these means availed them The English seamen broke through the boom, Ormond at the head of 2,000 soldiers scaled the forts; and the ships were all either taken or destroyed. The greater part of the treasure was thrown overboard by direction of the French and Spanish chiefs; but there remained enough to yield a large amount of booty to the victors."—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of Queen Anne, ch* 2.

ALSO IN: Col. A. Parnell, *War of the Succession in Spain, ch.* 3-4.—For the campaigns of the War of the Succession in other quarters see ITALY: A. D. 1701-1713; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704, and after; GERMANY: A. D. 1702, and after.

A. D. 1703-1704.—The War of the Succession: Charles III. claims the kingdom.—The English take Gibraltar.—"The Admiral of Castile, alienated from the cause of Philip V. by having been dismissed from his office of Master of the Horse, had retired into Portugal; and he succeeded in persuading King Pedro II. to accede to the Grand Alliance, who was enticed by the promise of the American provinces between the Rio de la Plata and Brazil, as well as a part of Estremadura and Galicia (May 9th). Pedro also entered into a perpetual defensive league with Great Britain and the States-General. In the following December, Paul Methuen, the English minister at Lisbon, concluded the celebrated commercial treaty between England and

Portugal named after himself [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1703]. It is the most laconic treaty on record, containing only two Articles, to the effect that Portugal was to admit British cloths, and England to admit Portuguese wines, at one-third less duty than those of France. Don Pedro's accession to the Grand Alliance entirely changed the plans of the allies Instead of confining themselves to the procuring of a reasonable indemnity for the Emperor, they now resolved to drive Philip V from the throne of Spain, and to place an Austrian Archduke upon it in his stead The Emperor and his eldest son Joseph formally renounced their claims to the throne of Spain in favour of the archduke Charles, Leopold's second son, September 12th [1703], and the Archduke was proclaimed King of Spain, with the title of Charles III The new King was to proceed into Portugal, and, with the assistance of Don Pedro, endeavour to obtain possession of Spain Charles accordingly proceeded to Holland, and embarked for England in January 1704, whence, after paying a visit to Queen Anne at Windsor, he finally set sail for Lisbon, February 17th In March 1704, the Pretender, Charles III., together with an English and Dutch army of 12,000 men, landed in Portugal, with the intention of entering Spain on that side, but so far were they from accomplishing this plan that the Spaniards, on the contrary, under the Duke of Berwick, penetrated into Portugal, and even threatened Lisbon, but were driven back by the Marquis das Minas An English fleet under Admiral Rooke, with troops under the Prince of Darmstadt, made an ineffectual attempt on Barcelona, but were compensated for their failure by the capture of Gibraltar on their return The importance of this fortress, the key of the Mediterranean, was not then sufficiently esteemed, and its garrison had been neglected by the Spanish Government A party of English sailors, taking advantage of a Saint's day, on which the eastern portion of the fortress had been left unguarded, scaled the almost inaccessible precipice, whilst at the same time another party stormed the South Mole Head The capture of this important fortress was the work of a few hours (August 4th) Darmstadt would have claimed the place for King Charles III., but Rooke took possession of it in the name of the Queen of England . The Spaniards, sensible of the importance of Gibraltar, speedily made an effort to recover that fortress, and as early as October 1704, it was invested by the Marquis of Villadarias with an army of 8,000 men. The French Court afterwards sent Marshal Tessé to supersede Villadarias, and the siege continued till April 1705; but the brave defence of the Prince of Darmstadt, and the defeat of the French blockading squadron under Pointis by Admiral Leake, finally compelled the raising of the siege."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk. 5, ch. 6 (v. 3)*

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne, ch. 9 (v. 2).*—F. Sayer, *Hist. of Gibraltar, ch. 6-8.*

A. D. 1704.—The War of the Succession: Blenheim. See GERMANY: A. D. 1704.

A. D. 1705.—The War of the Succession: The capture of Barcelona.—"As if to exhibit, upon a different theatre of the same great warfare, the most remarkable contrast to the patience, the caution, and the foresight of Marlborough, . . . Charles Mordaunt, earl of Peterborough, took the command of an expedition to Spain. Macaulay calls Peterborough 'the most extraordinary character of that age, the king of Sweden himself not excepted, . . . a polite, learned and amorous Charles XII' He sailed from Portsmouth in June, 1705, having the command of 5,000 men; unlimited authority over the land forces, and a divided command with sir Cloudesley Shovel at sea. At Lisbon, Peterborough was reinforced, and he here took on board the arch-duke Charles, and a numerous suite At Gibraltar he received two veteran battalions, in exchange for the same number of recruits which he had brought from England The prince of Darmstadt also here joined Peterborough The prince and the arch-duke desired to besiege Barcelona. Peterborough opposed the scheme of attempting, with 7,000 men, the reduction of a place which required 30,000 men for a regular siege With the squadron under sir Cloudesley Shovel, the fleet sailed from Gibraltar A landing was effected near Valencia; and here the people were found favourable to the cause of the Austrian prince, who was proclaimed, upon the surrender of the castle of Denia, as Charles III., king of Spain and the Indies Peterborough, encouraged by this reception, conceived the enterprise of dashing upon the capital, whilst all the Spanish forces were on the frontiers of Portugal, or in Catalonia; and king Philip was at Madrid with few troops Such an exploit had every chance of success, but Peterborough was overruled by a council of war. The troops were landed before Barcelona on the 27th of August In three weeks there was nothing but dissensions amongst the great men of this expedition The prince of Darmstadt and the earl of Peterborough had come to an open rupture The Dutch officers said their troops should not join in an enterprise so manifestly impossible of success for a small force. Peterborough conceived a plan of attack totally opposed to all the routine modes of warfare. The citadel of Montjouich, built on the summit of a ridge of hills skirting the sea, commanded the town Peterborough gave notice that he should raise the siege, sent his heavy artillery on board the ships; and made every preparation for embarking the troops. With 1,200 foot soldiers, and 200 horse, he marched out of the camp on the evening of the 13th of September, accompanied by the prince of Darmstadt, whom he had invited to join him. They marched all night by the side of the mountains; and before daybreak were under the hill of Montjouich, and close to the outer works. Peterborough told his officers that when they were discovered at daylight, the enemy would descend into the outer ditch to repel them, and that then was the time to receive their fire, leap in upon them, drive them into the outer works, and gain the fortress by following them close. The scheme succeeded, and the English were soon masters of the bastion. . . . The citadel held out for several days, but was finally reduced by a bombardment from the hills, the cannon having been relanded from the ships. The reduction of Montjouich by this extraordinary act of daring, was very soon followed by the surrender of Barcelona. . . . The possession of Barcelona, in which king Charles III. was proclaimed with great solemnity, was followed by the adhesion to his cause of the chief towns

of Catalonia. Peterborough was for following up his wonderful success by other daring operations. The German ministers and the Dutch officers opposed all his projects" He was able, notwithstanding, to raise the siege of San Mateo and to save Valencia from a threatened siege. "It was soon found that king Charles was incompetent to follow up the successes which Peterborough had accomplished for him"—C Knight, *Crown Hist of Eng, ch* 38—The above is substantially, in brief, the account of Peterborough's campaigns given by Mahon, Macaulay, and most of the later historians of the War of the Succession, who drew the narrative largely from a little book published in 1728, called the "Military Memoirs of Captain George Carleton." The story has been recently told, however, in a very different way and to a very different effect, by Colonel Arthur Parnell, who declines to accept the Carleton Memoirs as authentic history. Those Memoirs have been judged by some critics, indeed, to be a pure work of fiction and attributed to De Foe. They are included, in fact, in several editions of De Foe's works Colonel Parnell, who seems to have investigated the matter thoroughly, recognizes Captain Carleton as a real personality, and concludes that he may have furnished some kind of a note-book or diary that was the substratum of these alleged Memoirs, but that somebody (he suspects Dean Swift), in the interest of Peterborough, built up on that groundwork a fabric of fiction which has most wrongfully become accepted history. According to Colonel Parnell, it was not Peterborough, but Prince George of Hesse Darmstadt (killed in the assault on Montjouich) and De Ruvigny, Earl of Galway, who were entitled to the credit of the successes for which Peterborough has been laurelled. "In order to extol a contemptible impostor, the memory of this great Huguenot general [Ruvigny] has been aspersed by Lord Macaulay and most English writers of the present century."—Col. A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, pref; ch* 12–18, *and app C.*

Also in: E Warburton, *Memoir of Peterborough, ch.* 7–11 (*v* 1)—F. S. Russell, *The Earl of Peterborough, v.* 1, *ch.* 7–9.

A. D 1706.—The War of the Succession: Rapid changing of kings and courts at Madrid.—"The Courts of Madrid and Versailles, exasperated and alarmed by the fall of Barcelona, and by the revolt of the surrounding country, determined to make a great effort. A large army, nominally commanded by Philip, but really under the orders of Marshal Tessé, entered Catalonia. A fleet under the Count of Toulouse, one of the natural children of Lewis XIV., appeared before the port of Barcelona The city was attacked at once by sea and land. The person of the Archduke was in considerable danger. Peterborough, at the head of about 3,000 men, marched with great rapidity from Valencia. To give battle, with so small a force, to a great regular army under the conduct of a Marshal of France, would have been madness. . . . His commission from the British government gave him supreme power, not only over the army, but, whenever he should be actually on board, over the navy also. He put out to sea at night in an open boat, without communicating his design to any person. He was picked up, several leagues from the shore, by one of the ships of the English squadron. As soon as he was on board, he announced himself as first in command, and sent a pinnace with his orders to the Admiral. Had these orders been given a few hours earlier, it is probable that the whole French fleet would have been taken. As it was, the Count of Toulouse put out to sea The port was open The town was relieved On the following night the enemy raised the siege and retreated to Roussillon Peterborough returned to Valencia, a place which he preferred to every other in Spain; and Philip, who had been some weeks absent from his wife, could endure the misery of separation no longer, and flew to rejoin her at Madrid. At Madrid, however, it was impossible for him or for her to remain The splendid success which Peterborough had obtained on the eastern coast of the Peninsula had inspired the sluggish Galway with emulation He advanced into the heart of Spain Berwick retreated Alcantara, Ciuadad Rodrigo, and Salamanca fell, and the conquerors marched towards the capital Philip was earnestly pressed by his advisers to remove the seat of government to Burgos . . In the mean time the invaders had entered Madrid in triumph, and had proclaimed the Archduke in the streets of the imperial city Arragon, ever jealous of the Castilian ascendency, followed the example of Catalonia Saragossa revolted without seeing an enemy The governor whom Philip had set over Carthagena betrayed his trust, and surrendered to the Allies the best arsenal and the last ships which Spain possessed . It seemed that the struggle had terminated in favour of the Archduke, and that nothing remained for Philip but a prompt flight into the dominions of his grandfather So judged those who were ignorant of the character and habits of the Spanish people. There is no country in Europe which it is so easy to overrun as Spain, there is no country in Europe which it is more difficult to conquer. Nothing can be more contemptible than the regular military resistance which Spain offers to an invader, nothing more formidable than the energy which she puts forth when her regular military resistance has been beaten down Her armies have long borne too much resemblance to mobs, but her mobs have had, in an unusual degree, the spirit of armies. . Castile, Leon, Andalusia, Estremadura, rose at once; every peasant procured a firelock or a pike; the Allies were masters only of the ground on which they trod. No soldier could wander a hundred yards from the main body of the invading army without imminent risk of being poinarded, the country through which the conquerors had passed to Madrid, and which, as they thought, they had subdued, was all in arms behind them. Their communications with Portugal were cut off In the mean time, money began, for the first time, to flow rapidly into the treasury of the fugitive king. . . . While the Castilians were everywhere arming in the cause of Philip, the Allies were serving that cause as effectually by their mismanagement. Galway staid at Madrid, where his soldiers indulged in such boundless licentiousness that one half of them were in the hospitals. Charles remained dawdling in Catalonia. Peterborough had taken Requena, and wished to march from Valencia towards Madrid, and to effect a junction with Galway; but the Archduke refused his consent to the plan. The indignant general remained accordingly in his favourite city, on the beauti-

ful shores of the Mediterranean, reading Don Quixote, giving balls and suppers, trying in vain to get some good sport out of the Valencian bulls, and making love, not in vain, to the Valencian women At length the Archduke advanced into Castile, and ordered Peterborough to join him But it was too late Berwick had already compelled Galway to evacuate Madrid and, when the whole force of the Allies was collected at Quadalaxara, it was found to be decidedly inferior in numbers to that of the enemy Peterborough formed a plan for regaining possession of the capital His plan was rejected by Charles The patience of the sensitive and vain glorious hero was worn out He had none of that serenity of temper which enabled Marlborough to act in perfect harmony with Eugene, and to endure the vexatious interference of the Dutch deputies. He demanded permission to leave the army, Permission was readily granted, and he set out for Italy From that moment to the end of the campaign, the tide of fortune ran strong against the Austrian cause Berwick had placed his army between the Allies and the frontiers of Portugal They retreated on Valencia, and arrived in that province, leaving about 10,000 prisoners in the hands of the enemy '— Lord Macaulay, *Mahon's War of the Succession* (*Essays*) —In the Netherlands the Allies won the important victory of Ramillies, and in Italy, Prince Eugene inflicted a sore defeat on the French and rescued Turin —See NETHERLANDS A D 1706-1707, and ITALY A D 1701-1713

ALSO IN C T Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch* 5-6 —W Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch* 14 (v 1)

A. D. 1707.—The War of the Succession: The fortunes of the Bourbons retrieved at Almanza.—"The enemy [the Allies] began to move again in February After some weeks of manœuvring on the confines of the kingdom of Valencia and of New Castile, April 25 Galway and Las Minas, wishing to anticipate the arrival of a reinforcement expected from France, attacked Berwick at Almanza Singularly enough, the English were commanded by a French refugee (Ruvigni, Earl of Galway) and the French by a royal bastard of England [the Duke of Berwick, natural son of James II] The enemy numbered, it is said, 26,000 foot and 7,000 horse the Franco Castilians were somewhat inferior in infantry, somewhat superior in cavalry and artillery " The battle, decided by the cavalry, was disastrous to the Allies. "The English, Dutch and Portuguese infantry were cut to pieces the Portuguese foot showed a courage less fortunate, but not less intrepid, than the Spanish cavalry Another corps had fought with still greater fury, —the French refugees, commanded by Jean Cavalier, the renowned Camisard chieftain They had engaged a French regiment, and the two corps had almost destroyed each other. Six battalions were surrounded and taken in a body Thirteen other battalions, five English, five Dutch, and three Portuguese, retired, at evening, to a wooded hill; seeing themselves cut off from the mountains of Valencia, they surrendered themselves prisoners the next morning. Hochstadt [Blenheim] was fully avenged. Five thousand dead, nearly 10,000 prisoners, 24 cannon, 120 flags or standards, were purchased on the part of the conquerors by the loss of only about 2,000 men. Many Frenchmen, taken at Hochstadt or at Ramillies, and enrolled by force in the ranks of the enemies, were delivered by the victory The Duke of Orleans reached the army the next day. . . He marched with Berwick on Valencia, which surrendered, May 8, without striking a blow. The generals of the enemies, both wounded, retired with the wrecks of their armies towards the mouths of the Ebro. The whole kingdom of Valencia submitted, with the exception of three or four places Berwick followed the enemy towards the mouth of the Ebro, whilst Orleans returned to meet a French corps that was coming by the way of Navarre, and with this corps entered Aragon. Nearly all Aragon yielded without resistance Berwick joined Orleans by ascending the Ebro; they moved together on the Segre and began the blockade of Lerida, the bulwark of Catalonia." Lerida was taken by storm on the 12th of October, and "pillaged with immense booty . . The castle of Lerida surrendered, November 11. A great part of the Catalan mountaineers laid down their arms Fortune had favored the Franco-Castilians on the Portuguese frontier as in the States of Aragon, Ciudad-Rodrigo had been taken by assault, October 4, with the loss of more than 3,000 men on the side of the enemy. The news of Almanza had everywhere reanimated the hearts of the French armies."—H. Martin, *Hist of France: Age of Louis XIV* (*tr. by M L Booth*), *v* 2, *ch* 5

ALSO IN Col A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, ch* 23-26 —C T Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch* 7

A. D. 1707-1710.—The War of the Succession: Bourbon reverses and final triumph.—"In less than a month after the victory of Almanza, the Bourbon troops had recovered all Arragon, with Valencia and Murcia, excepting the ports of Denia and Alicant, but the war still continued in Catalonia, where General Stanhope now filled the double office of ambassador to Charles and general of the English forces, and prince Staremberg was sent by the emperor Joseph to take the command of the Austrian troops The Spanish government was reduced to still greater pecuniary distress than it had suffered before, by the success of the English squadron off Carthagena, under the command of Sir Charles Wager, which took three of the great galleons and dispersed fourteen, which were expected to furnish an unusual supply of the precious metals from America After a short siege of Port Mahon, General Stanhope took possession of Minorca and Majorca [A. D 1708]; the count of Cifuentes gained Sardinia; and all the efforts, spirit, and talents of the duke of Orleans were insufficient to make the slightest impression in Catalonia He consequently complained, in his letters to Versailles, that his operations were thwarted or retarded by the intrigues of the Princess Orsini and the ambassador Amelot. He was accused in return, and that not without reason, of forming designs on the crown of Spain, and corresponding with the enemies of Philip on the subject. The fortunes of France and Spain still continued to decline, and Louis felt that peace was the only measure which could stop the progress of that ruin which menaced the house of Bourbon. Conferences were accordingly opened at the Hague, and Louis pretended that he was willing to give up the interest of Philip; at the same time his

grandson himself protested that he would never quit Spain, or yield his title to its crown. . . . The disastrous campaign of 1710 rendered Louis more desirous than ever of obtaining peace, and though his professions of abandoning his grandson were insincere, he certainly would not have scrupled to sacrifice the Spanish Netherlands and the American commerce to Holland, as the price of an advantageous peace to France. Meantime the Austrians had gained the victories of Almenara and Zaragoza, and had once more driven the Spanish court from Madrid. This time it fled to Valladolid, and the king and queen talked of taking refuge in America, and re-establishing the empire of Mexico or Peru, rather than abandon their throne. But the Castilians once more roused themselves to defend the king; the duke of Vendome's arrival supplied their greatest want, that of a skilful general; and the imprudence of the allies facilitated the recovery of the capital. The disasters of the allies began with their retreat; Staremburg, after a doubtful though bloody battle [Villa Viciosa, December 10, 1710], at the end of which he was victor, was yet obliged to retire with the disadvantages of defeat; and Stanhope, with a small body of English, after a desperate resistance [at Brihuega, December 9, 1710], was taken prisoner."—M. Callcott, *Short Hist. of Spain, ch.* 22 (*v.* 2).—"As the result of the actions at Brihuega and Villa Viciosa and the subsequent retreat, the Austrians lost 3,600 killed or wounded, and 3,936 prisoners, or a total of 7,536 men; whilst the Bourbon casualties were 6,700 placed hors-de-combat, and 100 captured, or in all 6,800 men. These operations constituted a decisive victory for Vendôme, who thus, in less than four months after the battle of Saragossa, had re-established King Philip and the Bourbon cause."—Col. A. Parnell, *The War of the Succession in Spain, ch.* 27–34.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch.* 15–18 (*v.* 1–2).—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of the War of Succession in Spain, ch.* 6–8.

A. D. 1711.—The Austrian claimant of the throne becomes Emperor. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1711.

A. D. 1713-1714.—The betrayal of the Catalans.—"Alone among the Spaniards the Catalans had real reason to regret the peace. They had clung to the cause of Charles with a desperate fidelity, and the Peace of Utrecht rang the death-knell of provincial liberties to which they were passionately attached. From the beginning of 1705 they had been the steady and faithful allies of England; they had again and again done eminent service in her cause; they had again and again received from her ministers and generals the most solemn assurances that they would never be abandoned. When England first opened a separate negotiation for peace she might easily have secured the Catalonian liberties by making their recognition an indispensable preliminary of peace; but, instead of this, the English ministers began by recognising the title of Philip, and contented themselves with a simple prayer that a general amnesty might be granted. When the convention was signed for the evacuation of Catalonia by the Imperial troops, the question of the provincial liberties was referred to the definite peace, the Queen and the French King promising at that time to interpose their good offices to secure them. The Emperor, who was bound to the Catalans by the strongest ties of gratitude and honour, could have easily obtained a guarantee of their fueros at the price of an acknowledgment of the title of Philip; but he was too proud and too selfish for such a sacrifice. The English, it is true, repeatedly urged the Spanish King to guarantee these privileges, . . . but these were mere representations, supported by no action, and were therefore peremptorily refused. The English peace with Spain contained a clause granting the Catalans a general armistice, and also a promise that they should be placed in the same position as the Castilians, which gave them the right of holding employments and carrying on a direct trade with the West Indies, but it made no mention of their provincial privileges. The Peace of Rastadt was equally silent, for the dignity of the Emperor would not suffer him to enter into any negotiations with Philip. The unhappy people, abandoned by those whom they had so faithfully served, refused to accept the position offered them by treaty, and, much to the indignation of the English Government, they still continued in arms, struggling with a desperate courage against overwhelming odds. The King of Spain then called upon the Queen, as a guarantee of the treaty of evacuation, 'to order a squadron of her ships to reduce his subjects to their obedience, and thereby complete the tranquillity of Spain and of the Mediterranean commerce.' A fleet was actually despatched, which would probably have been employed against Barcelona, but for an urgent address of the House of Lords, and the whole moral weight of England was thrown into the scale against the insurgents. The conduct of the French was more decided. Though the French King had engaged himself with the Queen by the treaty of evacuation to use his good offices in the most effectual manner in favour of the Catalan liberties, he now sent an army to hasten the capture of Barcelona. The blockade of that noble city lasted for more than a year. The insurgents hung up over the high altar the Queen's solemn declaration to protect them. They continued the hopeless struggle till 14,000 bombs had been thrown into the city; till a great part of it had been reduced to ashes; till seven breaches had been made; till 10,000 of the besieging army had been killed or wounded; and till famine had been added to the horrors of war. At last, on September 11, 1714, Barcelona was taken by storm. A frightful massacre took place in the streets. Many of the inhabitants were afterwards imprisoned or transported, and the old privileges of Catalonia were finally abolished. Such was the last scene of this disastrous war."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th century, ch.* 1 (*v.* 1).

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, *ch.* 3 (*v.* 1).—C. T. Wilson, *The Duke of Berwick, ch.* 21.

A. D. 1713-1725.—Continued war with the Emperor.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance.—The Peace of Vienna.—The Alliance of Hanover.—"The treaty of Utrecht, although it had tranquillized a great part of Europe, was nevertheless defective, in as far as it had not reconciled the Emperor and the King of Spain, the two principal claimants to the Spanish succession. The Emperor Charles VI. did not recognize Philip V. in his quality of

King of Spain; and Philip, in his turn [instigated by his queen, Elizabeth Farnese—see ITALY, A. D. 1715–1735] refused to acquiesce in those partitions of the Spanish monarchy which the treaty of Utrecht had stipulated in favour of the Emperor. To defeat the projects and secret intrigues of the Spanish minister [Cardinal Alberoni], the Duke of Orleans [Regent of France], thought of courting an alliance with England, as being the power most particularly interested in maintaining the treaty of Utrecht, the fundamental articles of which had been dictated by herself That alliance, into which the United Provinces also entered, was concluded at the Hague (January 4th, 1717) Cardinal Alberoni, without being in the least disconcerted by the Triple Alliance, persisted in his design of recommencing the war No sooner had he recruited the Spanish forces, and equipped an expedition, than he attacked Sardinia [1717], which he took from the Emperor This conquest was followed by that of Sicily, which the Spaniards took from the Duke of Savoy (1718) France and England, indignant at the infraction of a treaty which they regarded as their own work, immediately concluded with the Emperor, at London (August 2nd, 1718) the famous Quadruple Alliance, which contained the plan of a treaty of peace, to be made between the Emperor, the King of Spain, and the Duke of Savoy. The allied powers engaged to obtain the consent of the parties interested in this proposal, and, in case of refusal, to compel them by force of arms The Emperor was to renounce his right to the Spanish crown, and to acknowledge Philip V as the legitimate King of Spain, in consideration of that prince renouncing the provinces of Italy and the Netherlands, which the treaty of Utrecht and the quadruple alliance adjudged to the Emperor. The Duke of Savoy was to cede Sicily to Austria, receiving Sardinia in exchange, which the King of Spain was to disclaim. The right of reversion to the crown of Spain was transferred from Sicily to Sardinia. That treaty likewise granted to Don Carlos, eldest son of Philip V, by his second marriage, the eventual reversion and investiture of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, as well as the grand duchy of Tuscany, on condition of holding them as fiefs-male of the Emperor and the Empire after the decease of the last male issue of the families of Farnese and Medici, who were then in possession. . . . The Duke of Savoy did not hesitate to subscribe the conditions of the quadruple alliance; but it was otherwise with the King of Spain, who persisted in his refusal; when France and England declared war against him. The French invaded the provinces of Guipuscoa and Catalonia [under Berwick, A. D. 1719], while the English seized Gallicia and the port of Vigo. These vigorous proceedings shook the resolutions of the King of Spain. He signed the quadruple alliance, and banished the Cardinal Alberoni from his court, the adviser of those measures of which the allies complained. The Spanish troops then evacuated Sicily and Sardinia, when the Emperor took possession of the former and Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, of the latter. The war to all appearance was at an end." But fresh difficulties arose, one following another. The reversion of Tuscany, Parma, and Placentia, promised to the Infant of Spain, was stoutly opposed in Italy. The Emperor provoked commercial jealousies in England and Holland by chartering a Company of Ostend (1723) with exclusive privileges of trading to the East and West Indies and the coasts of Africa. An attempted congress at Cambrai was long retarded and finally broken up. Meantime the French court gave mortal offense to the King of Spain by sending home his daughter, who had been the intended bride of the young King Louis XV., and marrying the latter to a Polish princess. The final result was to draw the Emperor and the King of Spain—the two original enemies in the embroilment—together, and a treaty between them was concluded at Vienna, April 30, 1725. "This treaty renewed the renunciation of Philip V. to the provinces of Italy and the Netherlands, as well as that of the Emperor to Spain and the Indies. The eventual investiture of the duchies of Parma and Placentia, and that of the grand duchy of Tuscany, were also confirmed The only new clause contained in the treaty was that by which the King of Spain undertook to guarantee the famous Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VI., which secured to the daughter of that prince the succession of all his estates It was chiefly on this account that Philip V became reconciled to the court of Vienna The peace of Vienna was accompanied by a defensive alliance between the Emperor and the King of Spain" The terms of the alliance were such as to alarm England for the security of her hold on Gibraltar and Minorca, and Holland for her commerce, besides giving uneasiness to France By the action of the latter, a league was set on foot "capable of counteracting that of Vienna, which was concluded at Herrenhausen, near Hanover, (September 3, 1725) and is known by the name of the Alliance of Hanover All Europe was divided between these two alliances"—C W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period* 8.

ALSO IN Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng*, 1713–1783, *v* 1, *ch* 7–10—G. P. R. James, *Eminent Foreign Statesmen, v* 4: *Alberoni*—W COXE, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch* 22–30—E Armstrong, *Elisabeth Farnese, "The Termagant of Spain," ch* 2–10.

A. D. 1714.—The Peace of Utrecht. See UTRECHT A. D 1712–1714; and SLAVERY, NEGRO A D 1698–1776

A. D. 1725–1740.—The Austrian Succession.—Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA A. D. 1718–1738, and 1740.

A. D. 1726–1731.—Fresh quarrels with England.—Siege of Gibraltar.—Treaty of Seville.—Second Treaty of Vienna.—Acquisition of the Italian Duchies.—"All Europe became divided between the alliances of Vienna and Hanover, and though both sides pretended that these treaties were only defensive, yet each made extensive preparations for war. George I. entered into a treaty with the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel for the supply of 12,000 men, manifests were published, ambassadors withdrawn, armies put on foot; the sea was covered with English fleets; an English squadron under Admiral Hosier annoyed the trade of Spain; and in Feb. 1727, the Spaniards laid siege to Gibraltar, and seized at Vera Cruz a richly laden merchant vessel belonging to the English South Sea Company. But all these vast preparations led to no results of importance. Of all the European Powers, Spain alone had any real desire for war. . . . The pre-

liminaries of a general pacification were signed at Paris, May 31st 1727, by the ministers of the Emperor, France, Great Britain, and Holland, and a Congress was appointed to assemble at Aix-la-Chapelle to arrange a definitive peace But Spain still held aloof and sought every opportunity to temporise The hopes of Philip being again awakened by the death of George I in July 1727, he renewed his intrigues with the Jacobites, and instigated the Pretender to proceed to a port in the Low Countries, and to seize an opportunity to pass over into England But these unfounded expectations were soon dispelled by the quiet accession of George II to the throne and policy of his father . . The Spanish Queen [Elizabeth Farnese], however, still held out, till, alarmed by the dangerous state of Philip's health, whose death might frustrate her favourite scheme of obtaining the Italian duchies, and leave her a mere cypher without any political influence, she induced her husband to accept the preliminaries by the Act of the Pardo, March 6th 1728. A congress was now opened at Soissons, to which place it had been transferred for the convenience of Fleury [French minister], who was bishop of that diocese But though little remained to be arranged except the satisfaction of Spain in the matter of the Italian duchies, the negociations were tedious and protracted." In the end they "became a mere farce, and the various plenipotentiaries gradually withdrew from the Congress Meanwhile the birth of a Dauphin (Sept 4th 1729) having dissipated the hopes of Philip V and his Queen as to the French succession, Elizabeth devoted herself all the more warmly to the prosecution of her Italian schemes, and finding all her efforts to separate France and England unavailing, she at length determined to accept what they offered . . . She persuaded Philip to enter into a separate treaty with France and England, which was concluded at Seville, Nov 9th 1729 England and Spain arranged their commercial and other differences; the succession of Don Carlos to the Italian duchies was guaranteed, and it was agreed that Leghorn, Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza should be garrisoned by 6,000 Spaniards, who, however, were not to interfere with the civil government. Nothing more was said about Gibraltar. Philip, indeed, seemed now to have abandoned all hope of recovering that fortress; for he soon afterwards caused to be constructed across the isthmus the strong lines of San Roque, and thus completely isolated Gibraltar from his Spanish dominions. The Dutch acceded to the Treaty of Seville shortly after its execution, on the understanding that they should receive entire satisfaction respecting the India Company established by the Emperor at Ostend. Charles VI. was indignant at being thus treated by Spain. . . . On the death of Antonio Farnese, Duke of Parma, January 10th 1731, he took military possession of that state. . . . The versatility of the cabinets of that age, however, enabled the Emperor to attain his favourite object at a moment when he least expected it. The Queen of Spain, wearied with the slowness of Cardinal Fleury in carrying out the provisions of the Treaty of Seville, suddenly declared, in a fit of passion, that Spain was no longer bound by that treaty (January 1731). Great Britain and the Dutch States, in concert with the Spanish Court, without the concurrence of France, now entered into negociations with the Emperor, which were skilfully conducted by Lord Waldegrave, to induce him to accede to the Treaty of Seville; and, on March 16th 1731, was concluded what has been called the Second Treaty of Vienna. Great Britain and the States guaranteed the Pragmatic Sanction; and the Emperor, on his side, acceded to the provisions of Seville respecting the Italian duchies, and agreed to annihilate the commerce of the Austrian Netherlands with the Indies by abolishing the obnoxious Ostend Company He also engaged not to bestow his daughter on a Bourbon prince, or in any other way that might endanger the balance of power in Europe . . In the following November an English squadron disembarked at Leghorn 6,000 Spaniards, who took possession of that place, as well as Porto Ferrajo, Parma, and Piacenza, in the name of Don Carlos, as Duke of Parma and presumptive heir of Tuscany."—T H. Dyer, *Hist of Modern Europe, bk 6, ch 1 (v 3)*

Also in Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng*, 1713–1783, *ch* 14–15 (*v* 2) — W. Coxe, *Hist of the House of Austria, ch* 88 (*v* 3) —W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, ch* 36–40 (*v* 3) — E Armstrong, *Elizabeth Farnese, "The Termagant of Spain," ch* 11–14.

A. D. 1733.— The First Bourbon Family Compact (France and Spain). See France. A D 1733

A. D. 1734-1735.— Acquisition of Naples and Sicily, as a kingdom for Don Carlos. See France A D 1733–1735

A. D. 1739.— Outbreak of hostilities with England.— The War of Jenkins' Ear. See England A D 1739–1741

A. D. 1740. — Unsuccessful attack of the English on Florida. See Georgia A. D 1738–1743

A. D. 1740-1741.—Beginning of the War of the Austrian Succession. See Austria. A. D 1740–1741

A. D. 1741-1747.—The War of the Austrian Succession: Operations in Italy. See Italy. A. D 1741–1743, to 1746–1747

A. D. 1743.—The Second Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.— Arrangements concerning Italy. See France A D 1743 (October).

A. D. 1746.—Accession of Ferdinand VI.

A. D. 1748.—Termination and results of the War of the Austrian Succession. See Aix-la-Chapelle, The Congress.

A. D. 1759.—Accession of Charles III.

A. D. 1761-1762.—The Third Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.—England declares War. See France: A D. 1761 (August).

A. D. 1762-1763.—Havana lost and recovered. See Cuba: A. D. 1514–1851.

A. D. 1763.—End and results of the Seven Years War.—Florida ceded to Great Britain. —Louisiana acquired from France. See Seven Years War: The Treaties.

A. D. 1766-1769.—Occupation of Louisiana. —The revolt of New Orleans and its suppression. See Louisiana: A. D. 1766–1768; and 1769.

A. D. 1767.—Suppression of the order of the Jesuits. See Jesuits: A. D. 1761–1769.

A. D. 1779-1781.— Reconquest of West Florida. See Florida: A. D. 1779–1781.

A. D. 1779-1782.— The unsuccessful siege of Gibraltar. See England: A. D. 1779–1783.

A. D. 1782.—Aims and interests in the settlement of peace between Great Britain and the United States.—Attempts of Vergennes to satisfy Spain at American expense. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1782 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER)

A. D. 1783-1800.—The question of Florida boundaries and of the navigation of the Mississippi, in dispute with the United States. See FLORIDA A D 1783–1787 and LOUISIANA A D 1785–1800

A. D. 1788-1808.—Accession of Charles IV. —The Queen, Marie Louise, and Manuel Godoy.—Corruption and degradation of the Court — Causes of French contempt. — Charles III had just died when the French Revolution commenced He was the best sovereign that Spain had had in a long time he left good ministers Aranda, Campomanès Florida Blanca but it was not given to them to continue his work This reparative reign was followed by one the most disintegrating Spain elevated anew for an instant by an intelligent prince, was in a few years, under the government of an imbecile one to founder in an ignoble intrigue The web of this latter was begun immediately upon the accession of the new king Charles IV was forty years old corpulent and weak minded simple and choleric incapable of believing evil because he was incapable of conceiving it amorous chaste devout and consequently the slave of his wife even more than of his temperament, the first years of his marriage blinded him for his entire life Scrupulous to the point of separating himself from the queen when he no longer hoped to have children by her he took refuge in the chase, manual labor violent exercise caring only for the table music and bull fights, exhausted when he had followed his trade of king for half an hour Small and without beauty dark of complexion but with some grace with elegance and above all carriage Marie Louise of Parma was at once superstitious and passionate, ignorant uneasy with a very frivolous soul as a foundation with obstinacy without firmness, with artifice without intelligence, with intrigue leading to no result more covetousness than ambition, much emptiness of mind, still more of heart Her husband seemed to her coarse and brutish, she despised him She detested her eldest son and cared moderately for her other children She was thirty four years old, of perturbed imagination of uneasy senses, without any curb of religion or virtue, when she ascended the throne and the fortune of Godoy threw him in her way He was a small provincial gentleman, for lack of something better, he had entered the life guards at seventeen. He was then twenty one He was very handsome, with a grave beauty frequent in the men of the south, which gives to youth that air of restrained and imperious passion, to mature age that impenetrable and imposing exterior so well calculated to conceal mediocrity of mind, barrenness of heart, despotic selfishness, and all the artifices of a corruption the more insinuating because it seems to be unaware of itself The queen fell in love with him, and abandoned herself wildly; he took advantage of it without shame. She was not satisfied to make of Godoy her lover, she desired to make a great man of him, a minister, to make him a partner in her power. She introduced him to the court and into the intimacy of the royal household, where Charles IV tractably became infatuated with him Marie Louise had at first some circumspection in the gradation of the honors which she lavished upon him, and which marked, by so many scandals, the progress of her passion, but she was very soon entirely possessed by it Godoy obtained over her an ascendancy equal to that which she arrogated to herself over Charles IV Thus on the eve of the French Revolution, these three persons, so strangely associated, began, in court costume, and under the austere decorum of the palace of Philip II, that comedy as old as vice and stupidity, of the compliant husband duped by his wife and of the old mistress exploited by her lover. At the beginning of the reign, Charles IV from scruple, the queen from hypocrisy, Godoy from policy, became devout The queen wished power for Godoy, and Godoy wished it for lucre It was necessary to set aside the old counsellors of Charles III They were philosophers the nation had remained catholic Marie Louise and Godoy relied on the old Spanish fanaticism. The ministers very soon lost influence, and after having secluded them for some time, the queen disgraced them A complete reaction took place in Spain The church regained its empire, the Inquisition was re-established It would appear then that the Revolution must necessarily have found Spain hostile a Bourbon king and a devout government could but detest it But before being a Bourbon the king was a husband, and Marie Louise was devout only to mask her intrigues The same passions led her to desire by turns war to make her lover illustrious and peace to render him popular This debilitated and corrupt court found itself given over in advance to all the suggestions of fear, to all the temptations of avidity Those who had to treat with it did not fail to profit by its feebleness to dominate it We see it successively linked to England, then to France treat the Revolution with consideration condemn it with violence, combat it without vigor seek an alliance with the Directory and abandon itself to Napoleon who annihilated it France found at Madrid only too much docility to her designs the illusions that she conceived from it became more fatal for her than were for Spain the incapacity and turpitude of its rulers The French were led by the habits and traditions of the 'ancien régime' to treat the Spaniards as a subordinate nation consigned to the rôle of auxiliary Holding the court of Spain as cowardly and venal, the politicians of Paris neglected to take account of the Spanish people They judged them to be divisible and governable at mercy It was not that they despised them nor that they intended to reduce them to servitude as a conquered people but they thought that the last Austrian kings had enervated and enfeebled them, that they had been uplifted from this decadence only by the Bourbons, that that dynasty was degenerating in its turn, that another foreign government, more intelligent, more enlightened, more resolute alone could take up again the work of reparation and bring it to a successful result by means of rigorous treatment and appropriate applications What Louis XIV. had undertaken solely in the interest of despotism, France, herself regenerated by the Revolution, had the right and the power to accomplish, for the highest

good of Spain and of humanity These calculations in which the essential element, that is to say the Spanish character, was suppressed, deceived the Convention, led the Directory astray, and ended by drawing Napoleon into the most fatal of his enterprises '—A Sorel, *L'Europe et la Revolution française* (*trans from the French*), *pt* 1, *pp* 373–377

A. D. 1791-1793. The Coalition of European Powers against revolutionary France. —Interest of the Spanish Bourbons.—Treaty of Aranjuez with Great Britain. See FRANCE A D 1790–1791, 1791 (JULY—SEPTEMBER), and 1793 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER)

A. D. 1793.—Successes on the French frontier. See FRANCE A D 1793 (JULY—DECEMBER) PROGRESS OF THE WAR

A. D. 1794.—French successes in the Pyrenees. See FRANCE A D 1794–1795 (OCTOBER—MAY)

A. D. 1795.—Peace and alliance with the French Republic.—Cession of Spanish San Domingo. See FRANCE A D 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER)

A. D. 1797.—Naval defeat by the English off Cape St. Vincent. See ENGLAND A D 1797

A. D. 1797.—Cession of western part of Hayti, or San Domingo, to France. See HAYTI A D 1632–1803

A. D. 1801.—Re-cession of Louisiana to France. See LOUISIANA A D 1798–1803

A. D. 1802.—The Peace of Amiens —Recovery of Minorca and Port Mahon. See FRANCE A. D 1801–1802.

A. D. 1805.—The naval defeat at Trafalgar. See FRANCE. A D 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER)

A. D. 1807-1808.—Napoleon's plots for the theft of the Spanish crown.—The popular rising.—Accession of Ferdinand VII.—"For more than ten years Spain had been drawn in the wake of revolutionary France To Napoleon from the beginning of his reign she had been as subservient as Holland or Switzerland, she had made war and peace at his bidding, had surrendered Trinidad to make the treaty of Amiens had given her fleet to destruction at Trafalgar In other states equally subservient, such as Holland and the Italian Republic, Napoleon had remodelled the government at his pleasure, and in the end had put his own family at the head of it After Tilsit he thought himself strong enough to make a similar change in Spain, and the occupation of Portugal seemed to afford the opportunity of doing this. By two conventions signed at Fontainebleau on October 27 [see PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807], the partition of Portugal was arranged with Spain. The Prince of the Peace was to become a sovereign prince of the Algarves, the King of Spain was to have Brazil with the title of Emperor of the two Americas, &c.; but the main provision was that a French army was to stand on the threshold of Spain ready to resist any intervention of England. The occupation of Portugal took place soon after, Junot arriving at Lisbon on November 30, just as the royal family with a following of several thousands set sail for Brazil under protection of the English fleet. At the same time there commenced in defiance of all treaties, a passage of French troops into Spain, which continued until 80,000 had arrived, and had taken quiet possession of a number of Spanish fortresses. At last Murat was appointed to the command of the army of Spain. He entered the country on March 1, 1808, and marched on Madrid, calculating that the king would retire and take refuge at Seville or Cadiz. This act revealed to the world, and even to a large party among the French themselves, the nature of the power which had been created at Tilsit The lawless acts of Napoleon's earlier life were palliated by the name of the French Revolution, and since Brumaire he had established a character for comparative moderation. But here was naked violence without the excuse of fanaticism, and on what a scale! One of the greater states of Europe was in the hands of a burglar, who would moreover, if successful, become king not only of Spain but of a boundless empire in the New World The sequel was worse even than this commencement, although the course which events took seems to show that by means of a little delay he might have attained his end without such open defiance of law The administration of Spain had long been in the contemptible hands of Manuel Godoy, supposed to be the queen's lover, yet at the same time high in the favor of King Charles IV Ferdinand, the heir apparent, headed an opposition, but in character he was not better than the trio he opposed, and he had lately been put under arrest on suspicion of designs upon his father's life To have fomented this opposition without taking either side, and to have rendered both sides equally contemptible to the Spanish people, was Napoleon's game The Spanish people, who profoundly admired him, might then have been induced to ask him for a king Napoleon, however, perpetrated his crime before the scandal of the palace broke out The march of Murat now brought it to a head On March 17 a tumult broke out at Aranjuez, which led to the fall of the favourite, and then to the abdication of the king, and the proclamation of Ferdinand amid universal truly Spanish enthusiasm It was a fatal mistake to have forced on this popular explosion, and Napoleon has characteristically tried to conceal it by a supposititious letter, dated March 29, in which he tries to throw the blame upon Murat, to whom the letter professes to be addressed It warns Murat against rousing Spanish patriotism and creating an opposition of the nobles and clergy, which will lead to a 'levée en masse,' and to a war without end. It predicts, in short, all that took place, but it has every mark of invention, and was certainly never received by Murat. The reign of Ferdinand having thus begun, all that the French could do was to abstain from acknowledging him, and to encourage Charles to withdraw his abdication as given under duress. By this means it became doubtful who was king of Spain, and Napoleon, having carefully refrained from taking a side now presented himself as arbiter. Ferdinand was induced to betake himself to Napoleon's presence at Bayonne, where he arrived on April 21; his father and mother followed on the 30th Violent scenes took place between father and son news arrived of an insurrection at Madrid and of the stern suppression of it by Murat. In the end Napoleon succeeded in extorting the abdication both of Charles and Ferdinand. It was learned too late that the insurrection of Spain had not really been suppressed. This crime, as clumsy as it was monstrous, brought on that great popu-

lar insurrection of Europe against the universal monarchy, which has profoundly modified all subsequent history, and makes the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution an event of the same order as the French Revolution. A rising unparalleled for its suddenness and sublime spontaneousness took place throughout Spain and speedily found a response in Germany. A new impulse was given, out of which grew the great nationality movement of the nineteenth century." —J. R. Seeley, *Short Hist. of Napoleon I., ch.* 5, *sect.* 1.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1800–1815, *ch* 52 (*v.* 11).—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch.* 2–5 (*v.* 1).—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon, v.* 8, *ch.* 32.—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon, v.* 3, *ch.* 4 *and* 6–8.

A. D. 1808 (May—September).—The stolen crown conferred on Joseph Bonaparte.—National revolt.—Organization of Juntas and planning of guerilla war.—French reverses.—Quick flight of Joseph Bonaparte from Madrid.—Arrival of English forces to aid the people.—"Murat was disappointed of the crown of Spain, on which he had fixed his hopes. It had been refused with surprise and indignation by Napoleon's brother Louis, who wore reluctantly even that of Holland, but was unwilling to exchange it for a still deeper royal servitude. Joseph Bonaparte, however, consented to abandon his more tranquil throne of Naples for the dangers and discontents which surrounded that of Spain. Napoleon, who had nominated him to it June 6th, was desirous of procuring at least the apparent consent of the Spanish nation. The Council of Castile, the chief political body of Spain, when informed of the Treaties of Bayonne, was at last induced to give a cold and reluctant assent to the accession of Joseph. Its example was followed by the Supreme Junta and the municipality of Madrid. There was, indeed, no alternative but war. Ferdinand displayed on the occasion all the baseness of his soul in its true colours. He not only wrote to Napoleon to express his satisfaction at the elevation of Joseph, he even addressed a letter of congratulation to the man who had usurped his crown! thus testifying under his own hand his utter unworthiness to wear it. A Junta of 150 Spanish notables, which had been summoned to Bayonne, accepted a constitution proposed by Napoleon, July 7th, and a day or two after Joseph left Bayonne for Madrid. He had signed on the 5th a treaty with his brother Napoleon, by which he renounced the crown of Naples, made, as King of Spain, a perpetual offensive alliance with France, fixed the number of troops and ships to be provided by each nation, and agreed to the establishment of a commercial system. By an act called Constitutional Statute, July 15th, the vacant throne of Naples was bestowed upon Joachim Murat. Ferdinand had found means to despatch from Bayonne a proclamation addressed to the Asturians, and dated May 8th, in which he called upon them to assert their independence and never to submit to the perfidious enemy who had deprived him of his rights. This letter naturally made a great impression on a proud and sensitive people; nor was its effect diminished by another proclamation which Ferdinand and his brothers were compelled to sign at Bordeaux, May 12th, calling upon the Spaniards not to oppose 'the beneficent views' of Napoleon. At this last address, evidently extorted from a prisoner, a general cry of indignation arose in Spain; the people everywhere flew to arms, except where prevented by the presence of French troops. The city of Valencia renounced its obedience to the Government of Madrid, May 23rd; Seville followed its example, and on the 27th, Joseph Palafox organised at Saragossa the insurrection of Aragon. As these insurrections were accompanied with frightful massacres, principally of persons who had held high civil or military posts under Charles IV., the better classes, to put an end to these horrible scenes, established central Juntas in the principal towns. . . . They proposed not to meet the enemy in pitched battles in the open field, but to harass, wear out, and overcome him by 'guerilla,' or the discursive and incessant attacks of separate small bands. The Supreme Junta issued instructions for conducting this mode of warfare. Andalusia was better fitted for organising the revolt, if such it can be called, than any other province of Spain. Its population formed one-fifth of the whole nation, it possessed the sole cannon-foundry in the kingdom, it contained half the disposable Spanish army, and it could receive assistance from the English both by means of Gibraltar and of Collingwood's fleet that was cruising on the coast. One of the first feats of arms of the Spaniards was to compel the surrender of five French ships of the line and a frigate, which had remained in the port of Cadiz ever since the battle of Trafalgar (June 14th). Marshal Moncey was repulsed towards the end of June in an advance upon Valencia, and compelled to retreat upon Madrid with a loss of one-third of his men. In the north-west the Spaniards were less fortunate. Cuesta, with a corps of 25,000 men, was defeated by Marshal Bessières, July 14th, at Medina del Rio Seco. The consequence of this victory was the temporary submission of Leon, Palencia, Valladolid, Zamora, and Salamanca to the French. But this misfortune was more than counterbalanced by the victory of General Castaños over the French in Andalusia, a few days after. Generals Dupont and Vedel had advanced into that province as far as Cordova, but they were defeated by Castaños with the army of Andalusia at Baylen, July 20th. On this occasion, the commencement of the French reverses in Spain, 18,000 French soldiers laid down their arms. Joseph Bonaparte found it prudent to leave Madrid, August 1st, which he had only entered on the day of the battle, and fly to Burgos. This important victory not only inspired the Spaniards with confidence, but also caused them to be regarded in Europe as a substantive Power. On the day after the battle Castaños issued a proclamation which does him great honour. He invoked the Spaniards to show humanity towards the French prisoners of war, and threatened to shoot those who should maltreat them. Such, however, was the exasperation of the people against their invaders, that numbers of the French were massacred on their route to Cadiz for embarkation, and the remainder were treated with barbarous inhumanity. These cruelties had, however, been provoked by the atrocities of the French at the capture and sack of Cordova. The campaign in Aragon was still more glorious for the Spaniards. Palafox, whether or not he was the poltroon described by Napier, had at all events the merit of organising, out of almost

nothing, the means by which the French were repulsed in several desperate assaults upon Saragossa, and at length compelled to retreat after a siege of some weeks (August 14th). The patriot cause was soon after strengthened by the arrival at Corunna of General La Romana, with 7 000 of his men from Denmark (Sept. 20th) Keats, the English admiral in the Baltic, had informed him of the rising of his countrymen and provided him the means to transport his troops from Nyborg The English Government, soon after the breaking out of the insurrection, had proclaimed a peace with the Spanish nation (July 4th 1808), and had prepared to assist them in their heroic struggle The example of Spain had also encouraged the Portuguese to throw off the insufferable yoke of the French A Junta was established at Oporto, June 6th, and an insurrection was organised in all parts of the kingdom where the French forces were not predominant Sir Arthur Wellesley, with about 10,000 British troops landed at Mondego Bay, July 31st "—T H Dyer, *Hist of Modern Europe, bk 7, ch* 14 (*v* 4)

ALSO IN T Hamilton *Annals of the Peninsular Campaigns, v* 1, *ch* 4–10 —Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon, ch* 12 (*v* 2) —Gen Foy, *Hist of the War in the Peninsula, v* 2, *pt* 1 —Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs, ch* 23–28

A. D. 1808 (September—December).—Napoleon's overwhelming campaign against the Spanish armies.—Joseph reinstated at Madrid.—"The French disasters in the Peninsula shook the belief in Napoleon's invincibility which had prevailed throughout the Continent, and the Emperor saw that he must crush the Spaniards at once, before the English could advance from the fortified base they had acquired on the flank of the Spanish plains To secure his power on the side of Germany, he had a prolonged interview with the Czar at Erfurt

. On the 14th October the two Emperors parted, and at the end of the month Napoleon set out from Paris for Bayonne, and continued his journey to Vitoria In September the French had evacuated Tudela and Burgos, and had been driven from Bilbao by General Joachim Blake [a Spanish officer of Irish descent] But such vast reinforcements had been poured across the Pyrenees, that the French armies in Spain now numbered 250,000 men, and of these 180,000 were drawn up behind the Ebro On the last day of October Lefevre re took Bilbao; and Blake, after a defeat at Tornosa, fell back upon Espinosa, where Napoleon, upon his arrival, directed Marshal Victor . . . and Lefevre to assail him with 40,000 men The Spaniards, though numbering only 25,000, held their ground till the morning of the second day's fighting (11th November). With one part of the fugitives Blake made a stand at Reynosa on the 13th against Marshal Soult, who had achieved a victory over Belvedere at Burgos on the 10th; but they were again broken, and fled to the mountains of the Cantabrian chain. With the other part of the fugitives, about 10,000, the Marquis of La Romana made his way into Leon. Castaños and Palafox had a united force of 48,000 men and 40 guns; but they were wrangling over their plans when Marshal Lannes, the intrepid Duke of Montebello, . . . appeared with 35,000 men, and broke their centre at Tudela. But on the Spanish left, the troops who had conquered at Baylen not only maintained their ground with obstinacy, but drove back the French At length they were outnumbered, and Castaños fell back in admirable order upon Madrid through Calatayud. The right, under Palafox, retired in disorder to Saragossa; and now the road to Madrid was blocked only by General San Juan with 12,000 men, who had entrenched the Somo Sierra Pass. But this post also was carried on the 30th November by the Polish lancers of the Imperial Guard, who rode up and speared the artillerymen at their guns. Aranjuez was at once abandoned by the central Junta, and on the 2nd December the French vanguard appeared on the heights north of Madrid The capital became at once a scene of tumult and confusion barricades were erected, and the bells sounded the alarm, but no discipline was visible in the assembling bands, and when the heights of the Retiro, overlooking the city, were carried by the French on the morning of the 3rd December, the authorities sent out to arrange a surrender On the following morning the French entered the city, Joseph was again installed in the palace, where deputations waited upon him to congratulate him and renew their professions of devoted attachment, and the city settled down once more to tranquil submission to the foreigner "—H R Clinton, *The War in the Peninsula, ch* 3

ALSO IN Gen Vane (Marquis of Londonderry), *Story of the Peninsular War, ch* 8

A. D. 1808-1809 (August—January).—Wellington's first campaign —Convention of Cintra.—Evacuation of Portugal by the French. —Napoleon in the field.—Sir John Moore's advance into Spain.—His retreat.—His repulse of Soult at Corunna.—His death.— "Sir Arthur Wellesley's division comprised 9,000 men Another corps, under sir John Moore, which had just arrived from the Baltic, numbered 11,000 men. These two detachments were to co operate But their united efforts were to be directed by sir Hew Dalrymple and sir Harry Burrard, two generals whose exploits were better known in the private records of the Horse Guards than in the annals of their country . . Sir Arthur Wellesley landed his troops at Figuiera, a difficult task on an iron coast On the 7th of August, major general Spencer's corps joined the army With 10,000 British and 5,000 Portuguese, sir Arthur Wellesley then prepared to march towards Lisbon On the 17th he defeated at Roliça the French under Laborde On the 20th he was at Vimiero, having been joined by general Anstruther and general Acland with their corps. He had now an army of 17,000 men. Junot had joined Laborde and Loison at Torres Vedras, and their united force was about 14,000 men, of whom 1,600 were cavalry Early in the morning of the 21st, the French attacked the British in their position. Sir Harry Burrard had arrived on the night of the 20th, but did not land. The principal attack on the British was on the centre and left; the sea being in their rear. The attack was repulsed. Kellermann then attacked with the French reserve, and he also was driven back. Junot's left wing and centre were discomfited. The road of Torres Vedras, the shortest road to Lisbon, was uncovered. When the action was nearly over, sir Harry Burrard had landed. In a private letter, sir Arthur Wellesley wrote, "The French got a terrible beating on the 21st. They

did not lose less, I believe, than 4,000 men, and they would have been entirely destroyed, if sir H. Burrard had not prevented me from pursuing them. Indeed, since the arrival of the great generals, we appear to have been palsied, and everything has gone on wrong.' Sir John Moore arrived with his corps on the 21st, and his troops were nearly all landed when hostilities were suspended by the Convention of Cintra for the evacuation of Portugal by the French. Sir Arthur writes to Lord Castlereagh, 'Although my name is affixed to this instrument, I beg that you will not believe that I negotiated it, that I approve of it, or that I had any hand in wording it' On the 5th of September, he writes, 'It is quite impossible for me to continue any longer with this army; and I wish, therefore, that you would allow me to return home and resume the duties of my office.' Dalrymple, Burrard, and Welles ley were all recalled home Sir John Moore remained at Lisbon, having been appointed to command the army. A Court of Inquiry was ordered on the subject of 'the late transactions in Portugal.' Wellesley had to bear much before the publicity of these proceedings was to set him right in public opinion The Inquiry ended in a formal disapprobation of the armis tice and convention on the part of the king being communicated to sir Hew Dalrymple. Neither of the two 'great generals' was again employed One advantage was gained by the Convention The Russian fleet in the Tagus was delivered up to the British. Sir John Moore, late in October, began his march into Spain, 'to co operate,' as his instructions set forth, 'with the Spanish armies in the expulsion of the French' He was to lead the British forces in Portugal, and to be joined by sir David Baird, with 10,000 men to be landed at Corunna. Instead of finding Spanish armies to co operate with, he learned that the French had routed and dispersed them Napoleon had himself come to command his troops, and had arrived at Bayonne on the 3rd of November. Moore was separated from Baird by a wide tract of country. He had been led by false information to divide his own army. He remained for some time at Salamanca, inactive and uncertain. Madrid was soon in the hands of the French. Moore made a forward movement against the advanced corps of Soult, and then, learning that the French armies were gathering all around him, he determined to retreat. Sir David Baird had previously joined him. Moore had abandoned all hopes of defending Portugal, and had directed his march towards Corunna. He commenced his retreat from Sahagun on the evening of the 24th of December. During this retreat, the retiring army constantly turned upon the pursuers, always defeating them, and on one occasion capturing general Lefebvre. The winter had set in with terrible severity; the sufferings of the troops were excessive; disorganization, the common consequence of a retreat, added to their danger. Moore saved his army from destruction by an overwhelming force when he carried it across the Eala, effectually destroying the bridge by which they passed the swollen stream. But Moore could not save his men from their own excesses, which made enemies of the inhabitants of every place through which they passed. At Lugo, on the 7th of January, 1809, the British general halted his exhausted troops, determined to give battle to Soult, to whom Napoleon had given up the pursuit of the English army, having received despatches which indicated that war with Austria was close at hand. Soult declined the conflict; and on the British marched to Corunna. On the 11th, when they had ascended the heights from which Corunna was visible, there were no transports in the bay. The troops met with a kind reception in the town; and their general applied himself to make his position as strong as possible, to resist the enemy that was approaching. On the evening of the 14th the transports arrived. The sick and wounded were got on board; and a great part of the artillery. Fourteen thousand British remained to fight, if their embarkation were molested. The battle of Corunna began at two o'clock on the 16th of January Soult had 20,000 veterans, with numerous field-guns; and he had planted a formidable battery on the rocks, commanding the valley and the lower ridge of hills. Columns of French infantry descended from the higher ridge, and there was soon a close trial of strength between the combatants. From the lower ridge Moore beheld the 42nd and 50th driving the enemy before them through the village of Elvina. He sent a battalion of the guards to support them, but through a misconception the 42nd retired. Moore immediately dashed into the fight; exclaimed 'Forty-second, remember Egypt,' and sent them back to the village The British held their ground or drove off their assailants; and victory was certain under the skilful direction of the heroic commander, when he was dashed to the earth by a shot from the rock battery. Sir David Baird, the second in command, had also fallen. Moore was carried into Corunna; and endured several hours of extreme torture before he yielded up his great spirit. The command had devolved upon general Hope, who thought that his first duty was now to embark the troops . . When the sufferers in Moore's campaign came home the hospitals were filled with wounded and sick; and some of the troops brought back a pestilential fever."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist of Eng., ch.* 57 (*abridgment of ch.* 28, *v* 7, *of Popular Hist. of Eng.*).

Also in: Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 2-4 (*v.* 1).—J. M. Wilson, *Memoirs of the Duke of Wellington, v.* 1, *ch.* 13-16.—*Dispatches of the Duke of Wellington, v.* 4.—G. R. Gleig, *General Sir John Moore* (*Eminent British Military Commanders, v.* 3).—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon, ch.* 18 (*v.* 2).—Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs, v.* 2, *pt.* 2, *ch.* 2-3.—Gen. Foy, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 2, *pt.* 2.

A. D. 1808-1809 (December—March).—The siege of Saragossa.—"When Moore was pursued by Napoleon, the Duke of Infantado, who had rallied 30,000 men in New Castile after the fall of Madrid, formed the Quixotic design of re-taking the capital. Marshal Victor, Duke of Belluno, utterly crushed his force at Ucles on the 13th January, 1809, where 1,500 Spaniards were slain, and 9,000 men and all the stores and artillery were taken. The French, in retaliation for the Spaniards having hanged some soldiers who had been captured, murdered many of the prisoners in cold blood, and perpetrated infamous atrocities on the inhabitants of Ucles. The Spaniards, however, showed their extraordinary valour behind walls in their second defence of

Saragossa, the siege of which [abandoned the previous August, after a fierce struggle] was renewed by 35,000 French under Marshals Moncey and Mortier, on the 20th December, 1808. The city was defended by Palafox, who had retired into it after his defeat at Tudela. The second siege of this renowned city — though the defence eventually proved unsuccessful — crowns with everlasting glory the Spanish War of Independence 'The citizens gave up their goods, their houses, and their bodies to the war, and, mingling with the peasants and soldiers, formed one mighty garrison suited to the vast fortress they had formed For doors and windows were built up, house fronts loopholed, internal communications opened, streets trenched and crossed by earthen ramparts mounted with cannon, and every strong building was a separate fortification there was no weak point — there could be none in a city which was all fortress, where the space covered by houses was the measure of the ramparts' (Napier) All the trees outside the walls were cut down, the houses destroyed, and the materials carried into the town The public magazines were provisioned for six months, and all the conventual communities and the inhabitants had large private stores Nearly 3,000 artillerymen and sappers, and 30,000 men of the regular army, had taken refuge in the city, and at least 20 000 citizens and fugitive peasants were fit for arms The popular leaders had recourse to all the aid which superstition could give them denunciations of the wrath of Heaven were hurled on those who were suspected of wavering, and the clergy readily recounted stories of miracles to encourage the faithful Saragossa was 'believed to be invincible through the protection of Our Lady of the Pillar, who had chosen it for the seat of her peculiar worship

An appearance in the sky, which at other times might have passed unremembered, and perhaps unnoticed, had given strong confirmation to the popular faith About a month before the commencement of the first siege, a white cloud appeared at noon, and gradually assumed the form of a palm-tree, the sky being in all other parts clear, except that a few specks of fleecy cloud hovered about the larger one It was first observed over the church of N Señora del Portillo, and moving from thence till it seemed to be immediately above that of the pillar, continued in the same form about half an hour, and then dispersed. The inhabitants were in a state of such excitement that crowds joined in the acclamation of the first beholder, who cried out, "A miracle!"— and after the defeat of the besiegers had confirmed the omen, a miracle it was universally pronounced to have been, the people proclaiming with exultation that the Virgin had by this token prefigured the victory she had given them, and promised Zaragoza her protection as long as the world should endure' (Southey). . . . At daybreak on the 21st December, General Suchet carried the works on the Monte Torrero; but Count Gazan de la Peyrière — a general highly distinguished in the Swiss and Italian campaigns — failed in his attack upon the suburbs on the left bank of the Ebro, and the confidence of the Spaniards in their leaders was restored. Three days later the town was completely invested, the siege operations being directed by General La Coste. On the 30th December, the trenches being completed, the town was summoned to surrender, and the example of Madrid was referred to; but Palafox replied proudly, 'If Madrid has surrendered, Madrid has been sold: Saragossa will neither be sold nor surrendered.' Marshal Moncey being recalled to Madrid, Junot took command of his corps. The besieged attempted several sallies, which were repulsed; and after a heavy bombardment, the St. Joseph convent was carried by the French on the 11th January, 1809. The Spanish leaders maintained the courage of their countrymen by proclaiming a forged despatch narrating the defeat of Napoleon. The guerrilla bands began to gather in round the French, and their condition was becoming perilous But the command had now been taken by the invincible Marshal Lannes, Duke of Montebello (who had been detained by a long illness); the approaches were steadily pushed on, the breaches in the walls became wider, and on the 29th the French rushed forward and took possession of the ramparts 'Thus the walls of Zaragoza went to the ground, but Zaragoza remained erect, and as the broken girdle fell from the heroic city, the besiegers started at her naked strength The regular defences had crumbled, but the popular resistance was instantly called with all its terrors into action; and as if fortune had resolved to mark the exact moment when the ordinary calculations of science should cease, the chief engineers on both sides [La Coste and San Genis] were simultaneously slain (Napier).

The Junta was in no degree cowed: they resolved on resistance to the last extremity, and a row of gibbets was raised for any who should dare to propose surrender Additional barricades were constructed, and alarm-bells were rung to summon the citizens to the threatened points As each house was in itself a fort which had to be separately attacked, mining now was had recourse to In this art the skill of the French was unquestioned, and room after room and house after house was carried. But still the constancy of the besieged was unshaken, and the French soldiers began to murmur at their excessive toil. From so many of the women and children being huddled together in the cellars of the city, for safety from the shells and cannon-balls, a pestilence arose, and slowly spread from the besieged to the besiegers 'The strong and the weak, the daring soldier and the shrinking child, fell before it alike, and such was the predisposition to disease, that the slightest wound gangrened and became incurable. In the beginning of February the daily deaths were from four to five hundred; — the living were unable to bury the dead; and thousands of carcases, scattered about the streets and courtyards, or piled in heaps at the doors of the churches, were left to dissolve in their own corruption, or be licked up by the flames of burning houses as the defence became concentrated' (Napier). On the 18th February a great assault took place, and so much of the town was carried that further resistance was hopeless. Terms of capitulation were offered by the besieged, but were rejected by Lannes, and on the 19th the heavy guns opened from the batteries on the left bank of the Ebro, to sweep the houses on the quays. On the 20th, when all the great leaders were dead or prostrated with fever, and none but the soldier-priest Rio remained to lead the diminished band of heroes, Saragossa surrendered, — at discretion,

according to the French; on honourable terms, according to the Spaniards Such was the close of one of the most heroic defences in the history of the world. If any conditions were really accepted, they were ill observed by the victors: the churches were plundered, and many of the clergy and monks were put to death . . The other strongholds in Aragon, one after another, surrendered to the French before the end of March. In Catalonia the French, under General Gouvion St Cyr, had met with equal success With 30,000 men St. Cyr had taken Rosas after a month's siege — which was prolonged by the presence of that brilliant naval commander, Lord Cochrane (afterwards Earl of Dundonald), with an English frigate in the harbour — in December, 1808, had routed Reding at Cardadeu, had relieved Barcelona (where General Duhesme was shut up with 8,000 Frenchmen), and had again, on the 21st December, routed Reding at Molinos del Rey, where all the Spanish stores, including 30,000 muskets from England, were taken In the spring of 1809 Reding made another attempt to achieve the independence of the north east, and moved to relieve Saragossa, but on the 17th February he was met by St. Cyr at Igualada, where Reding himself was killed and his army was dispersed The siege of Gerona alone in the north-east of Spain remained to be undertaken" —H R Clinton, *The War in the Peninsula, ch* 8

ALSO IN C. M. Yonge, *Book of Golden Deeds, p* 365 —R Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, ch* 18 (*v* 3).—Sir W F P Napier, *Hist of the War in the Peninsula, bk* 5, *ch* 2–3 (*v* 1) — Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs, v.* 1, *ch* 40

A. D. 1809 (February — June).—The war in Aragon.— Siege of Gerona. — "This decisive victory [of Igualada] terminated the regular war in Catalonia, and St Cyr, retiring to Vich, commenced preparations for the siege of Gerona The undertaking was for some time delayed by the discord of St Cyr and Verdier, but in the beginning of May they appeared before the town, and on the 1st of June the investment was completed But the prowess of the Spaniards nowhere appeared to greater advantage than in the defence of their walled towns. it was not till 12th August, after 37 days of open trenches, and two unsuccessful assaults, that the French possessed themselves of the fort of Monjuich, which commands the town: yet the gallant governor, Alvarez, still held out, and the safe arrival of a convoy sent by Blake reanimated the spirit of the garrison. The grand assault of the lower town was given (Sept. 17), but the French were repulsed from the breach with the loss of 1,600 men; and St Cyr, despairing of carrying the place by force, converted the siege into a blockade. The capture of three successive convoys, sent by Blake for their relief, reduced the besieged at last to extremity; famine and pestilence devastated the city; but it was not till the inhabitants were reduced to the necessity of eating hair that the place was yielded (Dec. 12) to Augereau, who had superseded St Cyr in the command. A more memorable resistance is not on record; but the heroic Alvarez, to the eternal disgrace of Augereau, was immured in a dungeon at Figueras, where he soon afterwards died. Junot, in the mean time, had been taken ill, and was succeeded in the command in Aragon by Suchet, a young general whose talents and success gave him a brilliant career in the later years of the empire. His first essay, however, was unfortunate; for the indefatigable Blake, encouraged by the retreat of St Cyr towards the Pyrenees, had again advanced with 12,000 men; and an action ensued (May 23) at Alcaniz, in which the French, seized with a panic, fled in confusion from the field. This unwonted success emboldened Blake to approach Saragossa; but the discipline and manœuvres of the French asserted their wonted superiority in the plains; the Spaniards were routed close to Saragossa (June 16), and more decisively at Belchite the next day. The army of Blake was entirely dispersed, and all regular resistance ceased in Aragon, as it had done in Catalonia, after the fall of Gerona."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect* 566–567.

A. D. 1809 (February — July). — Wellington again in the English command.—The French advance into Portugal checked. — Passage of the Douro by the English.— Battle of Talavera. —"Napoleon, before Moore's corps had actually left Corunna, conceived the war at an end, and, in issuing instructions to his marshals, anticipated, with no unreasonable confidence, the complete subjugation of the Peninsula. Excepting, indeed, some isolated districts in the east, the only parts now in possession of the Spaniards or their allies were Andalusia, which had been saved by the precipitate recall of Napoleon to the north; and Portugal, which, still in arms against the French, was nominally occupied by a British corps of 10,000 men, left there under Sir John Cradock at the time of General Moore's departure with the bulk of the army for Spain. The proceedings of the French marshals for the recovery of the entire Peninsula were speedily arranged. Lannes took the direction of the siege of Saragossa, where the Spaniards, fighting as usual with admirable constancy from behind stone walls, were holding two French corps at bay Lefebvre drove one Spanish army into the recesses of the Sierra Morena, and Victor chased another into the fastnesses of Murcia Meantime Soult, after recoiling awhile from the dying blows of Moore, had promptly occupied Gallicia upon the departure of the English, and was preparing to cross the Portuguese frontier on his work of conquest. In aid of this design it was concerted that while the last-named marshal advanced from the north, Victor, by way of Elvas, and Lapisse by way of Almeida, should converge together upon Portugal, and that when the English at Lisbon had been driven to their ships the several corps should unite for the final subjugation of the Peninsula by the occupation of Andalusia. Accordingly, leaving Ney to maintain the ground already won, Soult descended with 30,000 men upon the Douro, and by the end of March was in secure possession of Oporto. Had he continued his advance, it is not impossible that the campaign might have had the termination he desired; but at this point he waited for intelligence of the English in his front and of Victor and Lapisse on his flank. His caution saved Portugal, for, while he still hesitated on the brink of the Douro, there again arrived in the Tagus that renowned commander before whose genius the fortunes not only of the marshals, but of their imperial master, were finally to fail. England was now at the commencement of her greatest war. The system of small expeditions and insignificant diversions,

though not yet conclusively abandoned, was soon superseded by the glories of a visible contest. and in a short time it was known and felt by a great majority of the nation, that on the field of the Peninsula England was fairly pitted against France At the commencement of the year 1809, when the prospects of Spanish independence were at their very gloomiest point, the British Cabinet had proposed and concluded a comprehensive treaty of alliance with the Provisional Administration of Spain, and it was now resolved that the contest in the Peninsula should be continued on a scale more effectual than before, and that the principal, instead of the secondary, part should be borne by England . England's colonial requirements left her little to show against the myriads of the continent It was calculated at the time that 60,000 British soldiers might have been made disposable for the Peninsular service, but at no period of the war was such a force ever actually collected under the standards of Wellington, while Napoleon could maintain his 300,000 warriors in Spain, without materially disabling the arms of the Empire on the Danube or the Rhine We had allies, it is true, in the troops of the country, but these at first were little better than refractory recruits, requiring all the accessories of discipline, equipment, and organisation, jealous of all foreigners, even as friends, and not unreasonably suspicious of supporters who could always find in their ships a refuge which was denied to themselves But above all these difficulties was that arising from the inexperience of the Government in continental warfare . When, however, with these ambiguous prospects, the Government did at length resolve on the systematic prosecution of the Peninsular war, the eyes of the nation were at once instinctively turned on Sir Arthur Wellesley as the general to conduct it . . . He stoutly declared his opinion that Portugal was tenable against the French, even if actual possessors of Spain, and that it offered ample opportunities of influencing the great result of the war With these views he recommended that the Portuguese army should be organised at its full strength; that it should be in part taken into British pay and under the direction of British officers, and that a force of not less than 30,000 English troops should be despatched to keep this army together. . . . Such was the prestige already attached to Wellesley's name that his arrival in the Tagus changed every feature of the scene. No longer suspicious of our intentions, the Portuguese Government gave prompt effect to the suggestions of the English commander. . . . The command-in-chief of the native army was intrusted to an English officer of great distinction, General Beresford; and no time was lost in once more testing the efficacy of the British arms. . . . Of the Spanish armies we need only say that they had been repeatedly routed with invariable certainty and more or less disgrace, though Cuesta still held a nominal force together in the valley of the Tagus. There were, therefore, two courses open to the British commander: —either to repel the menaced advance of Soult by marching on Oporto, or to effect a junction with Cuesta, and try the result of a demonstration against Madrid. The latter of these plans was wisely postponed for the moment, and, preference having been decisively given to the former, the troops at once commenced their march upon the Douro. The British force under Sir Arthur Wellesley's command amounted at this time to about 20,000 men, to which about 15,000 Portuguese, in a respectable state of organisation, were added by the exertions of Beresford. Of these about 24,000 were now led against Soult, who, though not inferior in strength, no sooner ascertained the advance of the English commander, than he arranged for a retreat by detaching Loison with 6,000 men to dislodge a Portuguese post from his left rear. Sir Arthur's intention was to envelope, if possible, the French corps by pushing forward a strong force upon its left, and thus intercepting its retreat toward Ney's position, while the main body assaulted Soult in his quarters at Oporto. The former of these operations he intrusted to Beresford, the latter he directed in person On the 12th of May the troops reached the southern bank of the Douro, the waters of which, 300 yards in width, rolled between them and their adversaries . Availing himself of a point where the river by a bend in its course was not easily visible from the town, Sir Arthur determined on transporting, if possible, a few troops to the northern bank, and occupying an unfinished stone building, which he perceived was capable of affording temporary cover The means were soon supplied by the activity of Colonel Waters—an officer whose habitual audacity rendered him one of the heroes of this memorable war Crossing in a skiff to the opposite bank, he returned with two or three boats, and in a few minutes a company of the Buffs was established in the building. Reinforcements quickly followed, but not without discovery. The alarm was given, and presently the edifice was enveloped by the eager battalions of the French. The British, however, held their ground, a passage was effected at other points during the struggle, the French, after an ineffectual resistance, were fain to abandon the city in precipitation, and Sir Arthur, after his unexampled feat of arms, sat down that evening to the dinner which had been prepared for Soult. . . . This brilliant operation being effected, Sir Arthur was now at liberty to turn to the main project of the campaign—that to which, in fact, the attack upon Soult had been subsidiary—the defeat of Victor in Estremadura. . . . Cuesta would take no advice, and insisted on the adoption of his own schemes with such obstinacy, that Sir Arthur was compelled to frame his plans accordingly. Instead, therefore, of circumventing Victor as he had intended, he advanced into Spain at the beginning of July, to effect a junction with Cuesta and feel his way towards Madrid. The armies, when united, formed a mass of 78,000 combatants; but of these 56,000 were Spanish, and for the brunt of war Sir Arthur could only reckon on his 22,000 British troops, Beresford's Portuguese having been despatched to the north of Portugal. On the other side, Victor's force had been strengthened by the succours which Joseph Bonaparte, alarmed for the safety of Madrid, had hastily concentrated at Toledo; and when the two armies at length confronted each other at Talavera, it was found that 55,000 excellent French troops were arrayed against Sir Arthur and his ally, while nearly as many more were descending from the north on the line of the British com-

munications along the valley of the Tagus On the 28th of July the British commander, after making the best dispositions in his power, received the attack of the French, directed by Joseph Bonaparte in person, with Victor and Jourdan at his side, and after an engagement of great severity, in which the Spaniards were virtually inactive, he remained master of the field against double his numbers, having repulsed the enemy at all points with heavy loss, and having captured several hundred prisoners and 17 pieces of cannon in this the first great pitched battle between the French and English in the Peninsula In this well fought field of Talavera, the French had thrown, for the first time, their whole disposable force upon the British army without success, and Sir Arthur Wellesley inferred, with a justifiable confidence, that the relative superiority of his troops to those of the Emperor was practically decided Jomini, the French military historian, confesses almost as much, and the opinions of Napoleon himself, as visible in his correspondence, underwent from that moment a serious change '—*Memoir of Wellington, from "The Times" of Sept* 15-16, 1852

Also in R Southey, *Hist of the Peninsular War, ch* 22-24 (*v* 3-4) — Sir A Alison, *Hist of Europe*, 1789-1815, *ch* 62 (*v* 13)

A. D. 1809 (August— November) — Battles of Almonacid, Puerto de Baños, Ocana, and Alba de Tormes.— Soon after Wellington's unfruitful victory at Talavera, "Venegas had advanced as far as Aranjuez, and was besieging Toledo, but the retreat of the British having set the French armies at liberty, he was attacked and defeated after a sharp action at Almonacid (Aug 11) by Dessoles and Sebastiani, and Sir Robert Wilson, who had approached Madrid with 6,000 Spaniards and Portuguese, was encountered and driven back by Ney (Aug 8) at Puerto de Baños The British at length, after lying a month at Deleitosa, were compelled, by the scandalous failure of the Spanish authorities to furnish them with supplies or provisions, to cross the mountains and fix their headquarters at Badajos, after an angry correspondence between Wellesley and Cuesta, who soon after was removed from his command A gleam of success at Tamanes, where Marchand was routed with loss (Oct. 24) by Romana's army under the Duke del Parque, encouraged the Spaniards to make another effort for the recovery of Madrid, and an army of 50,000 men, including 7,000 horse and 60 pieces of cannon, advanced for this purpose from the Sierra Morena, under General Areizaga The battle was fought (Nov 12) at Ocana, near Aranjuez, but though the Spaniards behaved with considerable spirit, the miserable incapacity of their commander counterbalanced all their efforts, and an unparalleled rout was the result. Pursued over the wide plains of Castile by the French cavalry, 20,000 prisoners were taken, with all the guns and stores, the wreck was complete and irretrievable, and the defeat of the Duke del Parque (Nov. 25) at Alba de Tormes, dispersed the last force which could be called a Spanish army. It was evident from these events that Portugal was the only basis from which the deliverance of the Peninsula could be effected." — *Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect* 576 (*ch.* 62, *v.* 13 *of complete work*).

A. D. 1809 (August—December).—Wellington's difficulties.—His retreat into Portugal. —"In the course of the 29th, the army was reinforced by the arrival of a troop of horse artillery, and a brigade of light troops from Lisbon, under General Crawford. Under the circumstances of his situation, however, it was impossible for Sir Arthur Wellesley to follow up his victory The position he occupied was still one of extreme peril A powerful enemy was advancing on his rear, and no reliance could be placed for the supply of his army, either on the promises of the Spanish General, or of the Junta The army of Vanegas, which, in obedience to the orders of the Supreme Junta, had advanced from Madrilejos, was engaged, during the 28th and 29th, in endeavouring to dislodge the French garrison from Toledo His advance pushed on during the night to the neighbourhood of Madrid, and took prisoners some patroles of the enemy Vanegas, however no sooner learned from the prisoners that Joseph and Sebastiani were approaching, than he . . desisted from any further offensive operations. The intelligence that Vanegas had failed in executing the part allotted to him, was speedily followed by information that Soult had with facility driven the Spaniards from the passes leading from Salamanca to Placentia It was in consequence arranged between the Generals, that the British army should immediately march to attack Soult, and that Cuesta should remain in the position of Talavera, to protect this movement from any operation of Victor The wounded likewise were to be left in charge of Cuesta On the morning of the 3rd of August, the British accordingly commenced their march on Oropesa On his arrival there, Sir Arthur Wellesley received intelligence that Soult was already at Naval Moral Shortly after, a courier arrived from Cuesta, announcing, that, as the enemy were stated to be advancing on his flank, and as it was ascertained that the corps of Ney and Mortier had been united under Soult, he had determined on quitting his position, and joining the British army at Oropesa This movement was executed the same night; and nearly the whole of the British wounded were left unprotected in the town of Talavera. The conduct of Cuesta in this precipitate retreat, is altogether indefensible In quitting the position of Talavera, Cuesta had abandoned the only situation in which the advance of Victor on the British rear could be resisted with any prospect of success The whole calculations of Sir Arthur Wellesley were at once overthrown. . . . Sir Arthur determined to throw his army across the Tagus by the bridge of Arzobisbo. . . . Cuesta followed the British in their retreat to the bridge of Arzobisbo, and leaving the Duke del Albuquerque with two divisions of infantry and one of cavalry to defend it, he withdrew the remainder of his army to Paraleda de Garben. The French, however, having taken post on the opposite side of the river, soon succeeded in discovering a ford by which they crossed, and surprising the Spaniards, drove them at once from the works, with the loss of 30 pieces of cannon. After this, Cuesta with his whole force fell back on Deleytosa, while the British moved to Xaraicejo . . . Vanegas . . . remained with his army in the neighbourhood of Aranjuez. On the 5th of August, he succeeded in gaining a decided advantage over an advanced division of the enemy. . . . Harassed by inconsistent orders,

Vanegas was unfortunately induced again to advance, and give battle to the corps of Sebastiani at Almonacid This engagement, though many of the Spanish troops behaved with great gallantry, terminated in the complete defeat of the army of Vanegas It was driven to the Sierra Morena, with the loss of all its baggage and artillery With this action terminated the campaign which had been undertaken for the relief of Madrid, and the expulsion of the enemy from the central provinces of Spain The British army at Xaraicejo, still served as a shield to the southern provinces, and Sir Arthur Wellesley, (whom the gratitude of his country had now ennobled,) [raising him to the peerage as Baron Duke of Wellesley and Viscount Wellington of Talavera] considered it of importance to maintain the position he then occupied. But the total failure of supplies rendered this impossible, and about the 20th of August he fell back through Merida on Badajos, in the neighbourhood of which he established his army At this period all operations in concert ceased between the English and Spanish armies The Supreme Junta complained bitterly of the retreat of the former, which left the road to Seville and Cadiz open to the enemy, while the Marquis Wellesley, then ambassador in Spain, made strong representations of the privations to which the British army had been exposed, by the inattention and neglect of the authorities. In the correspondence which ensued, it appeared that the measure of retreat had been forced on Lord Wellington, by the absolute impossibility of supporting his army in the ground he occupied . . The year had closed in Spain triumphantly for the French arms, as it had commenced The Spanish armies had sustained a series of unparalleled defeats The British had retired into Portugal, and the efforts of Lord Wellington, were for the present, limited to the defence of that kingdom."— T. Hamilton, *Annals of the Peninsular Campaigns, ch 7 and 9.*

ALSO IN: R. Waite, *Life of the Duke of Wellington, ch.* 6 — Sir W. F P. Napier, *Hist of the War in the Peninsula, bk* 8, *ch* 7-9, *bk.* 9 (*v* 2).

A. D. 1809-1810 (October — September).— The Lines of Torres Vedras.—"Since Austria had laid down arms by signing the peace of Vienna, and had thus proved the inefficiency of England's last allies — since among the sovereigns of the Continent Napoleon boasted none but courtiers or subjects, Wellington saw that all the resources and all the efforts of his gigantic power would be turned against the only country which still struggled for the liberty of Europe. What could Spain achieve with her bands of insurgents and her defeated armies, albeit so persevering? or the small English army effect against so formidable an adversary, aided by the combined forces of so many nations? But during the very time when the world looked upon all as lost, and Napoleon's proudest enemies were growing weak, Wellington never despaired of the cause he had embraced. Far from allowing himself to be cast down by the magnitude or the imminence of the danger, he derived from that very circumstance, not only the resolution of fighting to the last extremity, but also the energy to conceive and to execute a project which will continue to be the admiration of the world, and an everlasting lesson to nations oppressed by foreign rule. He had always thought that some day, sooner or later, the whole of Europe would rise against Napoleon's tyranny, provided that an opportunity for such a rising were afforded to it by a prolonged resistance in certain points. The end to aim at therefore was, in his opinion, not so much to drive the French out of the Peninsula, as the tacticians of the central junta wildly fancied. but rather to keep the contest there alive at any cost, until the moment should arrive for so inevitable and universal a revolt. In view of the new invasion pouring into Spain, he could not dream of undertaking any offensive operations against the French. Even if conducted with genius, they would have rapidly exhausted his very limited forces. His small army . . . could not have lasted a month amidst the large masses of French troops then in Spain. He therefore resolved to entrench it in strong positions, rendered still more formidable by every resource of defensive warfare, where he might defy superiority in numbers and the risk of surprise, where he could also obtain supplies by sea, and whence if necessary he might embark in case of disaster; where, also, he might take advantage of the distances and the difficulties of communication which were so rapidly exhausting our troops, by creating around us a desert in which we should find it impossible to live To stand out under these restricted but vigorously conceived conditions, and to resist with indomitable obstinacy until Europe, ashamed to let him succumb, should come to his succour, was the only course which afforded Wellington some chance of success in view of the feeble means at his disposal; and such, with equal firmness and decision, was the one he now adopted The necessity which suggested it to him in no wise diminishes the merit or originality of an operation which was, one may say, without precedent in military history. The position he was seeking for he found in the environs of Lisbon, in the peninsula formed by the Tagus at its entrance to the sea. Protected on almost every side either by the ocean or the river, which at this point is nearly as wide as an inland sea, this peninsula was accessible only on the north where it joined the mainland. There, however, the prolongation of the Sierra d'Estrella presented a series of rugged heights, craggy precipices and deep ravines filled with torrents, forming a true natural barrier, the strength of which had already struck more than one military observer. . . . Wellington was the first who conceived and executed the project of transforming the whole peninsula into a colossal fortress, of more than a hundred miles in circumference. He desired that this fortress should be composed of three concentric enclosures, defended by cannon, and large enough to contain not only his army and the Portuguese allies — comprising the regular troops, the militia and Ordenanzas — but the whole available population of the Southern provinces of Portugal, with their harvests, their cattle and their provisions, so that the country surrounding Lisbon should offer no resource whatever to the invaders. He at the same time secured his retreat by means of a spacious and fortified port, in which, should any untoward accident occur, the English army and even the Portuguese troops might embark in safety. This immense citadel extended to the north from Zizembre and the heights of Torres Vedras, which protected its front, as far as

Alemquer; thence to the east by Sobral and Alvera it followed the counterforts of the Estrella which overhang the Tagus, and extended to Lisbon," where it was covered alike by the mouth of the river and by the ocean. . . . From the beginning of the month of October, 1809, with the aid of Colonel Fletcher of the Engineers, he had employed thousands of workmen and peasants, without intermission, in throwing up intrenchments, constructing redoubts, and forming sluices for inundating the plain."— P. Lanfrey, *Life of Napoleon I., v.* 4, *ch.* 4.

Also in: W. H. Maxwell, *Life of Wellington, v.* 2, *ch.* 9-12.—Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 11, *ch.* 8 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1810.—Revolt of the Argentine provinces. See Argentine Republic: A. D. 1806-1820.

A. D. 1810-1812.—The French advance into Portugal. — Their recoil from the Lines of Torres Vedras.—"By the spring of 1810, the French armies in Spain numbered fully 350,000 men, and Napoleon had intended to cross the Pyrenees, at the head of this enormous force. His marriage, however, or more probably the innumerable toils and cares of Empire prevented him from carrying out his purpose; and this was one of the capital mistakes of his life, for his presence was necessary on the scene of events. He still despised the insurrection of Spain; he held Wellington cheap as a 'Sepoy general'; strange as it may appear, he was wholly ignorant of the existence of the Lines of Torres Vedras, and he persisted in maintaining that the only real enemy in the Peninsula was the British army, which he estimated at 25,000 men. He gave Masséna 70,000, with orders 'to drive the English into the sea'; and at the same time, he sent a great army to subdue Andalusia and the South, false to his art in thus dividing his forces. A contest followed renowned in history, and big with memorable results for Europe. Masséna took the fortresses on the northeast of Portugal, and by the close of September had entered Beira; he met a bloody reverse at Busaco [September 27], but he succeeded in turning Wellington's flank, and he advanced, in high heart, from Coimbra, on Lisbon. To his amazement, however, the impregnable lines, a gigantic obstacle utterly unforeseen, rose before him, and brought the invaders to a stand, and the 'spoiled child of victory,' daring as he was, after vain efforts to find a vulnerable point, recoiled from before the invincible rampart, baffled and indignant, but as yet hopeful. Masséna, with admirable skill, now chose a formidable position near the Tagus, and held the British commander in check. . . . But Wellington, with wise, if stern, forethought, had wasted the adjoining region with fire and sword; Napoleon, meditating a new war, was unable to despatch a regiment from France; Soult, ordered to move from Andalusia to the aid of his colleague, paused and hung back; and Masséna, his army literally starved out, and strengthened by a small detachment only, was at last reluctantly forced to retreat. The movement began in March, 1811; it was conducted with no ordinary skill; but Wellington had attained his object and the French general re-entered Spain with the wreck only of a once noble force. Masséna, however, would not confess defeat; having restored and largely increased his army, he attacked Wellington at Fuentes de Onoro, and possibly only missed a victory, owing to the jealousies of inferior men. This, nevertheless, was his last effort; he was superseded in his command by Napoleon, unjust in this instance to his best lieutenant, and Wellington's conduct of the war had been completely justified. Torres Vedras permanently arrested Napoleon's march of conquest; the French never entered Portugal again. . . . Meantime the never-ceasing insurrection of Spain continued to waste the Imperial forces, and surrounded them, as it were, with a circle of fire. It was all in vain that another great army was struck down in the field at Ocana; that Suchet invaded and held Valencia; that Soult ravaged Andalusia; that Victor besieged Cadiz. The resistance of the nation became more intense than ever; Saguntum, which had defied Hannibal, Girona, Tortosa, and, above all, Tarragona, defended their walls to the last; and not a village from Asturias to Granada acknowledged Joseph at Madrid, as its lawful king. . . . After Fuentes de Onoro the contest in Spain had languished in 1811, though Marmont and Soult missed a great chance of assailing Wellington, with very superior numbers. In the following year the British commander pounced on Ciudad Rodrigo, and Badajoz, the keys of Spain from the Portuguese frontier, completely deceiving the distant Emperor, who would direct operations from Paris; and he defeated Marmont in a great battle, at Salamanca, beside the Tormes, which threw open to him the gates of Madrid. Yet, in an effort made against the communications of the French, the object he steadily kept in view, he was baffled by the resistance of Burgos, and before long he was in retreat on Portugal, having just escaped from a great French army, so various were the fortunes of this most instructive war."—W. O'C. Morris, *Napoleon, ch.* 10-11.

Also in: G. Hooper, *Wellington, ch.* 7.—J. H. Stocqueler, *Life of Wellington, v.* 1, *ch.* 4-10.—Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, v.* 2-3.—R. Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War, v.* 4-5.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and Empire, bk.* 42 (*v.* 4).—Gen. Sir J. T. Jones, *Journal of the Sieges in Spain, v.* 1.

A. D. 1810-1821.—Revolt and achievement of independence in Venezuela and New Granada. See Colombian States: A. D. 1810-1819.

A. D. 1810-1825.—Revolt and independence of Mexico. See Mexico: A. D. 1810-1819; and 1820-1826.

A. D. 1812 (June—August).—Wellington's victory at Salamanca.—Abandonment of Madrid by King Joseph.—"In the month of May, 1812, that rupture took place [between Napoleon and Alexander I. of Russia] which was to determine, by its issue, whether Europe should acknowledge one master; and Napoleon, too confident in his own fortunes, put himself at the head of his armies and marched on Moscow. The war in Spain, which had hitherto occupied the first place in public attention, became from that hour, as far as France was concerned, a matter of minor consideration. Whatever effective battalions were at the disposal of the war-minister, were forwarded to the Vistula; while to recruit the regiments in Spain, depôts were formed in the south, out of which, from time to time, a body of conscripts were equipped and dispatched

to reinforce the French armies. Lord Wellington's army consisted of 60,000 men, Portuguese and Spaniards included. Of these, 10,000 infantry, with about 1,200 cavalry, were cantoned on the Tagus at Almarez; while the commander-in-chief, with the remainder, prepared to operate, on the north of that river, against Marmont. The capture of the redoubts at Almarez had, in some degree, isolated the French marshal; and, although he was at the head of 50,000 veterans, Lord Wellington felt himself in a condition to cope with him At the same time Lord Wellington had to observe Soult, who, commanding the army of the south, was around Seville and Cordova with 58,000 men — while Suchet held the eastern provinces with 50,000 excellent troops — Souham was in the north with 10,000 — and the army of the centre, probably 15,000 more, was disposed around the capital, and kept open the communications between the detached corps. On the other hand, there were on foot no Spanish armies deserving of the name Bands of guerrillas moved, indeed, hither and thither, rendering the communications between the French armies and their depôts exceedingly insecure; but throughout the north, and west, and centre of Spain, there was no single corps in arms of any military respectability In the east, Generals Lacy and Sarsfield were at the head of corps which did good service, and occupied Suchet pretty well, while D'Eroles, more bold than prudent, committed himself at Rhonda with General Rourke, in a combat which ended in his total defeat and the dispersion of his troops Yet were the French far from being masters of the country. Few fortified towns, Cadiz and Alicante excepted, continued to display the standard of independence, but every Sierra and mountain range swarmed with the enemies of oppression, out of whom an army, formidable from its numbers, if not for its discipline, might at any moment be formed. But it had never entered into the counsels of the allies to furnish a nucleus round which such an army might be gathered. . . . Meanwhile, the commander-in-chief, after having given his army a few weeks' repose, . . . broke up from his cantonments, and advanced in the direction of Salamanca On the 17th of June his divisions crossed the Tormes, by the fords above and below the town, and, finding no force in the field competent to resist them, marched direct upon the capital of the province." Salamanca was taken on the 27th of June, after a siege of ten days, and a series of manœuvres — a great game of tactics between the opposing commanders — ensued, which occupied their armies without any serious collision, until the 22d of July, when the decisive battle of Salamanca was fought. "The dispositions of the French, though masterly against one less self-collected, had been, throughout the day, in Wellington's opinion, full of hazard. They aimed at too much — and, manœuvring to throw themselves in force upon the English right, risked, as the event proved fatally, the weakening of their own right and centre. Lord Wellington saw that filing constantly in one direction disconnected the divisions of Marmont's army, and left an interval where he might strike to advantage. . . . It was the first mistake that Marmont had made, and Wellington never permitted him to retrieve it. Lord Wellington had dined amid the ranks of the third division, and Packenham, its frank and chivalrous leader, was one of those who shared his simple and soldier-like meal. To him the commander-in-chief gave his orders, somewhat in the following words: 'Do you see those fellows on the hill, Packenham? Throw your division into columns of battalions — at them directly — and drive them to the devil.' Instantly the division was formed — and the order executed admirably. . . . By this magnificent operation, the whole of the enemy's left was destroyed Upward of 3,000 prisoners remained in the hands of the victors, while the rest, broken and dispirited, fell back in utter confusion upon the reserves, whom they swept away with them in their flight Meanwhile, in the centre, a fiercer contest was going on. . . . Marmont, . . struck down by the explosion of a shell, was carried off the field early in the battle, with a broken arm and two severe wounds in the side The command then devolved upon Clausel, who did all that man in his situation could do to retrieve the fortune of the day . . . But Lord Wellington was not to be arrested in his success, nor could his troops be restrained in their career of victory . . Seven thousand prisoners, two eagles, with a number of cannon and other trophies, remained in the hands of the English. 10,000 men, in addition, either died on the field or were disabled by wounds, whereas the loss on the part of the allies amounted to scarcely 5,000 men. . . After this disaster, Clausel continued his retreat by forced marches. . . . Meanwhile, Joseph, ignorant of the result of the late battle, was on his way, with 20,000 men, to join Marmont, and had arrived at the neighbourhood of Arevolo before the intelligence of that officer's defeat was communicated to him. He directed his columns instantly toward Segovia. . . . On the 7th of August the British army moved, . . while Joseph, retreating with precipitation, left the passes of the Guadarama open, and returned to Madrid, where the confusion was now extreme . . Lord Wellington's march was conducted with all the celerity and good order which distinguished every movement of his now magnificent army. On the 7th, he entered Segovia. . . . On the 12th [he] entered Madrid in triumph. . . . The city exhibited the appearance of a carnival, and the festivities were kept up till the dawn of the 13th came in. . . . Immediately the new constitution was proclaimed; Don Carlos D'Espana was appointed governor of the city, and the people, still rejoicing, yet restrained from excesses of every sort, returned to their usual employments."—Gen. Vane (Marquess of Londonderry), *Story of the Peninsular War, ch.* 30.

ALSO IN: Gen. Sir W. F. P. Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula, bk.* 18 (*v.* 4).—Lt. Col. Williams, *Life and Times of Wellington, v.* 1, *pp.* 275-290.

A. D. 1812-1814.—Final campaigns of the Peninsular War.—Expulsion of the French.— "The south and centre of Spain . . . seemed clear of enemies, but the hold of the French was as yet shaken only, not broken; for in fact though Wellington's march had forced his enemies in two directions (Clausel, with the remainder of Marmont's army, having retired north, while the king withdrew south-east), such were their numbers that each division became the centre of an army as powerful as his own. . . . Of the two armies against which Wellington had to contend by far the largest was the army of South

and the king, on the south-east On the other hand, Clausel's forces were beaten and retreating, so that it appeared to the general better to leave a detachment under Hill to cover Madrid, while he himself repaired with the bulk of his army to strike a final blow at Clausel by the capture of Burgos, intending to return at once and with his whole combined forces fight a great battle with Soult and the king before the capital The resistance offered by Burgos and the deficiency of proper artillery proved greater obstacles than had been expected The delay thus caused allowed the French to recover . As Soult began to draw towards Madrid from Valencia, thus threatening the safety of Hill, there was no course left but to summon that general northward, and to make a combined retreat towards Salamanca and Portugal This was the last of Wellington's retreats Events in Europe lessened the power of his enemies, while fighting for his very existence on the main continent of Europe, Napoleon could not but regard the war in Spain as a very secondary concern, and a great many old and valuable soldiers were withdrawn The jealousy which existed between Joseph and the generals and the dislike of the great generals to take upon themselves the Spanish war threw it into inferior hands for some little while and there is little more to chronicle than a succession of hard won victories A vigorous insurrection had arisen all along the northern provinces, and it was this more than anything else which decided Wellington's course of action While leaving troops to occupy the attention of the French in the valley of the Tagus, he intended to march northwards, connect himself with the northern insurgents, and directly threaten the communications with France As he had expected, the French had to fall back before him, he compelled them to evacuate Burgos and attempt to defend the Ebro Their position there was turned and they had again to fall back into the basin of Vittoria This is the plain of the river Zadora which forms in its course almost a right angle at the south west corner of the plain, which it thus surrounds on two sides Across the plain and through Vittoria runs the high road to France, the only one in the neighbourhood sufficiently large to allow of the retreat of the French army, encumbered with all its stores and baggage, and the accumulated wealth of some years of occupation of Spain While Wellington forced the passage of the river in front south of the great bend, and drove the enemy back to the town of Vittoria, Graham beyond the town closed this road The beaten enemy had to retreat as best he could towards Salvatierra, leaving behind all the artillery, stores, baggage, and equipments [June 21, 1813] The offensive armies of France had now to assume the defensive and to guard their own frontier Before advancing to attack them in the mountains, Wellington undertook the blockade of Pampeluna and the siege of St. Sebastian. It was impossible for the French any longer to regard diplomatic or dynastic niceties. Joseph was superseded, and the defence of France intrusted to Soult, with whom the king had hopelessly quarrelled. He proved himself worthy of the charge. A series of terrible battles was fought in the Pyrenees, but one by one his positions were forced. With fearful bloodshed, St. Sebastian was taken, the Bidasoa was crossed (Oct. 7), the battle of the Nivelle fought and won (Nov. 10), and at length, in February, the lower Adour was passed, Bayonne invested, and Soult obliged to withdraw towards the east But by this time events on the other side of France had changed the appearance of the war . . Napoleon was being constantly driven backward upon the east The effect could not but be felt by the southern army, and Soult deserves great credit for the skill with which he still held at bay the victorious English He was however defeated at Orthes (Feb 27), lost Bordeaux (March 8), and was finally driven eastward towards Toulouse, intending to act in union with Suchet, whose army in Catalonia was as yet unbeaten. On the heights upon the east of Toulouse, for Wellington had brought his army across the Garonne, was fought, with somewhat doubtful result, the great battle of Toulouse [April 10] The victory has been claimed by both parties, the aim of the English general was however won, the Garonne was passed the French position taken, Toulouse evacuated and occupied by the victors. The triumph such as it was had cost the victors 7,000 or 8 000 men, a loss of life which might have been spared, for Napoleon had already abdicated, and the battle was entirely useless"—J. F. Bright, *Hist of Eng*, *period* 3, *pp* 1317–1321.

ALSO IN Sir A Alison, *Hist of Europe*, 1789–1815, *ch* 76–77 (*v* 16) — Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs*, *ch* 33–34 — Gen Sir W. F P. Napier, *Hist of the War in the Peninsula*, *v* 4–5

A. D. 1813.—Possession of West Florida taken by the United States. See FLORIDA: A D 1810–1813

A. D. 1813-1814 (December—May).—Restoration of Ferdinand and despotic government.—Abolition of the Cortes.—Re-establishment of the Inquisition.—Hostility of the people to freedom.—"The troops of the allies in Catalonia were paralyzed, when just about to take their last measures against Suchet, and, as they hoped, drive out the last of the French from Spain An envoy arrived from the captive Ferdinand, with the news that Ferdinand and Napoleon had made a treaty, and that the Spaniards might not fight the French any more, nor permit the English to do so on their soil. Ferdinand had been a prisoner at Valençay for five years and a half, and during that time he had, by his own account, known nothing of what was doing in Spain, but from the French newspapers The notion uppermost in his little mind at this time appears to have been that the Cortes and the liberal party in Spain were 'Jacobins and infidels,' and that it was all important that he should return, to restore absolutism and the Inquisition. In sending to Spain the treaty he had made with Napoleon, he took no notice whatever of the Cortes, but addressed himself solely to the Regency and with them, his business was to consult whether he should adhere to the treaty or break through it;—which he might easily do on the plea that it was an extorted act, agreed to under deficient knowledge of the state of Spain. Thus crooked was the policy, even at the moment of restoration, of the foolish prince who seems to have had no ability for any thing but mean and petty intrigue. The terms of the treaty might easily be anticipated from the circumstances under which it was made. Napoleon wanted to shake out the British from his southwestern quarter; he was

in great need of the veteran French troops who were prisoners in Spain: and he had no longer any hope of restoring his brother Joseph. The treaty of December, 1813, therefore provided that Ferdinand and his successors should be recognised as monarchs of Spain and of the Indies: that the territory of Spain should be what it had been before the war—the French giving up any hold they had there: that Ferdinand should maintain the integrity of this territory, clearing it completely of the British: that France and Spain should ally themselves to maintain their maritime rights against England. that all the Spaniards who had adhered to King Joseph should be reinstated in whatever they had enjoyed under him: that all prisoners on both sides should immediately be sent home and that Joseph and his wife should receive large annuities from Spain The General of the Spanish forces in Catalonia, Copons, was in so much haste to conclude a separate armistice for himself, with Suchet, without any regard to his British comrades, that the Cortes had to act with the utmost rapidity to prevent it Since the Cortes had invested themselves with executive, as well as legislative power, the Regency had become a mere show and now, when the Cortes instantly quashed the treaty, the Regency followed the example. On the 8th of January, the Regency let his Majesty know how much he was beloved and desired, but also, how impossible it was to ratify any act done by him while in a state of captivity. As Napoleon could not get back his troops from Spain in this way, he tried another. He released some of Ferdinand's chief officers, and sent them to him, with advocates of his own, to arrange about an end to the war, and exchanging prisoners, and General Palafox, one of the late captives, went to Madrid, where, however, he met with no better success than his predecessor. By that time (the end of January) it was settled that the Spanish treaty, whatever it might be, was to be framed under the sanction of the Allies, at the Congress of Chatillon. With the hope of paralyzing the Spanish forces by division, Napoleon sent Ferdinand back to Spain. He went through Catalonia, and arrived in his own dominions on the 24th of March. . . . These intrigues and negotiations caused extreme vexation to Wellington. They suddenly stopped every attempt to expel the French from Catalonia, and threatened to bring into the field against him all the prisoners he had left behind him in Spain: and there was no saying how the winding-up of the war might be delayed or injured by the political quarrels which were sure to break out whenever Ferdinand and the Cortes came into collision. . . . He therefore lost no time: and the war was over before Ferdinand entered Madrid. It was on the 14th of May that he entered Madrid, his carriage drawn by the populace. As he went through the city on foot, to show his confidence, the people cheered him. They were aware of some suspicious arrests, but were willing to hope that they were merely precautionary. Then followed the complete restoration of the religious orders to the predominance which had been found intolerable before; the abolition of the Cortes; and the re-establishment of the Inquisition. The Constitution had been rejected by the King before his entry into Madrid. In a few weeks, the whole country was distracted with discontent and fear; and, in a few months, the prisons of Madrid were so overflowing with state prisoners—ninety being arrested on one September night—that convents were made into prisons for the safe-keeping of the King's enemies. Patriots were driven into the mountains, and became banditti, while Ferdinand was making arrests right and left, coercing the press, and ceremoniously conveying to the great square, to be there burned in ignominy, the registers of the proceedings of the late Cortes." —H. Martineau, *Hist. of England*, 1800-1815, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 6.—"Ferdinand was a person of narrow mind, and his heart seems to have been incapable of generous feeling; but he was not a wicked man, nor would he have been a bad King if he had met with wise ministers, and had ruled over an enlightened people. On the two important subjects of civil and religious freedom he and the great body of the nation were in perfect sympathy,—both, upon both subjects, imbued with error to the core; and the popular feeling in both cases outran his The word Liberty ('Libertad') appeared in large bronze letters over the entrance of the Hall of the Cortes in Madrid The people of their own impulse hurried thither to remove it. . . The Stone of the Constitution, as it was called, was everywhere removed. . . The people at Seville deposed all the existing authorities, elected others in their stead to all the offices which had existed under the old system, and then required those authorities to re-establish the Inquisition. In re-establishing that accursed tribunal by a formal act of government, in suppressing the freedom of the press, which had been abused to its own destruction, and in continuing to govern not merely as an absolute monarch, but as a despotic one, Ferdinand undoubtedly complied with the wishes of the Spanish nation. . . But, in his treatment of the more conspicuous persons among the 'Liberales,' whom he condemned to strict and long imprisonment, many of them for life, he brought upon himself an indelible reproach" —R Southey, *Hist. of the Peninsular War*, *ch.* 46 (*v* 6).

A. D. 1814-1827.—The Constitution of 1812. —Abrogated by Ferdinand.—Restored by the Revolution of 1820.—Intervention of the Holy Alliance.—Absolutism and bigotry reinstated by the arms of France.—"During the war and the captivity of Ferdinand, the Cortès had, in March 1812 established a new Constitution, by which the royal authority was reduced to little more than a name. . . . Ferdinand VII., after his return, immediately applied himself to restore the ancient régime in all its unmitigated bigotry and exclusiveness. He issued decrees, in May, 1814, by which all Liberals and Freemasons, and all adherents of the Cortès, and of the officers appointed by them, were either compelled to fly, or subjected to imprisonment, or at least deposed. All national property was wrested from the purchasers of it, not only without compensation, but fines were even imposed upon the holders. All dissolved convents were re-established. The Inquisition was restored, and Mir Capillo, Bishop of Almeria, appointed Grand Inquisitor, who acted with fanatical severity, and is said to have incarcerated 50,000 persons for their opinions, many of whom were subjected to torture. . . . Ten thousand persons are computed to have fled into France. The kingdom was governed by a Camarilla, consisting of the

King's favourites, selected from the lowest and most worthless of the courtiers. . . . The French invasion of Spain had occasioned a revolution in Spanish America [see ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1806–1820; COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810–1819; MEXICO: A. D. 1810–1819, and 1820–1826; CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818; PERU: A. D. 1820–1826]. The loss of the American colonies, and a bad system of rural economy, by which agriculture was neglected in favour of sheep-breeding, had reduced Spain to great poverty. This state of things naturally affected the finances; the troops were left unpaid, and broke out into constant mutinies. A successful insurrection of this kind, led by Colonels Quiroga and Riego, occurred in 1820. Mina, who had distinguished himself as a guerilla leader, but, having compromised himself in a previous mutiny, had been compelled to fly into France, now recrossed the Pyrenees to aid the movement. The Constitution of 1812 was proclaimed at Saragossa; and the cowardly Ferdinand . . . was also obliged to proclaim it at Madrid, March 8th 1820. The Cortès was convened in July, when Ferdinand opened the Assembly with an hypocritical speech, remarkable for its exaggeration of Liberal sentiments. The Cortès immediately proceeded again to dissolve the convents, and even to seize the tithes of the secular clergy, on the pretext that the money was required for the necessities of the State. The Inquisition was once more abolished, the freedom of the press ordained, the right of meeting and forming clubs restored. . . . The Spanish revolutionists were divided into three parties: the Decamisados, answering to the French 'Sans-culottes'; the Communeros, who were for a moderate constitutional system; and the Anilleros, known by the symbol of a ring; who, dreading the interference of the Holy Alliance, endeavoured to conciliate the people with the crown. On the whole, the insurgents used their victory with moderation, and, with the exception of some few victims of revenge, contented themselves with depriving their opponents, the Serviles, of their places and emoluments. . . . The revolution, though originated by the soldiery, was adopted by the more educated class of citizens. On the other hand, the clergy and the peasantry were bitterly opposed to it. In the summer of 1821, guerilla bands were organised in the provinces in the cause of Church and King, and obtained the name of 'Armies of the Faith.' . . . In these civil disturbances dreadful atrocities were committed on both sides. . . . The French Government, with the ulterior design of interfering in Spanish affairs, seized the pretext of this disorder to place a cordon of troops on the Pyrenees; to which the Spaniards opposed an army of observation. Ferdinand, relying on the Army of the Faith, and on his Foreign Minister, Martinez de la Rosa, a Moderado, thought he might venture on a coup d'état before the appearance of the French; but his guards were worsted in a street fight, July 7th 1822. . . . Ferdinand was now base enough to applaud and thank the victors, to dismiss the Moderados from the Ministry, and to replace them by Exaltados, or Radicals. This state of things had attracted the attention of the Holy Alliance. In October 1822, the three northern monarchs assembled in congress at Verona, to adopt some resolution respecting Spain [see VERONA: THE CONGRESS OF]. . . . They addressed a note to the Spaniards requiring the restoration of absolutism. . . . In the spring, the French army of observation, which had been increased to 100,000 men, was placed under the command of the Duke of Angoulême." The Spanish troops "were few and ill disciplined; while in Old Castile stood guerilla bands, under the priest Merino, ready to aid the French invasion. An attempt on the part of Ferdinand to dismiss his Liberal ministry induced the ministers and the Cortès to remove him to Seville (March 20th 1823), whither the Cortès were to follow. The Duke of Angoulême addressed a proclamation to the Spaniards from Bayonne, April 2nd, in which he told them that he did not enter Spain as an enemy, but to liberate the captive King, and, in conjunction with the friends of order, to re-establish the altar and the throne. The French crossed the Bidassoa, April 7th. The only serious resistance which they experienced was from Mina [in Catalonia]. Ballasteros [in Navarre] was not strong enough to oppose them, while the traitor O'Donnell [commanding a reserve in New Castile] entered into negociations with the enemy, and opened to them the road to the capital. Ballasteros was compelled to retire into Valencia, and the French entered Madrid, May 23rd. A Regency . . . was now instituted till the King should be rescued. . . . A French corps was despatched . . . against Seville, where the Cortès had reopened their sittings; but on the advance of the French they retired to Cadiz, June 12th, taking with them the King, whom they declared of unsound mind, and a provisional Regency was appointed." The French advanced and laid siege to Cadiz, which capitulated October 1st, after a bombardment, the Cortès escaping by sea. Mina, in Catalonia, gave up resistance in November. "The Duke of Angoulême returned to Paris before the end of the year, but Spain continued to be occupied by an army of 40,000 French. The first act of Ferdinand after his release was to publish a proclamation, October 1st, revoking all that had been done since March 7th 1820. The Inquisition, indeed, was not restored; but the vengeance exercised by the secular tribunals was so atrocious that the Duke of Angoulême issued an order prohibiting arrests not sanctioned by the French commander; an act, however, which on the principle of non-interference was disavowed by the French Government. . . . It is computed that 40,000 Constitutionalists, chiefly of the educated classes, were thrown into prison. The French remained in Spain till 1827. M. Zea Bermudez, the new Minister, endeavoured to rule with moderation. But he was opposed on all sides. . . . His most dangerous enemy was the Apostolic Junta, erected in 1824 for the purpose of carrying out to its full extent, and independently of the Ministry, the victory of bigotry and absolutism." In 1825, Bermudez was driven to resign. "The Junta . . . in the spring of 1827 excited in Catalonia an insurrection of the Serviles. The insurgents styled themselves Aggraviados (aggrieved persons), because the King did not restore the Inquisition, and because he sometimes listened to his half Liberal ministers, or to the French and English ambassadors, instead of suffering the Junta to rule uncontrolled. The history of the revolt is obscure. . . . The object seems to have been to dethrone Ferdinand in favour of his brother Carlos." The insurrection

was suppressed, "the province disarmed, and many persons executed."—T H Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, bk.* 8 (*v* 4)

ALSO IN E Blaquiere, *Historical Review of the Spanish Revolution.*—F. A. de Châteaubriand, *Memoirs: Congress of Verona, v* 1—S Walpole, *Hist. of Eng., ch.* 9 (*v.* 2)—Sir A Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1815–1852, *ch* 7 *and* 11–12

A. D. 1815.—The Allies in France. See FRANCE: A D 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1815.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE

A. D. 1818.—Chile lost to the Spanish crown. See CHILE: A D 1810–1818

A. D. 1821.—Mexican independence practically gained.—Iturbide's empire. See MEXICO: A D 1820–1826

A. D. 1822-1823.—The Congress of Verona.—French intervention approved. See VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF

A. D. 1824.—Peruvian independence won at Ayacucho. See PERU: A D 1820–1826.

A. D. 1833.—Accession of Isabella II.

A. D. 1833-1846.—The civil war of Carlists and Christinos.—Abdication of Christina.—Regency of Espartero.—Revolution of 1843.—Accession of Queen Isabella.—Louis Philippe and his Spanish marriages.—"The eyes of King Ferdinand VII. were scarcely closed, September 29th 1833, when the Apostolic party—whose strength lay in the north of Spain, and especially in Navarre and the Basque provinces—proclaimed his brother, Don Carlos, king under the title of Charles V *In order to offer a* successful resistance to the Carlists, who were fighting for absolutism and priestcraft, there was no other course for the regent, Maria Christina, than to throw herself into the arms of the liberal party. So the seven years' war between Carlists and Christinos, from a war of succession, became a strife of principles and a war of citizens At the outset, owing to the skill of General Zumalacarreguy, to whom the Christinos could oppose no leader of equal ability, the Carlists had the advantage in the field. Don Carlos threatened the Spanish frontiers from Portugal, where he had been living in exile with his dear nephew, Don Miguel. In this strait, Christina applied to England and France, and between those two states and Spain and Portugal was concluded the quadruple alliance of April 22d, 1834, the aim of which was to uphold the constitutional thrones of Isabella and Maria da Gloria, and to drive out the two pretenders, Carlos and Miguel. In that year both pretenders, who enjoyed to a high degree the favor of the Pope and the Eastern powers, had to leave Portugal. Carlos reached England on an English ship in June, but fled again in July, and, after an adventurous journey through France, appeared suddenly in Navarre, to inspire his followers with courage by the royal presence. The war was conducted with passion and cruelty on both sides. After the death of Zumalacarreguy at the siege of Bilbao, June 14th, 1835, the Christinos, who were superior in point of numbers, seemed to have the advantage. . . . The turning-point was reached when the command of the Christino army was committed to Espartero. In 1836 he defeated the Carlists in the murderous battle of Luchana. In 1837, when Carlos advanced into the neighborhood of Madrid, he hastened to the succor of the capital, and compelled him to retreat. To these losses were added disunion in the Carlist camp. The utterly incapable, dependent pretender was the tool of his Camarilla, which made excellence in the catechism a more important requisite for the chief command than military science, and which deposed the most capable generals to put its own creatures in command. The new commander in-chief, Guergué, said, bluntly, to Carlos, 'We, the blockheads and ignoramuses, have yet to conduct your Majesty to Madrid; and whoever does not belong in that category is a traitor.' This Apostolic hero was defeated several times by Espartero in 1838, and the enthusiasm of the northern provinces gradually cooled down. He was deposed, and the chief command intrusted to the cunning Maroto. . . . As he [Maroto] did not succeed in winning victories over Espartero, who overmatched him, he concluded, instead, August 31st, 1839, the treaty of Vergara, in accordance with which he went over to the Christinos, with his army, and by that means obtained full amnesty, and the confirmation of the privileges of Navarre and the Basque provinces. After this, Don Carlos's cause was hopelessly lost. He fled, in September, to France, with many of his followers, and was compelled to pass six years in Bourges under police supervision. In 1845, after he had resigned his claims in favor of his eldest son, the Duke of Montemolin, he received permission to depart, and went to Italy. He died in Trieste, March 10th, 1855 His followers, under Cabrera, carried on the war for some time longer in Catalonia. But they, too, were overcome by Espartero, and in July, 1840, they fled, about 8,000 strong, to France, where they were put under surveillance. The civil war was at an end, but the strife of principles continued Espartero, who had been made Duke of Victory (Vittoria), was the most important and popular personage in Spain, with whom the regent, as well as everybody else, had to reckon. In the mean time Christina had contrived to alienate the respect and affection of the Spaniards, both by her private life and her political conduct. Her liberal paroxysms were not serious, and gave way, as soon as the momentary need was past, to the most opposite tendency. . . . In 1836 the Progressists apprehended a reaction, and sought to anticipate it. Insurrections were organized in the larger cities, and the constitution of 1812 was made the programme of the revolt. . . . Soldiers of the guard forced their way into the palace, and compelled [Christina] to accept the constitution of 1812. A constitutional assembly undertook a revision of this, and therefrom resulted the new constitution of 1837. Christina swore to it, but hoped, by controlling the elections, to bring the Moderados into the Cortes and the ministry. When she succeeded in this, in 1840, she issued a municipal ordinance placing the appointment of the municipal authorities in the hands of the administration. This occasioned riots in Madrid and other cities; and when Christina commissioned Espartero, who was just returning victorious, to suppress the revolt in Madrid, he refused to constitute himself the tool of an unpopular policy. But he was the only man who could hold in check the revolution which threatened to break out on all sides; and so, September 16th, 1840, he had to be named minister president. . . . Under such circumstances the regency had but little charm for Christina, and there were, more-

over, other causes working with these to the same result. Soon after the death of her husband, she had bestowed her favor on a young lifeguardsman named Munoz, made him her chamberlain, and been secretly married to him. This union soon published itself in a rich blessing of offspring, but it was not until the year 1844 that her public marriage with Munoz, and his elevation to the rank of duke (of Rianzares) and grandee of Spain took place. Having by this course of life forfeited the fame of an honest woman, and exposed herself to all sorts of attacks, she preferred to leave the country. October 12th, she abdicated the regency, and journeyed to France. May 8th, 1841, the newly elected Cortes named Espartero regent of Spain, and guardian of Queen Isabella and her sister, the Infanta Luisa Fernanda. . . . Since he knew how actively Christina, supported by Louis Philippe, was working against him with gold and influence, he entered into closer relations with England, whereupon his envious foes and rivals accused him of the sale of Spanish commercial interests to England Because he quieted rebellious Barcelona by a bombardment in 1842, he was accused of tyranny In 1843 new insurrections broke out in the south, Colonel Prim hastened to Catalonia, and set himself at the head of the soldiers whom Christina's agents had won over by a liberal use of money, Espartero's deadliest foe, General Narvaez, landed in Valencia, and marched into Madrid at the head of the troops Espartero, against whom Progressists and Moderados had conspired together, found himself forsaken, and embarked at Cadiz, July 26th 1843, for England, whence he did not dare to return to his own country until 1848 In November, 1843, the thirteen year-old Isabella was declared of age. She assumed the government, made Narvaez, now Duke of Valencia, minister president, and recalled her mother Thereby gate and doors were opened to the French influence, and the game of intrigue and reaction recommenced. In 1845 the constitution of 1837 was altered in the interests of absolutism . . . In order to secure to his house a lasting influence in Spain, and acquire for it the reversion of the Spanish throne, Louis Philippe, in concert with Christina, effected, October 16th, 1846, the marriage of Isabella with her kinsman Francis of Assis, and of the Infanta Luisa with the Duke of Montpensier, his own youngest son (At first his plan was to marry Isabella also to one of his sons, the Duke of Aumale, but he abandoned it on account of the energetic protest of the Palmerston cabinet, and, instead, chose for Isabella, in Francis of Assis, the person who, by reason of his mental and physical weakness, would be least likely to stand in the way of his son Montpensier.) This secretly negotiated marriage cost Louis Philippe the friendship of the English cabinet."—W. Müller, *Political Hist. of Modern Times, sect.* 9.

ALSO IN: W. Bollaert, *The Wars of Succession in Portugal and Spain, 1826 to 1840*, v. 2.—C. F. Henningsen, *A Twelve Months' Campaign with Zumalacarregui.*—Sir H. L. Bulwer (Lord Dalling), *Life of Palmerston*, v. 8, *ch.* 7.—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 2, *ch.* 6.

A. D. 1845-1860.—Cuba in danger from the United States.—Filibustering movements.—The Ostend Manifesto. See CUBA: A. D. 1845–1860.

A. D. 1861.—Allied intervention in Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1861–1867.

A. D. 1866. — War with Peru. — Repulse from Callao. See PERU: A. D. 1826–1876.

A. D. 1866-1873.—Vices and misgovernment of Isabella.— Revolution of 1868.—Flight of the Queen.—Constitution of 1869.—Religious toleration.—Candidates for the vacant throne.—Election of Amadeo of Italy.— Unfriendliness of the nation to him.—His abdication.— "In January, 1866, occurred an insurrection headed by General Prim, a leading officer of the army, which, failing, caused his temporary exile. In June there originated in the barrack of San Gil, a few hundred yards from the palace, a more serious revolt, which extended over a great part of Madrid. In October of the same year the Ministry, in a public proclamation, alleged as a justification for an autocratic exercise of power, that 'revolutionary tendencies constituted an imposing organism with dangerous pretensions; that a rebellion adverse to the fundamental institutions of the country and the dynasty of Isabella, such as had never been seen in Spain, had obtained possession of important municipalities, and triumphed in the deputations from all the provinces,' and that it was necessary to dissolve the municipalities and renew the provisional deputations. . . . By this arbitrary assumption Spain was under as complete a despotism as existed in the neighboring empire of Morocco. The dissatisfaction at such maladministration, such abuses in the government, and the thinly disguised immoralities of the Queen, soon found expression in audible murmurs and severe criticism These verbal protests were followed by machinations for the overthrow or control of a sovereign subject to ambitious priests and a venal coterie. Two exiles, Marshal Serrano and Marshal Prim, united with Admiral Topete at Cadiz, and began a revolution which soon had the sympathy and co-operation of a large part of the army and the navy. A provisional revolutionary junta of forty-one persons—a few others, notably Sagasta and Martos, were afterwards added—was appointed, which signed decrees and orders having the force and effect of laws. In less than a month Francisco Serrano was authorized by the junta to form a temporary ministry to rule the country until the Cortes should meet. The defeat of the royal troops near Alcolea prevented the return of Isabella to Madrid, and on September 30, 1868, she fled across the border into France. . . . With the flight of the Queen vanished for a time the parliamentary monarchy, and, despite her impotent proclamations from France, and offers of amnesty, a provisional government was at once established. A decree of the Government to take inventories of all the libraries, collections of manuscripts, works of art, or objects of historical value—a measure necessary to make useful and available these treasures, and to prevent spoliation and transfer—was peacefully executed except at Burgos. Here, under instigation of the priests and aided by them, a mob assembled, broke down the doors of the cathedral, assassinated the Governor, wounded the chief of police, and expelled those engaged in making the required examination and inventory. This outbreak, attributed to a clerical and Carlist conspiracy, awakened opposition and horror. A strong pressure was created for the immediate establishment of freedom of

worship. The atrocious butchery at Burgos aroused the inhabitants of the capital. The Nuncio was so imperilled by the excited populace that the diplomatic corps interposed for the safety and protection of their colleague. Marshal Serrano quieted the angry multitude gathered at his residence by saying that the Government had prepared the project of a constitution to be submitted to the Constitutional Assembly, one of whose first articles was liberty of worship. On February 12, 1869, the Constitutional Cortes convoked by the Provisional Government, assembled with unusual pomp and ceremony and with striking demonstrations of popular enthusiasm. . . . The Republicans among whom the eloquent Castelar was influential, were a compact phalanx, and to them the independent Progresistas, led by General Prim, made overtures which were accepted. On Sunday June 5, 1869, the Constitution was promulgated. . . . While recognizing the provinces and endowing them with important functions, the Cortes rejected the plan of a federal republic, and adhered to the monarchical form of government as corresponding with and a concession to Spanish traditions, and as most likely to secure a larger measure of the liberal principles of the revolution. The Constitution, the legitimate outgrowth of that popular uprising, recognized the natural and inherent rights of man, and established an elective monarchy. . . . Congress was chosen by universal suffrage. The provincial assemblies and the municipal authorities were elected by the people of their respective localities The ancient privileges of the aristocracy were annulled, and the equality of all men before the law was recognized. . . . The Clerical party claimed the continued maintenance of the Roman Catholic Church and the exclusion of all other worship, but the country had outgrown such intolerance . . . The Catholic form of faith was retained in the organic law as the religion of the State, but a larger liberty of worship was secured to the people. In Article XXI. the Catholic Apostolic Roman religion was declared the State religion, and the obligation to maintain its worship and ministers was imposed. Foreigners were granted toleration for public and private worship under the limitations of the universal rules of morals and right, and Spaniards, even, professing another than the Catholic religion were to have the like toleration. . . . Spain quietly passed from the anomalous condition of a provisional into a regular constitutional government, the title of Provisional Government having been changed to that of Executive Power. In June a regency was established, and Serrano was chosen by a vote of 193 to 45. From June 16, 1869, the date of Prim's first cabinet, until December 27, 1870, when he was shot [as he rode through the street, by assassins, who escaped], he had four separate ministries besides several changes of individual ministers; and this instability is characteristic of Spanish politics. . . . For the vacant throne some Spaniards turned to the Duke of Montpensier; some to the Court of Portugal, and in default thereof to the house of Savoy. . . . At the moment of greatest embarrassment, the candidature of Leopold, Prince of Hohenzollern, was proposed [—a proposal which led to the Franco-German war: see FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JUNE — JULY)]. . . . Leopold's declension was a welcome relief. His candidacy being removed, the strife for the throne became fiercer. On November 8, 1870, General Prim announced to the Cortes the Duke of Aosta, son of Victor Emmanuel, as the Ministerial candidate for the crown. Castelar impetuously denounced the attempt to put a foreigner over Spaniards. On the 15th Amadeo was elected king, receiving on a vote by ballot a majority of seventy-one of those present and a majority of eighteen in a full house. . . . The choice excited no enthusiasm, elicited no applause, nor was a viva given by the multitude outside the building where the Cortes had made a sovereign. Thirty thousand troops, discreetly posted in principal thoroughfares, prevented any hostile demonstration, and the leading Republicans, Figueras, Castelar, and Piyy Margall, advised against any acts of violence. Many journals condemned the Cortes. Grandees protested, placards caricatured and ridiculed. . . . Nevertheless, Zorrilla went to Italy to make the formal tender of the crown, and on January 2, 1871, the prince reached Madrid and took the prescribed oaths of office in the presence of the regent, the Cortes, and the diplomatic corps. The ceremony was brief and simple. The reception by the populace was respectful and cold. The Provisional Government resigned, and a new ministry was appointed, embracing such men as Serrano, Martos, Moret, Sagasta, and Zorrilla. . . . Amadeo never had the friendship of the Carlists nor of the simon-pure Monarchists. The dynasty was offensive to the adherents of Don Carlos and of Alfonso, and to the Republicans, who were opposed to any king. . . . Becoming [after two years] convinced that the Opposition was irreconcilable, that factions were inevitable, that a stable ministry was impossible, Amadeo resolved on the singular course of abdicating the royal authority, and returning to the nation the powers with which he had been intrusted;" and this abdication he performed on the 11th of February, 1873.—J. L. M. Curry, *Constitutional Government in Spain, ch.* 3–4.

ALSO IN J. A. Harrison, *Spain, ch.* 27–28.

A. D. 1873-1885.—Reign of Alphonso XII., son of Queen Isabella.—On the abdication of King Amadeo, "a republic was declared by the Cortes, and the gifted and eminent statesman, Castelar, strove to give it a constitutional and conservative character. But during the disorders of the last few years the Basque provinces of Navarre and Biscay had been in a ferment excited by the Carlists. The grandson of the Don Carlos who had troubled Spain from 1833 to 1839 appeared in those provinces which were still favourable to his cause, and this ardent young champion of divine right of course received the support of French legitimists. On the other hand, the doctrines of the Paris Commune had found in the south of Spain many adherents, who desired that their country should form a federation of provincial republics. Malaga, Seville, Cadiz, Cartagena, and Valencia revolted, and were reduced only after sharp fighting. A group of generals then determined to offer the crown to Alphonso, the young son of Isabella II, in whose favour she had abdicated in 1868. Castelar, the moderate republican statesman, reluctantly consented, and young Alphonso XII, on landing in Spain, 1874, received the support of most republicans and Carlists, disgusted by the excesses of their extreme partisans. His generals gradually hemmed

in the Carlists along the north coast by battles near Bilbao and Irun; and when the rebels shot a German subject Prince Bismarck sent German ships to aid the Alphonsists. These in the spring of 1876 forced Don Carlos and most of his supporters to cross the French frontier. The Madrid Government now determined to put an end to the fueros or local privileges of the Basque provinces, which they had misused in openly preparing this revolt. So Biscay and Navarre henceforth contributed to the general war expenses of Spain, and their conscripts were incorporated with the regular army of Spain. Thus the last municipal and provincial privileges of the old Kingdom of Navarre vanished, and national unity became more complete in Spain, as in every other country of Europe except Austria and Turkey. The Basque provinces resisted the change which placed them on a level with the rest of Spain, and have not yet become reconciled to the Madrid Government. The young King, Alphonso XII, had many other difficulties to meet. The government was disorganised, the treasury empty, and the country nearly ruined; but he had a trusty adviser in Calovas del Castillo, a man of great prudence and talent, who, whether prime minister or out of office, has really held power in his hands. He succeeded in unifying the public debt, and by lowering its rate of interest he averted State bankruptcy. He also strove to free the administration from the habits of bribe-taking which had long enfeebled and disgraced it; but in this he met with less success, as also in striving for purity of parliamentary election. . . . The Senate is composed of (1) nobles, (2) deputies elected by the corporations and wealthy classes, and (3) of life senators appointed by the crown. The Chamber of Deputies is elected by universal suffrage, one deputy for every 50,000 inhabitants. The king or either House of Parliament has the right of proposing laws. In 1883 King Alphonso paid a visit to Berlin, and was made honorary colonel of a Uhlan regiment. For this he was hooted and threatened by the Parisians on his visit to the French capital; and this reception increased the coldness of Spain toward the French, who had aggrieved their southern neighbour by designs on Morocco. The good understanding between Spain and Germany was overclouded by a dispute about the Caroline Islands in the Pacific, which Spain rightly regarded as her own. This aggravated an illness of Alphonso, who died suddenly (November 25, 1885). His young widow, as queen-regent for her infant child, has hitherto [1889] succeeded with marvellous tact."—J. H. Rose, *A Century of Continental History, ch.* 43.

A. D. 1885-1894.—Alphonso XIII.—At the time of this writing (November, 1894), the queen-regent, Maria Christina, is still reigning in the name of her young son, Alphonso XIII.

SPALATO. See SALONA, ANCIENT.

SPANISH AMERICA: A. D. 1492-1517.—Discoveries and early settlements. See AMERICA: A. D. 1492, to 1513-1517.

A. D. 1517-1524.—Discovery and conquest of Mexico. See AMERICA: A. D. 1517-1518; and MEXICO: 1519, to 1521-1524.

A. D. 1527-1533.—Discovery and conquest of Peru. See AMERICA: A. D. 1524-1528; and PERU: A. D. 1528-1531, and 1531-1533.

A. D. 1533.—Conquest of the kingdom of Quito. See ECUADOR.

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

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

A. D. 1542-1568.—Establishment of the audiencias of Quito, Charcas, New Granada, and Chile, under the viceroyalty of Peru. See AUDIENCIAS.

A. D. 1546-1724.—The Araucanian War. See CHILE: A. D. 1450-1724.

A. D. 1580.—Final founding of the city of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777.

A. D. 1608-1767.—The Jesuits in Paraguay. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608-1873.

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

A. D. 1767.—Expulsion of the Jesuits. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608-1873.

A. D. 1776.—Creation of the viceroyalty of Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1580-1777; and PERU: A. D. 1550-1816.

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

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

A. D. 1810-1821.—The War of Independence in Venezuela and New Granada. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1810-1819.

A. D. 1811.—Paraguayan independence accomplished. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1608-1873.

A. D. 1820-1826.—The independence of Mexico.—Brief Empire of Iturbide.—The Federal Republic established. See MEXICO: A. D. 1820-1826.

A. D. 1821.—Independence acquired in the Central American States. See CENTRAL AMERICA: A. D. 1821-1871.

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

A. D. 1826.—The Congress of Panama. See COLOMBIAN STATES: A. D. 1826.

A. D. 1828.—The Banda Oriental becomes the Republic of Uruguay. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1819-1874.

SPANISH ARMADA, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1588.

SPANISH COINS.—"The early chroniclers make their reckonings of values under different names at different times. Thus during the discoveries of Columbus we hear of little else but 'maravedis'; then the 'peso de oro' takes the lead, together with the 'castellano'; all along 'marco' and 'ducado' being occasionally used. At the beginning of the 16th century, and before and after, Spanish values were reckoned from a mark of silver, which was the standard. A mark was half a pound either of gold or silver. The gold mark was divided into 50 castellanos; the silver mark into eight ounces. In the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the mark was divided by law into 65 'reales de vellon' of 34 maravedis each, making 2,210 maravedis in a mark. . . . In the reign of Alfonso XI., 1312-1350, there were 125 maravedis to the mark, while in the reign of Ferdinand VII., 1808-1833, a mark was

divided into 5,440 maravedis. In Spanish America a 'real' is one-eighth of a 'peso,' and equal to 2½ reales de vellon. The peso contains one ounce of silver; it was formerly called 'peso de ocho reales de plata,' whence came the term 'pieces of eight,' a vulgarism at one time in vogue among the merchants and buccaneers in the West Indies . . The castellano, the one fiftieth of the golden mark, in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, was equivalent to 490 maravedis of that day The 'peso de oro,' according to Oviedo, was exactly equivalent to the castellano, and either was one third greater than the ducado or ducat. The 'doblon' . . was first struck by Ferdinand and Isabella as a gold coin of the weight of two castellanos. The modern doubloon is an ounce of coined gold, and is worth 16 pesos fuertes Reduced to United States currency, the peso fuerte, as slightly alloyed bullion, is in weight nearly enough equivalent to one dollar. Therefore a mark of silver is equal to 8 dollars, a piece of eight, equal to one peso, which equals one dollar; a real de vellon, 5 cents, a Spanish-American real, 12½ cents; a maravedi, $\frac{1}{272}$ of a cent, a castellano, or peso de oro $2.56, a doubloon $5.14; a ducat, $1 92, a mark of gold $128, assuming the United States alloy. The fact that a castellano was equivalent to only 490 maravedis shows the exceedingly high value of silver as compared with gold at the period in question."— H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. of the Pacific States, v.* 1, *pp.* 192–193, *foot-note.*

SPANISH CONSPIRACY, The. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1785–1800.

SPANISH ERA, The. See ERA, SPANISH.

SPANISH FURY, The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575–1577.

SPANISH INQUISITION, The. See INQUISITION. A. D. 1203–1525.

SPANISH MAIN, The. — "The Spanish main was simply the mainland, terra firma, of Spanish America, as opposed to the islands: but the term 'terra firma' was specially applied to the northern part of South America, extending 'all along the North Sea from the Pacific Ocean to the mouth of the river of Amazons upon the Atlantic' (Burke, European Settlements in America, Pt. III., chap. xvi.), and comprising the towns of Panama, Carthagena, and Porto Bello [see TIERRA FIRME]. Longfellow blunders in the 'Wreck of the Hesperus' when he speaks of the old sailor who 'had sailed the Spanish main.'"—C. P. Lucas, *Hist. Geog. of the British Colonies, v.* 2, *p.* 35, *foot-note.*

SPANISH MARCH, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 778.

SPANISH MARRIAGES, The question of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1841–1848.

SPANISH SUCCESSION, The War of the. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698–1700, and after; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702–1704, and after; GERMANY: A. D. 1702, and after; ITALY: A. D. 1701–1718; NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702–1710; and UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714.

SPARTA: The City.—Its situation, origin and growth.— Laconia.— "Hollow Lacedæmon."—"Laconia is formed by two mountain-chains running immediately from Arcadia [from the center to the southeastern extremity of Peloponnesus], and enclosing the river Eurotas, whose source is separated from that of an Arcadian stream by a very trifling elevation. The Eurotas is, for some way below the city of Sparta, a rapid mountain-stream; then, after forming a cascade, it stagnates into a morass; but lower down it passes over a firm soil in a gentle and direct course. Near the town of Sparta rocks and hills approach the banks on both sides, and almost entirely shut in the river both above and below the town: this enclosed plain is without doubt the 'hollow Lacedæmon' of Homer."—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiq. of the Doric Race, bk* 1, *ch.* 4.—Upon the Dorian invasion and occupation of Peloponnesus (see DORIANS AND IONIANS) the city and neighborhood of Sparta in Laconia,—i e. Sparta and 'hollow Lacedæmon,'—became the seat of the dominant state which they founded in the peninsula. The conquerors, themselves, and their descendants, were the only full citizens of this Spartan state and were called Spartiatæ or Spartans. The prior inhabitants of the country were reduced to political dependence, in a class called the Periœci, or else to actual serfdom in the more degraded class known as Helots. "Sparta was not, like other towns of the Greeks, composed of a solid body of houses, but, originally in a rural and open situation on the river and its canals, it gradually stretched out into the open country, and Dorians lived far beyond Sparta along the entire valley, without the inhabitants of remoter points being on that account in any less degree citizens of Sparta than those dwelling by the ford of the Eurotas. They were all Spartans, as by a stricter term they were called, as distinguished from the Lacedæmonians . . Strictly apart from this exclusive community of Spartiatæ there remained, with its ancient conditions of life intact, the older population of the land, which dwelt scattered on the mountains surrounding the land of the Spartiatæ on all sides (hence called the dwellers-around, or Periœci). More than trebling the Spartiatæ in number, they cultivated the incomparably less remunerative arable land of the mountains, the precipitous declivities of which they made available by means of terraced walls for cornfields and vineyards. . . . Free proprietors on their own holdings, they, according to primitive custom, offered their tribute to the kings. The country people, on the other hand, residing on the fields of the Spartiatæ, met with a harder fate. Part of them probably consisted of peasants on the domains; others had been conquered in the course of internal feuds. They were left on the fields which had been once their own, on the condition of handing over to the Spartiatæ quartered upon them an important portion of their produce. This oppression provoked several risings; and we must assume that the ancient sea-town of Helos was for a time the centre of one of these outbreaks. For this is the only admissible explanation of the opinion universally prevailing among the ancients, that from that town is derived the name of the Helots."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, v.* 1, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.

The Constitution ascribed to Lycurgus.—"Sparta was the city from which the Dorians slowly extended their dominion over a considerable portion of Peloponnesus. Of the progress of her power we have only the most meagre information. . . . The internal condition of Sparta at this early period is uniformly

described as one of strife and bad government, a condition of affairs which was certainly unfavourable to external development and conquest Herodotus attributes these dissensions, at least in part, to the mutual animosity of the two royal families, the twin sons of Aristodemus quarrelled all their lives, and their descendants after them did the same Plutarch, on the other hand, speaks of quarrels between the kings and the people Whatever the cause, it is more certain than any other fact in early Spartan history that the condition of the country was for a long time one of internal strife and dissension It was the great merit of Lycurgus to have put an end to this disastrous state of affairs Lycurgus is the foremost name in Spartan history Tradition is nearly unanimous in describing this lawgiver as the author of the prosperity of Sparta, and the founder of her peculiar institutions, but about the date and the events of his life the greatest uncertainty prevailed Thucydides, though he does not mention Lycurgus, asserts that the form of the government had continued the same in Sparta for more than four hundred years before the end of the Peloponnesian war In his opinion, therefore, the reforms of Lycurgus were introduced shortly before 804 B C This date is considerably later than that usually given to Lycurgus, on the authority of the ancient chronologers Herodotus tells us that Lycurgus, when visiting the Delphic shrine, was hailed by the priestess as a being more than human and some authorities asserted that the Spartan institutions were revealed to him there The Lacedaemonians, however, regarded Crete as the source of their peculiar arrangements [see CRETE] They were thus enabled to connect them with the great name of Minos, and derive their authority from Zeus himself Plutarch has fortunately transcribed the text of the Rhetrae, or ordinances, which were given to Lycurgus at Delphi There does not seem to be any reason to doubt that these were the oldest ordinances known at Sparta, or that they formed the basis of their 'good government' They were therefore the oldest political ordinances known in Hellas, and, indeed, in the world 'Found a temple to Zeus Hellanius, and Athena Hellania, arrange the tribes, and the Obes, thirty in number, establish the Gerousia with the Archagetae Summon the people for meeting from time to time between Babyca and the Cnacion, there bring forward and decide (reject) The people are to have the supreme power' Thus the first duty of the lawgiver was to found a public sanctuary which should be as it were the centre of the community Then the people were to be arranged in tribes and Obes The division into tribes was not a new one, from the first the Dorians at Sparta, as elsewhere, when free from the admixture of external elements, were divided into three tribes, Hylleis, Dymanes, Pamphyli, but it is possible that some changes were now introduced, regulating the internal arrangement of the tribe In each tribe were ten Obes, of which we know nothing beyond the name They appear to have been local divisions As the Gerousia [see GERUSIA], including the kings, contained thirty members, we may conjecture that each Obe was represented in the Senate, and therefore that the two kings were the representatives of two distinct Obes. The Archagetae are the kings, or leaders of the people. From time to time the community were to be summoned to a meeting Before the assembled people measures were to be introduced that they might decide upon them, for no measure was valid which had not received the sanction of the whole people The elements with which these ordinances deal — the Kings, the Council and the Assembly — appear in the Homeric poems, and grew naturally out of the patriarchal government of the tribe The work of Lycurgus did not consist in creating new elements, but in consolidating those which already existed into a harmonious whole Three other ordinances which are ascribed to Lycurgus forbade (1) the use of written laws, (2) the use of any tools but the axe and saw in building a house, (3) frequent wars upon the same enemies He is also said to have forbidden the use of coined money in Sparta Neither gold nor silver was to be used for purposes of exchange, but bars of iron, which by their small value and great bulk rendered money dealings on any large scale impossible The iron of these bars was also made unusually brittle in order that it might be use less for ordinary purposes Such precepts were doubtless observed at Sparta, though they may not have been derived from Lycurgus. The training which every Spartan underwent was intended to diminish the sphere of positive law as much as possible, and to encourage the utmost simplicity and even rudeness of life . About a century after Lycurgus, in the reign of Theopompus, two changes of great importance were made in the Spartan constitution The veto which the earlier rhetra had allowed to the assembled people was cancelled, and a new law was introduced, which gave the ultimate control to the Gerontes and Kings 'If the people decide crookedly, the elders and chiefs shall put it back,' i e shall reverse the popular decision Under what circumstances this ordinance, which is said to have been obtained from Delphi, was passed, we do not know, nor is it quite clear how it consists with what we find recorded of the constitutional history of Sparta in later times.

The second innovation was even more important Though Herodotus ascribes the institution of the Ephoralty [see EPHORS] to Lycurgus, it seems more correct to follow Aristotle and others in ascribing it to Theopompus. The Ephors, who were five in number, appear in the first instance to have been of no great importance But as they were intimately connected with the commons, elected from and by them as their representatives, we must assume that the ephoralty was a concession to the people, and it may have been a compensation for the loss of the right of voting in the assembly In time the ephors grew to be the most important officers in the state, both in war and in peace. They were associated with the council, they presided in the assembly, and even the kings were not exempt from their power To this result the growing dread of 'a tyrannis,' like that at Corinth or Sicyon, and the increasing importance of the Spartan training, which the ephors superintended, in a great measure contributed. . . . The kings were the leaders of the army. For a time they always took the field together, but owing to the dissensions of Cleomenes and Demaratus, a law was passed that one king only should go out with the army, and it was henceforth the custom for one king only to be absent from Sparta, at a

time. The kings had the right of making war on whom they would, and no one could prevent them, on pain of being under a curse, but as they were liable to be brought to trial on their return for failure in an expedition, they usually obtained the consent of the ephors or the assembly before going. . . . The origin of the dual monarchy, which from the first was so distinctive a feature of the Spartan government, is very obscure, and many attempts have been made to explain it. It may have arisen by a fusion of the native and immigrant races, each of which was allowed to retain its own prince in the new community . It is perhaps more reasonable to assume that the two kings represent two leading families, each of which had a claim to give a chief to the community. That two families holding equal rights should be regarded as descended from the twin sons of the Dorian founder of Sparta is merely one of the fictions which of necessity arose in the period when all political unions and arrangements were expressed in the terms of genealogical connection . . The Apella was an assembly of all the Spartan citizens who had reached the age of thirty years . . In historical times it was presided over by the ephors. No speaking was allowed except by officers of State and persons duly invited, and perhaps the Senators The votes were given by acclamation. The assembly decided on war and peace, treaties, and foreign politics generally, it elected the ephors and gerontes . More important for the development of Sparta than her political constitution was the education and training which her citizens received. The Spartan did not exist for himself but for his city, for her service he was trained from birth, and the most intimate relations of his life were brought under her control. In the secluded valley of the Eurotas, where till the time of Epaminondas no invader ever set foot, amid profound peace, he nevertheless led the life of a warrior in the field. His strength and endurance were tested to the utmost; he was not permitted to surrender himself to the charm of family life and domestic affections. Even when allowed to marry, he spent but little time at home, his children, if thought worthy of life, were taken from him at an early age to go through the same training in which he himself had been brought up. Only when he reached the age of sixty years, at which he could no longer serve his country in the field, was he permitted to enjoy the feeling of personal freedom."—E. Abbott, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 1, *ch* 6

Also in: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 6.—G. W. Cox, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 1, *ch.* 5.—C. O. Müller, *Hist. and Antiquities of the Doric Race, bk.* 3 (*v.* 2).

B. C. 743-510.—The First and Second Messenian Wars.—Military supremacy in Peloponnesus established.—"The effect of the Lycurgean institutions was to weld the people of Sparta into what Grote well denominates a 'military brotherhood'—the most potent military machine which at that time, and for long after, existed in Greece or in the world. Had their political ambition and ability been proportionate, it is difficult to doubt that the Lacedæmonians might have anticipated the career of the Romans; but their inability to produce really great statesmen, and the iron rigidity of their political system, placed in their path effectual barriers to the attainment of such grandeur. . . . The first object of their attacks was the neighbouring Dorian kingdom of Messenia. The kinship between the two peoples and their rulers had previously kept them on friendly terms. It was symbolized and expressed by joint sacrifices, annually celebrated at a temple in honour of Artemis which stood on the borders between the two countries, near the source of the river Neda. It was a quarrel that broke out at these annual rites which led to the outbreak of the first Messenian war, about 743 B C. The circumstances of the quarrel were differently related by the two parties, but it resulted in the death of Teleclus, one of the Spartan kings. His subjects invaded Messenia to obtain redress. At first the struggle was of an indecisive character, but ultimately the Messenians were obliged to take refuge on the fortified mountain of Ithome, and all the rest of their country was overrun and conquered by their persistent enemies After the war had lasted twenty years, the Messenian garrison was compelled to abandon Ithome, the fortifications of which were razed by the Spartans, and Messenia became part of the Lacedæmonian territory, —all its inhabitants who refused to submit being driven into exile Pausanius and other ancient writers give long details of the events of this twenty years' struggle, the great hero of which was the Messenian king Aristomenes, but these details are as legendary as the exploits of the Homeric heroes, and all that is certainly known about the war is that it ended in the subjugation of Messenia The severity and oppression with which the conquered people were ruled led them, about forty years later, to rise up in revolt, and another struggle of seventeen years' duration followed In this, again, Aristomenes is represented as the Messenian leader, although he had put an end to his own life at the unsuccessful close of the former contest, and the later Hellenic writers tried to get over this impossibility by declaring that the Aristomenes of the second war must have been a descendant of the earlier hero bearing the same name. In the course of the war the Spartans suffered severely, as the Messenians had the support of other Peloponnesian communities — especially the Arcadians — who had begun to dread the strength and arrogance of the Lacedæmonians. Ultimately, however, the revolt was crushed, and from that time till the days of Epaminondas, Messenia remained a part of the Laconian territory [see Messenian Wars, First and Second]. To Sparta it was an important acquisition, for the plain of the Pamisus was the most fertile district in Peloponnesus. The Spartans next became aggressive on the eastern and northern frontiers of their territory. Among the numerous independent communities of Arcadia, the two most important were Tegea and Mantinea, in the extreme east of the Arcadian territory. With these cities, especially the former, the Spartans had some severe struggles, but were not able to conquer them, though they established a dominant influence, and reduced them to the position of dependent allies. From Argos . . . the Lacedæmonians wrested, in the course of two centuries, the strip of territory between the Parnon range and the sea from Thyrea down to the Malean promontory. By the beginning of the 6th century B. C. they were masters of two-fifths of the whole area of Peloponnesus,—a

territory of something more than 8,000 square miles. To modern notions, such a territory, which is smaller in extent than more than one Scottish county, seems utterly insignificant; but it sufficed to make Sparta the largest and strongest state in Hellas, and even at the pinnacle of her power she never made any further addition to her possessions in Peloponnesus Protected from invasion by impregnable natural defences, and possessing a military discipline, a social and political unity, such as no other Grecian community could boast, the Lacedæmonians possessed peculiar advantages in the competition for the Hellenic leadership . . It was about the close of the 6th century B C. that Sparta, having asserted her supremacy in Peloponnesus, began to take an active part in the affairs of the Hellenic communities outside the peninsula . In 510 B C her king, Cleomenes, went to Athens at the head of a large force to obey the mandate of the Delphic oracle and 'liberate the city' by the expulsion of the Pisistratids "—C H. Hanson, *The Land of Greece, ch* 11

ALSO IN C Thirlwall, *Hist of Greece, ch* 9.—G Grote, *Hist of Greece, pt* 2, *ch* 7–8

B. C. 509-506.— Persistent undertakings of Cleomenes to restore tyranny at Athens, opposed by the Corinthians and other allies. See ATHENS B C 509–506

B. C. 508.—Interference of King Cleomenes at Athens, and its failure. See ATHENS B C 510–507

B. C. 501.—Refusal of aid to the Ionian revolt. See PERSIA B C 521–493

B. C. 496.—War with Argos.—Prostration of the Argive state. See ARGOS B C 496–421

B. C. 492-491.—Headship in Greece recognized.—Defiance of the Persian king.—Enforced unity of Greece for war. See GREECE B C 492–491

B. C. 481-479.—Congress at Corinth.—Organized Hellenic Union against Persia.—The Spartan headship. See GREECE B C 481–479

B. C. 480.—The Persian War.—Leonidas and his Three Hundred at Thermopylæ. See GREECE: B. C 480 THERMOPYLÆ

B. C. 478.—Interference to forbid the rebuilding of the walls of Athens, foiled by Themistocles. See ATHENS. B C 479–478

B. C. 478-477.—Mad conduct of Pausanias at Byzantium.— Alienation of the Asiatic Greeks.—Loss of the leadership of the Greek world.—Formation of the Confederacy of Delos, with Athens at its head. See GREECE: B. C. 478–477.

B. C. 464-455.— The great Earthquake.—The Third Messenian War.—Offensive rebuff to Athenian friendliness. See MESSENIAN WARS. THE THIRD.

B. C. 462-458. — Embittered enmity at Athens.—Rise of Pericles and the democratic Anti-Spartan party.—Athenian alliance with Argos, Thessaly, and Megara. See ATHENS. B. C. 466–454.

B. C. 457.— Interference in Phocis.—Collision with the Athenians and victory at Tanagra. See GREECE: B C. 458–456

B. C. 453.—Five years truce with Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 460–449.

B. C. 449-445.—Aid to revolts in Bœotia, Eubœa and Megara against Athenian rule or influence.— The Thirty Years Truce. See GREECE: B. C. 449–445.

B. C. 440. — Interference with Athens in Samos opposed by Corinth. See ATHENS. B. C. 440–437.

B. C. 432-431.—Hearing of charges against Athens.— Congress of Allies.— Decision for war.—Theban attack on Platæa —Opening of the Peloponnesian War. See GREECE: B C. 432–431.

B. C. 431-429.—First and second years of the Peloponnesian War: Invasions of Attica. —Plague at Athens.—Death of Pericles. See GREECE B C 431–429.

B. C. 429-427.— The Peloponnesian War: Siege of Platæa. See GREECE. B. C. 429–427 SIEGE OF PLATÆA

B. C. 428-427.—The Peloponnesian War: Aid to the insurgent Mityleneans.—Its failure. See GREECE: B. C. 429–427 PHORMIO'S SEA-FIGHTS.

B. C. 425.—The Peloponnesian War: Catastrophe at Sphacteria.—Peace pleaded for and refused by Athens. See GREECE: B. C. 425

B. C. 424-421.—Peloponnesian War: Successes of Brasidas in Chalcidice.—Athenian defeat at Delium.—Death of Brasidas.—Peace of Nikias. See GREECE B C. 424–421.

B. C. 421-418.—The Peloponnesian War: New hostile combinations.—The Argive confederacy.—War in Argos and Arcadia.—Victory at Mantinea. See GREECE: B C. 421–418

B. C. 415-413 —The Peloponnesian War: Help to Syracuse against the Athenians.— Comfort to the fugitive Alcibiades. See SYRACUSE B C 415–413

B. C. 413-412.—The Peloponnesian War: Aid to the revolting cities in Asia and the Ægean.— Intrigues of Alcibiades. See GREECE B C 413–412

B. C. 413.— Negotiations with Persian satraps.— Subsidies for war against Athens.— Invasion of Attica.—The Decelian War. See GREECE. B C 413

B. C. 411-407.— Athenian victories at Cynossema and Abydos.— Exploits of Alcibiades.— His return to Athens — His second deposition and exile. See GREECE B. C. 411–407.

B. C. 406 —The Peloponnesian War: Defeat at Arginusæ. See GREECE B C 406.

B. C. 405.—The Peloponnesian War: Decisive victory at Ægospotami. See GREECE: B. C 405.

B. C. 404.— End of the Peloponnesian War: Surrender of Athens. See ATHENS: B. C. 404.

B. C. 404-403.— The organizing of Spartan supremacy.—The Harmosts in power.— The overthrow of Athenian power in the Greek world, made final by the battle of Ægospotami, B. C. 405, rendered Sparta supreme, and established her in a sovereignty of affairs which is often alluded to as the Spartan, or Lacedæmonian Empire The cities which had been either allied or subject to Athens were now submissive to the Spartan conqueror, Lysander. "He availed himself of his strength to dissolve the popular system of government in all the towns which had belonged to the Attic confederation, and to commit the government to a fixed body of men enjoying his confidence. As at Athens the Thirty

[see ATHENS: B. C. 404–403], so elsewhere Commissions of Ten [called Dekarchies] were established; and in order to give security and strength to those governing bodies, detachments of Spartan troops were placed by their side, under the command of a Harmost. This measure, again, was, by no means a novel invention. From an early period the Lacedæmonians had been in the habit of despatching Harmostæ (i. e. military governors) into the rural districts, to hold sway over the Perioeci, and to keep the latter in strict subjection to the capital. Such Harmosts were subsequently also sent abroad; and this, of itself, showed how the Spartans had no intention of recognizing various kinds of subjection, and how they at bottom designed to make no essential difference between subject rural communities in Laconia and the foreign towns which had of their own accord, or otherwise, submitted to the power of Sparta. The duration of the Harmosts' tenure of office was not defined."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 5, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 4).

ALSO IN: G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 72.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State, pt.* 3, *ch.* 1.—C. Sankey, *The Spartan and Theban Supremacies, ch.* 1.

B. C. 399-387.—War with Persia and with a hostile league in Greece.—Struggle for the Corinthian isthmus.—Restored independence of Athens.—The Peace of Antalcidas. See GREECE: B. C. 399–387.

B. C. 385.—Destruction of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 385.

B. C. 383.—Treacherous seizure of the Kadmeia of Thebes. See GREECE: B. C. 383.

B. C. 383-379.—Overthrow of the Olynthian Confederacy. See GREECE: B. C. 383–379.

B. C. 379-371.—Liberation and triumph of Thebes.—Spartan supremacy broken at Leuctra. See GREECE: B. C. 379–371.

B. C. 371-362.—The conflict with Thebes.—Two attempts of Epaminondas against the city.—The battle of Mantinea. See GREECE: B. C. 371–362.

B. C. 353-337.—Independent attitude towards Philip of Macedon. See GREECE: B. C. 357–336.

B. C. 317.—Building of Walls.—It was not until about the year 317 B. C., during the distractions which followed the death of Alexander the Great, that walls were built around the city of Sparta. "The maintenance of Sparta as an unwalled city was one of the deepest and most cherished of the Lykurgean traditions; a standing proof of the fearless bearing and self-confidence of the Spartans against dangers from without. The erection of the walls showed their own conviction, but too well borne out by the real circumstances around them, that the pressure of the foreigner had become so overwhelming as not to leave them even safety at home."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 96.

B. C. 272.—Siege by Pyrrhus.—Not many years after the walls of Sparta were first built the city was subjected to a siege by Pyrrhus, the ambitious Epirotic king. There were two claimants to the Spartan crown, and Pyrrhus, espousing the cause of the unsuccessful one, marched into Peloponnesus with a powerful army, (B. C. 272) and assailed the Lacedæmonian capital. He was repulsed and repulsed again, and gave up the attempt at last, marching away to Argos, where his interference in local quarrels had been solicited. He perished there, ignominiously, in another abortive enterprise, being killed by a tile flung down by a woman's hand, from a housetop overlooking the street in which he was attempting to manage the retreat of his discomfited forces.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 60.—See MACEDONIA, &c.: B. C. 277–244.

B. C. 227-221.—Downfall in the Cleomenic War. See GREECE: B. C. 280–146.

A. D. 267.—Ravaged by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 395.—Plundered by the Goths. See GOTHS: A. D. 395.

SPARTACUS, The Rising of.—Schools for the training of gladiators, to supply the barbarous amusement which the Romans delighted in, were numerous at Rome and throughout Italy. The men placed in these schools were slaves, criminal prisoners, or unfortunates whose parents abandoned them in infancy. As a rule, they were forced into the brutal profession and the schools which trained them for it were places of confinement and restraint. From one of these schools, at Capua, some seventy or more gladiators escaped, in the year 73 B. C., and fled to the mountains. They had for their leader a Thracian, named Spartacus, who proved to be a soldier of remarkable ability and energy. Stationing himself at first on Mount Vesuvius, Spartacus was joined by other slaves and fugitives, until he had a large force under his command. Again and again the Roman armies sent against him were defeated and the insurgents equipped themselves with captured arms. Nola, Nuceria, and other towns in Southern Italy fell into their hands. In the year 72 they moved toward North Italy, routing two consular armies on their way, and were thought to be intending to escape beyond the Alps; but, after another great victory at Mutina (Modena) over the proconsul of Gallia Cisalpina, Spartacus turned southward again, for some unexplained reason, and allowed himself to be blockaded in the extremity of Lucania, by M. Licinius Crassus. In this situation he sought to make terms, but his proposals were rejected. He then succeeded in breaking through the Roman lines, but was pursued by Crassus and overwhelmingly defeated at Mount Calamatius, where 35,000 of the insurgents are said to have been slain. The flying remnant was again brought to bay near Petilia, in Bruttium, and there Spartacus ended his life. A few thousand of the insurgents who escaped from the field were intercepted by Pompey and cut to pieces, while 6,000 captives were crucified, with Roman brutality, along the road between Capua and Rome.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic, v.* 3, *ch.* 2.—See, also, ROME: B. C. 78–68.

SPARTAN EMPIRE. See SPARTA: B. C. 404–403.

SPARTAN TRAINING. See EDUCATION, ANCIENT: GREECE; also, SPARTA, THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—"The splendor of the position of Speaker of the British House of Commons is perhaps not generally realized. The appointment, nominally for the duration of but one Parliament, generally extends over several. . . . Chosen from among the members, subject to the approval of the Crown, the Speaker can be re-

moved only upon an address to the Crown. Besides a palatial residence occupying one wing of the Houses of Parliament, and a large patronage, he receives a salary of £5,000 a year At the end of his labors he is rewarded with a peerage and a pension of £4,000 per annum for two lives. He is a member of the Privy Council, and the first gentleman in the United Kingdom, taking rank after barons . . The wig and gown which he wears, the state and ceremony with which he is surrounded, doubtless contribute to the isolation and impressiveness of his position When, at the opening of proceedings, he makes his way in state from his residence to the Chamber, through the corridors used by members for passing to the committee, library, and refreshment rooms, it is against etiquette for any one to be found therein When on summer evenings he and his family take the air upon the portion of the terrace which is outside his residence, there is no more thought of approaching them than there would be if he were a Grand Lama When in the chair, he can be approached only upon strictly business matters His levees, held twice a year and open to all members, can be attended only in court costume, sword by the side "—*The Nation, Aug* 17, 1893 (*p* 117)

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. See CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

SPECIE CIRCULAR, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1835–1837

SPENCEAN PHILANTHROPISTS.—SPENCEANS. See ENGLAND. A. D 1816–1820

SPEUSINII. See SCYTHIANS, OR SCYTHÆ, OF ATHENS

SPHACTERIA, Capture of. See GREECE B. C. 425.

SPHINX, The.—"About six hundred yards to the S. E. of the Great Pyramid is the Sphinx. The Sphinx is a natural rock, to which has been given, more or less accurately, the external appearance of that mystic animal The head alone has been sculptured. The body is formed of the rock itself, supplemented, where defective, by a somewhat clumsy masonry of limestone The total height of the monument is 19 metres 80 centimetres, equal to 65 English feet The ear measures 6 feet 5 inches, the nose 5 feet 10 inches; and the mouth 7 feet 8 inches The face, in its widest part, across the cheek, is 4 metres 15 centimetres, that is, 13 feet 7 inches. Its origin is still a matter of doubt. At one time it was supposed to be a monument of the reign of Thothmes IV. (XVIIIth dynasty) But we know now, thanks to a stone in the Boulak Museum, that the Sphinx was already in existence when Cheops (who preceded Chephren) gave orders for the repairs which this stone commemorates . . . The Sphinx is the colossal image of an Egyptian god called Armachis "—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt*, *p* 70.

SPICE ISLANDS. See MOLUCCAS.

SPICHERN, OR FORBACH, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

SPINNING-JENNY, Invention of the. See COTTON MANUFACTURE.

SPIRES: A. D. 1526-1529.—The imperial Diets.—Legal recognition of the Reformed religion, and its withdrawal.—Protest of Lutheran princes. See PAPACY: A. D. 1525–1529.

A. D. 1689.—Destruction by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1690

A. D. 1713.—Taken by the French. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712–1714

SPOILS SYSTEM, The. See CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE UNITED STATES.

SPOLETO: A. D. 1155.—Burned by Frederick Barbarossa. See ITALY. A. D. 1154–1162.

SPOLIA OPIMA.—"The proudest of all military trophies were Spolia Opima, which could be gained only when the commander-in-chief of a Roman army engaged and overthrew in single combat the commander-in-chief of the enemy. . . . Roman history afforded but three examples of legitimate Spolia Opima. The first were won by Romulus from Acro, King of the Ceninenses; the second by Aulus Cornelius Cossus from Lar Tolumnius, King of the Veientes, the third by M. Claudius Marcellus from Virodomarus, a Gaulish chief (B. C. 222). In all cases they were dedicated to Jupiter Feretrius and preserved in his temple."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch* 12.

SPOLIATION CLAIMS, French. See UNITED STATES OF AM : A D. 1800.

SPORADES, The. See CYCLADES.

SPOTTSYLVANIA, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM . A D 1864 (MAY: VIRGINIA) GRANT'S MOVEMENT, &c. SPOTTSYLVANIA

SPRING HILL, Engagement at. See UNITED STATES OF AM · A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER. TENNESSEE)

SPRINGFIELD, Mass.: A. D. 1637.—The first settlement. See CONNECTICUT· A. D. 1634–1637

SPURS, The Battle of the (1513). See FRANCE A. D. 1513–1515.

SPURS, The Day of the. See COURTRAI, THE BATTLE OF.

SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A D 1854.

SQUIRE. See CHIVALRY.

STAATEN-BUND. See GERMANY: A. D. 1814–1820

STADACONA. See QUEBEC: A. D. 1535.

STADION, OR STADIUM, The. See HIPPODROME.

STADIUM, OR STADE, The Greek.—"Throughout the present work I shall uniformly assume that the Greeks employed but one measure under that designation [the stadium] which was . . a hundred fathoms, or 600 Greek feet. This has been proved, in my opinion, beyond a doubt, by Col Leake in his paper 'On the Stade as a Linear Measure' . . . republished in his treatise 'On some disputed Questions of Ancient Geography.' . . At the present day the controversy may be considered as settled. . . . A stade of 600 Greek feet was in reality very nearly the 600th part of a degree [of the circumference of the earth], ten stades are consequently just about equal to a nautical or geographical mile of 60 to a degree "—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 6, *note c.*

STADTHOLDER. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584–1585.

STADTLOHN, Battle of (1623). See GERMANY: A. D. 1621–1623.

STAFFARDA, Battle of (1690). See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1691.

STAHL, George E. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17TH CENTURY—CLOSING PERIOD, &c

STAHLHOF. See HANSA TOWNS.

STALLER AND HORDERE, The.—"In the time of Ælfred [Alfred the Great] the great officers of the court were the four heads of the royal household, the Hordere, the Staller, the Dish-thegn, and the Cup-thegn . . . The Hordere was the officer of the court in its stationery aspect, as the Staller or Constable was of the court on progress . Of the four officers one only retained under the later West-Saxon monarchy any real power. The dish thegn and cup-thegn lost importance as the court became stationary and no longer maintained a vast body of royal followers. The staller retained only the functions of leading in war as the feudal constable, which in turn passed away with later changes in the military system The hordere alone held a position of growing importance. . . No doubt the 'Hoard' contained not only money and coin, but the costly ornaments and robes of the crown."—J R Green, *Conquest of Eng*, *ch.* 10, *note*—"The names by which the Chamberlain was designated are Hrægel thegn, literally thane or servant of the wardrobe, Cubicularius, Camerarius, Búrthegn, perhaps sometimes Dispensator, and Thesaurarius or Hordere . . . We may presume that he had the general management of the royal property, as well as the immediate regulation of the household. . . . The Marshal (among the Franks Marescalcus and Comes stabuli) was properly speaking the Master of the Horse . . The Anglosaxon titles are Steallere [Staller] and Horsthegn, Stabulator and Strator regis."—J M. Kemble, *The Saxons in Eng*, *bk* 2, *ch.* 3—See, also, CONSTABLE

STALWARTS AND HALF-BREEDS.—During the administration of President Grant, certain leaders of the Republican party in the United States—conspicuous among them Senator Conkling of New York—acquired a control of the distribution of appointed offices under the Federal Government which gave them a more despotic control of the organization of their party than had been known before in the history of the country It was the culminating development of the "spoils system" in American politics. It produced a state of things in which the organization of the party—its elaborated structure of committees and conventions—state, county, city, town and district,—became what was accurately described as a "political machine." The managers and workers of the machine were brought under a discipline which allowed no room for personal opinions of any kind; the passive adherents of the party were expected to accept what was offered to them, whether in the way of candidates or declarations of principle The faction which controlled and supported this powerful machine in politics acquired the name of Stalwarts and contemptuously gave the name of Half-breeds to their dissatisfied Republican opponents. During the term of President Hayes, who favored Civil Service Reform, the Stalwarts were considerably checked. They had desired to nominate General Grant in 1876 for a third term, but found it unwise to press the proposition. In 1880, however, they rallied all their strength to accomplish the nomination of Grant at Chicago and were bitterly enraged when their opponents in the convention carried the nomination of Garfield. They joined in electing him, but Conkling, the Stalwart leader, speedily quarreled with the new President when denied the control of the Federal "patronage" (that is, official appointments) in New York State, resigned from the Senate, appealed to the New York Legislature for re-election, and was beaten Then followed the tragedy of the assassination of President Garfield, which had a very sobering effect on the angry politics of the time. Conkling disappeared from public life, and Stalwartism subsided with him—J C. Ridpath, *Life and Work of James A. Garfield*, *ch.* 10–12.

ALSO IN: E. Stanwood, *Hist of Presidential Elections*, *ch* 24–25—J Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, *ch.* 60–65 (*v* 2)

STAMBOUL.—"It must be remembered that the Constantinople of 1200 was only that portion which is now called Stamboul or Istamboul, a word which is probably the Turkish abbreviation of Constantinople, just as Skenderoun is the abbreviation of Alexandretta, Skender bey for Alexander bey, Isnik for Nicæa, Ismidt for Nicomedia, &c. . . . The 'Itinerario' of Clavigo states that before the Moslem occupation the inhabitants themselves called the city Escomboli The Turks allow a few foreigners to have their warehouses in Stamboul, but will not permit them to reside there All the embassies and legations are in Pera, that is, across the water, or at Galata, which is a part of what was originally called Pera"—E Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople*, *ch* 7, *foot note.*

STAMFORD, Battle of. See LOSE COAT FIELD

STAMFORD BRIDGE, Battle of. See ENGLAND A D 1066 (SEPTEMBER)

STAMP ACT, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A D 1765, and 1766.

STANDARD, The Battle of the (1138).—In the civil war which arose in England, on the death of Henry I, over the disputed succession to the throne, Matilda's claims, as the daughter of Henry, were supported against Stephen of Blois by her mother's brother David, king of Scotland. David, as the nephew of Edgar Ætheling, heir of the dethroned Saxon royal house, had some claims of his own to the English crown; but these he declared that he waived in favor of his niece. "Though he himself declared that he had no desire for the English throne, there is mentioned by one chronicler a general conspiracy of the native English with their exiled country-men, of whom the south of Scotland was full, for the purpose of taking advantage of the condition of the country to put to death the Normans, and to place the crown upon David's head. The plot was discovered, . . . and many of the conspirators were hanged, but many others found a refuge in Scotland. At length, in 1138, David entered England with a large army, and pushed forward as far as Northallerton in Yorkshire. He was there met by the forces of the Northern bishops and barons. . . . They gathered round a tall mast borne upon a carriage, on which, above the standards of the three Northern Saints, St. Peter of York, St. John of Beverley, and St. Wilfred of Ripon, was displayed a silver pyx bearing the consecrated wafer. The motley army of the Scots, some armed as the English, some in the wild dress of the Picts of Galloway, after a well-fought battle [August 22, 1138]

broke against the full-clad Norman soldiers, and were killed by the arrows, which had now become the national weapon of the English; 11,000 are said to have fallen on the field." From the great standard above described, the fight at Northallerton was called the Battle of the Standard.—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period* 1, *p.* 79.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 1135-1154.

STANDERATH, The. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848-1890.

STANDING ARMY: The first in modern Europe. See FRANCE: A. D. 1453-1461.

STANDISH, Miles, and the Plymouth Colony. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623-1629.

STANISLAUS AUGUSTUS PONIATOWSKI, King of Poland, A. D. 1764-1795.

STANISLAUS LESZCZYNSKI, King of Poland, A. D. 1704-1709.

STANLEY, HENRY M.: Explorations of. See AFRICA: A. D. 1866-1873.

STANWIX, Fort.—The early name of the fort afterwards called Fort Schuyler, near the head of the Mohawk River, in New York.

A. D. 1768.—Boundary Treaty with the Six Nations. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768.

STANZ, Battle of (1798). See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1792-1798.

STANZ, Convention of. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1481-1501.

STAOUELI, Battles of. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830.

STAPLE.—STAPLERS, The.—"A term which makes a great figure in the commercial regulations of this period [13th and 14th centuries] is that of the Staple. The word, in its primary acceptation, appears to have meant a particular port or other place to which certain commodities were obliged to be brought to be weighed or measured for the payment of the customs, before they could be sold, or in some cases exported or imported. Here the king's staple was said to be established. The articles of English produce upon which customs were anciently paid were wool, sheep skins (or woolfels), and leather; and these were accordingly denominated the staples or staple goods of the kingdom. The persons who exported these goods were called the Merchants of the Staple: they were incorporated, or at least recognized as forming a society with certain privileges." By a charter granted by Edward II., in 1313, to the merchants of the staple, Antwerp was made the staple for wool and woolfels, and they could be carried for sale to no other port in Brabant, Flanders or Artois. In 1326 the staple was removed altogether from the continent and fixed at certain places within the English kingdom. In 1841 it was established at Bruges; in 1348 at Calais (which the English had captured); in 1353 it was again removed entirely from the continent;—and thus the changes were frequent. During some intervals all staples were abolished and trade was set free from their restriction; but these were of brief duration.—G. L. Craik, *Hist. of British Commerce, ch.* 4 (*v.* 1).—"The staplers were merchants who had the monopoly of exporting the principal raw commodities of the realm, especially wool, woolfels, leather, tin, and lead; wool figuring most prominently among these 'staple' wares. The merchants of the staple used to claim that their privileges dated from the time of Henry III, but existing records do not refer to the staple before the time of Edward I. . . . The staples were the towns to which the above-mentioned wares had to be brought for sale or exportation. Sometimes there was only one such mart, and this was situated abroad, generally at Bruges or Calais, occasionally at Antwerp, St. Omer, or Middleburg. From the reign of Richard II until 1558 the foreign staple was at Calais. The list of home staples was also frequently changed."—C. Gross, *The Gild Merchant, pp.* 140-141.

ALSO IN: A. Anderson, *Hist. of Commerce, v.* 1, *p.* 216, *and after.*

STAR, Knights of the.—"On the 8th September, 1351, king John [of France] revived the almost obsolete order of the Star, in imitation of the Garter, and the first chapter of it was held at his palace of St. Ouen. At first there were but eighteen knights; the rest were added at different chapters. They wore a bright star on the crest of their helmets, and one pendant at their necks, and the same was embroidered on their mantles."—T. Johnes, *Note to Froissart's Chronicles, bk* 1, *ch.* 152.

STAR CHAMBER, The Court of.—"In the reign of Edward III, the king's Continual Council was in the habit of sitting in what was called the Starred Chamber (la Chambre des Etoiles). After the establishment of the Court of Chancery as a separate and independent jurisdiction taking cognizance of the greater portion of the civil business of the Council, the latter body appears to have usually sat in the Star Chamber while exercising jurisdiction over such cases as were not sent to the Chancery. . . . Henry VII. . . . created, in the 3rd year of his reign, a new court, sometimes inaccurately called the Court of Star Chamber. . . . It continued to exist as a distinct tribunal from the Privy Council till towards the close of the reign of Henry VIII.; but in the meantime, probably during the chancellorship of Wolsey, the jurisdiction of the ancient Star Chamber (i. e. the Council sitting for judicial business) was revived, and in it the limited court erected by Henry VII. became gradually merged. . . . Under the Stewart Kings the court was practically identical with the Privy Council, thus combining in the same body of men the administrative and judicial functions. . . . Under the Stewart Kings the pillory, whipping, and cruel mutilations were inflicted upon political offenders by the sentence of this court; and at length the tyrannical exercise and illegal extension of its powers became so odious to the people that it was abolished by the Long Parliament in 1641."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist., pp.* 181-183.—"The Star Chamber was no temporary court. During 150 years its power penetrated into every branch of English life. No rank was exalted enough to defy its attacks, no insignificance sufficiently obscure to escape its notice. It terrified the men who had worsted the Armada; it overshadowed the dignity of the judicial bench; it summoned before its tribunal the Prynnes and the Cromwells, who at last proved its destroyers. It fell at length, but great was the fall thereof, and in its ruin was involved the downfall of the monarchy. It is with something of astonishment that the inquirer discovers that this august tribunal was merely the Council under another name; and that

the court, whose overgrown power the patriots of 1640 cast to the ground, was the same body whose early encroachments had alarmed the parliamentary leaders under Edward III and Richard II. The process by which the judicial authority of the Council passed into the form of the Court of Star Chamber admits of some dispute, and is involved in no little obscurity. . . . The Council's manner of proceeding was unlike that of other courts Its punishments were as arbitrary as they were severe, it also exercised a power peculiar to itself of extorting confession by torture Some, however, may imagine that powers so great were only occasionally exercised, that exceptional exertions of authority were employed to meet exceptional crimes, and that gigantic force was put forth to crush gigantic evils. . . It is, indeed, perhaps not generally known, that crimes of a very ordinary nature, such as would now come before a police magistrate, occupied the attention of the Star Chamber "—A V Dicey, *The Privy Council, pt* 3, *ch* 4

ALSO IN: H Hallam, *Const Hist of Eng*, *v* 1, *ch* 1—R Gneist, *Hist of the Eng Const ch* 35 *and* 38 (*v* 2)

STAR OF INDIA, The Order of the.—An Order of Knighthood instituted by Queen Victoria, in 1861, to commemorate the assumption of the Government of India by the British Crown

STAR ROUTE FRAUDS. Post routes on which the mails are carried by stages, wagons, post-riders, or by any other service than railway or steamer, are called "star routes," for the reason that the contracts made for them do not specify the method of carriage, but simply require the service to be performed with "celerity, certainty and security" which conditions are represented on the registers of the post office department by three stars. In 1878 it was found that an enormous system of fraud had been contrived in connection with certain of these routes (nearly 10,000 of which were then under contract), by a ring of public men, so numerous and influential that, though the frauds were broken up, no man was brought to punishment.

STAR SPANGLED BANNER. See FLAG. Also, on the writing of the song, see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D. 1814 (AUGUST—SEPT)

STARK, General John: Victory at Bennington. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

STARO-OBRIADTSI, The. See RUSSIA: A. D 1655-1659.

STAROSTS.—"Elders," in Poland, who administered justice in the towns.—Count Moltke, *Poland, p.* 8—See, also, MIR, THE RUSSIAN.

STARRY CROSS, Order of the.—An Austrian order, founded in 1668, for ladies of noble birth, by the dowager Empress Eleanora.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY, The doctrine of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

STATES-GENERAL OF FRANCE: In the 14th Century—"I lately attempted to explain the manner in which the identity or union of the Royal Council and of the Parliament of Paris was virtually, though not formally dissolved [see PARLIAMENT OF PARIS], so that each of them thenceforward existed as a substantive and distinct body in the state. This tacit revolution had been nearly completed when Philip le Bel for the first time convened the States-General of France" (A. D. 1301). The circumstances under which this occurred were as follows: Philip had imposed a tax from which the clergy were not excepted. Pope Boniface issued a bull forbidding them to make the required payment. "Philip retaliated by an order forbidding them to pay the customary papal dues to Boniface himself The Pope then summoned a synod, to advise him how he might most effectually resist this invasion of his pontifical rights; and Philip, in his turn, summoned the barons, clergy, and commons of his realm to elect deputies who should meet him at Paris, there to deliberate on the methods to be pursued for the successful conduct of his controversy with Rome. To Philip himself, the importance of this great innovation was probably not perceptible. He, as we may well believe, regarded it only as a temporary device to meet a passing exigency" Once more, before the end of his reign, in 1314, Philip assembled the States-General and procured their apparent assent to a tax, which proved to be exceedingly unpopular and which provoked a very turbulent resistance. The next meeting of the States-General,—called by King John—was in 1355, on the outbreak of the war with Edward III. of England. Under the lead of the celebrated Étienne (Stephen) Marcel, the States took matters on that occasion quite into their own hands They created a commission to superintend the collecting of funds raised for the war, and they provided for an adjourned session in the following year to receive an accounting of the Expenditure. When the adjourned session took place, in 1356, King John was a prisoner in the hands of the English and his son Charles reigned as regent in his stead. This Charles, who became king in 1364, and who acquired the name of Charles the Wise, contrived to make the meeting of 1356 an abortive one and then endeavored to raise moneys and to rule without the help of the three estates. The result was an insurrection at Paris, led by Marcel, which forced the regent to convene the States-General once more They met in 1357 under circumstances which gave them full power to check and control the royal authority, even to the extent of instituting a permanent commission, from their own membership, charged with a general superintendence of the administration of the government during the intervals between sessions of the States-General themselves. At that moment there would have seemed to be more promise of free government in France than across the channel. But the advantage which the national representatives acquired was brief. The taxes they imposed produced disappointment and discontent. They lost public favor; they fell into quarrels among themselves; the nobles and the clergy deserted the deputies of the people. The young regent gained influence, as the States-General lost it, and he was strengthened in the end by the violence of Marcel, who caused two offending ministers of the crown to be slain in the presence of the king. Then ensued a short period of civil war; Paris was besieged by the Dauphin-regent; Marcel perished by assassination; royalty recovered its ascendancy in France, with more firmness of footing than before. "It was the commencement of a long series of similar conflicts and of similar successes—conflicts and successes which terminated at length in the transfer of the power of the purse from the representatives of

the people to the ministers of the crown "—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France, lect.* 10 — "The year 1357 was the period when the States-General had greatest power during the Middle Ages; from that time they rapidly declined; they lost, as did also the Third Estate, all political influence, and for some centuries were only empty shadows of national assemblies."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, period* 4, *bk.* 2, *ch.* 3 — "One single result of importance was won for France by the states-general of the 14th century, namely, the principle of the nation's right to intervene in their own affairs, and to set the government straight when it had gone wrong or was incapable of performing that duty itself . . Starting from King John, the states-general became one of the principles of national right, a principle which did not disappear even when it remained without application, and the prestige of which survived even its reverses."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist of France, ch.* 21

ALSO IN A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État in France*, v. 1, *ch.* 2-3 — See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1356-1358

The last States General before the Revolution. See FRANCE: A. D. 1610-1619

The States-General of 1789. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789 (MAY) and (JUNE).

STATES-GENERAL, OR ESTATES, OF THE NETHERLANDS. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1494-1519, and 1584-1585; LIMITS OF THE UNITED PROVINCES

STATES OF THE CHURCH: Origin. See PAPACY: A. D. 755-774, and 1077-1102

A. D. 1198-1216.—The establishing of Papal Sovereignty. See PAPACY: A. D. 1198-1216

A. D. 1275.—The Papal Sovereignty confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See GERMANY: A. D. 1273-1308

A. D. 1352-1378.—Subjugation by Cardinal Albornoz.—Revolt, supported by Florence, and war with the Pope. See PAPACY: A. D. 1352-1378, and FLORENCE: A. D. 1375-1378

A. D. 1380.—Proposed formation of the kingdom of Adria. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1343-1389.

A. D. 1409.—Sale to Ladislas, king of Naples, by Pope Gregory XII. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1386-1414

A. D. 1503-1513.—Conquests and consolidation of Papal Sovereignty under Julius II. See PAPACY: A. D. 1471-1513, and ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513.

A. D. 1545-1556.—Alienation of Parma and Piacentia. See PARMA: A. D. 1545-1592

A. D. 1597.—Annexation of Ferrara. See PAPACY: A. D. 1597.

A. D. 1631.—Annexation of Urbino. See PAPACY: A. D. 1605-1700.

A. D. 1796-1797.—Territories taken by Bonaparte to add to the Cispadine and Cisalpine Republics. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER); 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

A. D. 1808-1809.—Seizure by Napoleon.—Partial annexation to the kingdom of Italy.—Final incorporation with the French Empire. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

A. D. 1815.—Papal Sovereignty restored. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1831-1832.—Revolt suppressed by Austrian troops. See ITALY: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1860-1861.—Absorption in the new kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1859-1861.

STATUTES. See LAW.

STAURACIUS, Emperor in the East (Byzantine, or Greek), A. D. 811.

SIAVOUTCHANI, Battle of (1739). See RUSSIA: A. D. 1725-1789.

STEAM ENGINE: The beginning of its invention, before Watt.—"It is probable that the first contriver of a working steam-engine was Edward, second Marquis of Worcester [A. D. 1601-1667]. . . . He was born at London in 1601. His early years [when his title was Lord Herbert] were principally spent at Raglan Castle, his father's country seat, where his education was carefully attended to. . . . From an early period of his life Lord Herbert took especial pleasure in mechanical studies, and in the course of his foreign tours he visited and examined the famous works of construction abroad. On settling down at Raglan he proceeded to set up a laboratory, or workshop, wherein to indulge his mechanical tastes . . Among the works executed by Lord Herbert and his assistant at Raglan, was the hydraulic apparatus by means of which the castle was supplied with water . . It is probable that the planning and construction of these works induced Lord Herbert to prosecute the study of hydraulics, and to enter upon that series of experiments as to the power of steam which eventually led to the contrivance of his 'Water-commanding Engine.'" No description of the Marquis's engine remains which enables modern engineers to understand with certainty its principle and mode of working, and various writers "have represented it in widely different forms . . But though the Marquis did not leave the steam-engine in such a state as to be taken up and adopted as a practicable working power, he at least advanced it several important steps. . . . Even during the Marquis's lifetime other minds besides his were diligently pursuing the same subject. . . . One of the most distinguished of these was Sir Samuel Morland, appointed Master of Mechanics to Charles II. immediately after the Restoration. . . . Morland's inventions proved of no greater advantage to him than those of the Marquis of Worcester had done . . The next prominent experimenter on the powers of steam was Dr. Dionysius Papin." Being a Protestant, he was driven to England in 1681, four years before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and received, through the friendship of Dr. Boyle, the appointment of Curator of the Royal Society. It was during this connection that he constructed his well-known "Digester," which was an apparatus for the cooking of meats under a high pressure and consequent high temperature of steam. For the safe employment of so high a pressure he invented the safety-valve. His success with the Digester led him to experiments with steam as a motive force. Having been invited to Germany, he made the attempt there to pump water by atmospheric pressure, on a large scale, producing the vacuum by a condensation of steam; but his undertakings were not successful. He next tried steam navigation, converting the alternate motion of a piston in a steam cylinder into rotary motion, turning paddle-wheels on the sides of a boat, by arming the piston-rods with

teeth, geared into wheels on the paddle axis. "His first experiments were doubtless failures;" but he finally succeeded to his satisfaction, and was conveying his model to London for exhibition, in 1707, when some barbarous boatmen in Germany destroyed it. Papin could raise no means for the construction of another, and three years later he died. "The attempts hitherto made to invent a working steam-engine, it will be observed, had not been attended with much success." But, "although the progress made seemed but slow, the amount of net result was by no means inconsiderable. Men were becoming better acquainted with the elastic force of steam . . . Many separate and minor inventions, which afterwards proved of great value, had been made, such as the four way cock, the safety-valve, and the piston moving in a cylinder. The principle of a true steam engine had not only been demonstrated, but most of the separate parts of such an engine had been contrived by various inventors. It seemed as if all that was now wanting was a genius of more than ordinary power to combine them in a complete and effective whole. To Thomas Savery is usually accorded the merit of having constructed the first actual working steam engine. . . . Thomas Savery was born at Shilston, . . . in Devon, about the year 1650. Nothing is known of his early life, beyond that he was educated to the profession of a military engineer. . . . He occupied much of his spare time in mechanical experiments, and in projecting and executing contrivances of various sorts." One of the earliest of these was a boat propelled by paddle-wheels, worked by man-power, turning a capstan, and this he exhibited on the Thames. "It is curious that it should not have occurred to Savery, who invented both a paddle-wheel boat and a steam-engine, to combine the two in one machine; but he was probably sick of the former invention . . . and gave it up in disgust, leaving it to Papin, who saw both his inventions at work, to hit upon the grand idea of combining the two in a steam-vessel. . . . It is probable that Savery was led to enter upon his next and most important invention by the circumstance of his having been brought up in the neighbourhood of the mining districts," and being well aware of the great difficulty experienced by the miners in keeping their pits clear of water." He devised what he called a "Fire Engine" for the raising of water. In this he made a double use of steam, in tight cylinders, first to create a vacuum, by condensing it, and then to force the water, so lifted, to a greater height, by pressure of fresh steam. "The great pressure of steam required to force up a high column of water was such as to strain to the utmost the imperfect boilers and receivers of those early days; and the frequent explosions which attended its use eventually led to its discontinuance in favour of the superior engine of Newcomen, which was shortly after invented. . . . This engine [of which the first working model was completed in 1705] . . worked entirely by the pressure of the atmosphere, steam being only used as the most expeditious method of producing a vacuum," in a steam cylinder, under the piston which worked the rod of a pump. "The engine was, however, found to be very imperfect," until it was improved by a device for throwing a jet of cold water into the cylinder, to produce a more rapid condensation of steam. "Step by step, Newcomen's engine grew in power and efficiency, and became more and more complete as a self-acting machine."—S. Smiles, *Lives of Boulton and Watt, ch.* 1-4.—"We have . . . certain evidence that the Marquis of Worcester's Engine was in full operation for at least seven years, and that one of the conditions of the Act of Parliament obliged him to deposit a model in the Exchequer. His own estimate of its value may be judged by his gladly giving up for the promised tithe of it to the King, his claim on Charles I equal to £40,000, in lieu thereof. His Lordship's invention was never offered by him as a merely amusing trifle"—H. Dircks, *Life and Times of the Second Marquis of Worcester, p* 387.

A. D. 1765-1785.—The improvements of James Watt.—After Newcomen, "no improvement of essential consequence . . . was effected in the steam engine until it came into the hands of Watt." James Watt, born at Greenock, Scotland, in 1736, educated to the profession of a mathematical instrument maker, and settled as such at Glasgow in 1757, began a few years later to give his thoughts to this subject. "Directing his attention first, with all his profound physical and mathematical knowledge, to the various theoretical points involved in the working of the machine, 'he determined,' says M. Arago, 'the extent to which the water dilated in passing from its liquid state into that of steam. He calculated the quantity of water which a given weight of coal could vaporise—the quantity of steam, in weight, which each stroke of one of Newcomen's machines of known dimensions expended—the quantity of cold water which required to be injected into the cylinder, to give the descending stroke of the piston a certain force—and finally, the elasticity of steam at different temperatures. All these investigations would have occupied the lifetime of a laborious philosopher; whilst Watt brought all his numerous and difficult researches to a conclusion, without allowing them to interfere with the labours of his workshop.'. . . Newcomen's machine laboured under very great defects. In the first place, the jet of cold water into the cylinder was a very imperfect means of condensing the steam. The cylinder, heated before, not being thoroughly cooled by it, a quantity of steam remained uncondensed, and, by its elasticity, impeded the descent of the piston, lessening the power of the stroke. Again, when the steam rushed into the cylinder from the boiler, it found the cylinder cold, in consequence of the water which had recently been thrown in; and thus a considerable quantity of steam was immediately condensed and wasted while the rest did not attain its full elasticity till the cylinder became again heated up to 212 degrees. These two defects . . . were sources of great expense. . . . Watt remedied the evil by a simple but beautiful contrivance—his separate condenser. The whole efficacy of this contrivance consisted in his making the condensation of the steam take place, not in the cylinder, but in a separate vessel communicating with the cylinder by a tube provided with a stop-cock. . . . So far the invention was all that could be desired; an additional contrivance was necessary, however, to render it complete. The steam in the act of being condensed in the separate vessel would give out its latent heat;

this would raise the temperature of the condensing water; from the heated water vapour would rise; and this vapour, in addition to the atmospheric air which would be disengaged from the injected water by the heat, would accumulate in the condenser, and spoil its efficiency. In order to overcome this defect, Watt attached to the bottom of the condenser a common air-pump, called the condenser pump, worked by a piston attached to the beam, and which, at every stroke of the engine, withdrew the accumulated water, air, and vapour This was a slight tax upon the power of the machine, but the total gain was enormous—equivalent to making one pound of coal do as much work as had been done by five pounds in Newcomen's engine This, certainly, was a triumph, but Watt's improvements did not stop here In the old engine, the cylinder was open at the top, and the descent of the piston was caused solely by the pressure of the atmosphere on its upper surface Hence the name of Atmospheric Engine, which was always applied to Newcomen's machine" Watt constructed his engine with the cylinder, closed at both ends, sliding the rod of the piston through a tightly packed hole in the metallic cover, introducing steam both above and below the piston,—but still using its expansive power only in the upper chamber, while in the lower it was employed as before to create a vacuum "The engine with this improvement Watt named the Modified Engine, it was, however, properly, the first real steam engine, for in it, for the first time, steam, besides serving to produce the vacuum, acted as the moving force. . . Another improvement less striking in appearance, but of value in economising the consumption of fuel, was the enclosing of the cylinder in a jacket or external drum of wood, leaving a space between which could be filled with steam By this means the air was prevented from acting on the outside of the cylinder so as to cool it A slight modification was also necessary in the mode of keeping the piston air-tight . The purpose was . . . effected by the use of a preparation of wax, tallow, and oil, smeared on the piston-rod and round the piston-rim. The improvements which we have described had all been thoroughly matured by Mr. Watt before the end of 1765, two years after his attention had been called to the subject" Another two years had passed before he found the means to introduce his invention into practice. He formed a partnership at length with Dr. Roebuck, who had lately founded the Carron iron-works, near Glasgow. "A patent was taken out by the partners in 1769, and an engine of the new construction, with an eighteen-inch cylinder, was erected at the Kinneil coal-works [leased by Dr Roebuck], with every prospect of complete success; when, unfortunately, Dr. Roebuck was obliged by pecuniary embarrassments to dissolve the partnership, leaving Watt with the whole patent, but without the means of rendering it available." For five years after this failure the steam-engine was practically put aside, while Watt devoted himself to civil engineering, which he had worked into as a profession. "At length, in 1774, Mr. Watt entered into a partnership most fortunate for himself and for the world. This was with Mr. Matthew Boulton, of the Soho Foundry, near Birmingham—a gentleman of remarkable scientific abilities, of liberal disposition and of unbounded enterprise." A prolongation of Watt's patent, which had nearly expired, was procured with great difficulty from Parliament, where a powerful opposition to the extension was led by Edmund Burke. The new engine, now fairly introduced, speedily supplanted Newcomen's, and Watt and his partner were made wealthy by stipulating with mine owners for one third part of the value of the coal which each engine saved. "The first consequence of the introduction of Watt's improved steam-engine into practice was to give an impulse to mining speculations. New mines were opened, and old mines . . . now yielded a return. This was the only obvious consequence at first Only in mines, and generally for the purpose of pumping water was the steam-engine yet used, and before it could be rendered applicable to other purposes in the arts . . . the genius of Watt required once again to stoop over it, and bestow on it new creative touches" He produced the beautiful device known as the "parallel motion," for connecting the piston-rod of the engine with the beam through which its motion is transmitted to other pieces of machinery. "Another improvement, which, in point of the additional power gained, was more important than the parallel motion, and which indeed preceded it in point of time, was the 'Double-acting Engine,'" in which steam was introduced to act expansively on each side of the piston in the engine He also invented the governor, to regulate the quantity of steam admitted from the boiler into the cylinder, and thus regulate the motion of the engine. "To describe all the other inventions of a minor kind connected with the steam-engine which came from the prolific genius of Watt, would occupy too much space." —*Life of James Watt* (*Chambers's Miscellany*, v. 17) —"The Watt engine had, by the construction of the improvements described in the patents of 1782-'85, been given its distinctive form, and the great inventor subsequently did little more than improve it by altering the forms and proportions of its details. As thus practically completed, it embodied nearly all the essential features of the modern engine. . . . The growth of the steam-engine has here ceased to be rapid, and the changes which followed the completion of the work of James Watt have been minor improvements, and rarely, if ever, real developments."—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 8.

Also in S Smiles, *Lives of Boulton and Watt, ch.* 5-17 —J. P. Muirhead, *Life of James Watt.* —The same, *Origin and Progress of the Mechanical Inventions of James Watt.*

STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.—The beginning of Railroads.—"The application of the steam engine to locomotion on land was, according to Watt, suggested by Robison, in 1759 In 1784, Watt patented a locomotive engine, which, however, he never executed. About the same time Murdoch, assistant to Watt, made a very efficient working model of a locomotive engine. In 1802, Trevithick and Vivian patented a locomotive engine, which was constructed and set to work in 1804 or 1805. It travelled at about five miles an hour, with a net load of ten tons. The use of fixed steam engines to drag trains on railways by ropes, was introduced by Cook in 1808. After various in-

ventors had long exerted their ingenuity in vain to give the locomotive engine a firm hold of the track by means of rackwork-rails and toothed driving wheels, legs, and feet, and other contrivances, Blackett and Hedley, in 1813, made the important discovery that no such aids are required, the adhesion between smooth wheels and smooth rails being sufficient. To adapt the locomotive engine to the great and widely varied speeds at which it now has to travel, and the varied loads which it now has to draw, two things are essential — that the rate of combustion of the fuel, the original source of the power of the engine, shall adjust itself to the work which the engine has to perform, and shall, when required, be capable of being increased to many times the rate at which fuel is burned in the furnace of a stationary engine of the same size; and that the surface through which heat is communicated from the burning fuel to the water shall be very large compared with the bulk of the boiler. The first of these objects is attained by the 'blast-pipe,' invented and used by George Stephenson before 1825; the second, by the tubular boiler, invented about 1829, simultaneously by Séguin in France and Booth in England, and by the latter suggested to Stephenson. On the 6th October, 1829, occurred that famous trial of locomotive engines, when the prize offered by the directors of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was gained by Stephenson's engine, the 'Rocket,' the parent of the swift and powerful locomotives of the present day, in which the blast-pipe and tubular boiler are combined."— W. J. M. Rankine, *Manual of the Steam Engine, pp. xxv-xxvii.*— George Stephenson, the son of a common workingman, and self-educated as a mechanic and engineer, was appointed engine-wright of Killingworth Colliery in 1812. In the following year he urged the lessees of the colliery to undertake the construction of a "travelling engine," as he called it. "Lord Ravensworth, the principal partner, had already formed a very favourable opinion of Stephenson, from the important improvements which he had effected in the colliery engines, both above and below ground; and, after considering the matter, and hearing Stephenson's statements, he authorized him to proceed with the construction of a locomotive. . . . The engine was built in the workshops at the West Moor, the leading mechanic being John Thirlwall, the colliery blacksmith, an excellent workman in his way, though quite new to the work now entrusted to him. . . . The wheels of the new locomotive were all smooth,— and it was the first engine that had been so constructed. From the first, Mr. Stephenson was convinced that the adhesion between a smooth wheel and an edgerail would be as efficient as Mr. Blackett had proved it to be between the wheel and the tramroad. . . . The engine was, after much labour and anxiety, and frequent alterations of parts, at length brought to completion, having been about ten months in hand. It was first placed upon the Killingworth Railway on the 25th of July, 1814; and its powers were tried on the same day. On an ascending gradient of 1 in 450, the engine succeeded in drawing after it eight loaded carriages of 30 tons' weight at about four miles an hour; and for some time after, it continued regularly at work. It was indeed the most successful working engine that had yet been constructed. . . . The working of the engine was at first barely economical; and at the end of the year the steam power and the horse power were ascertained to be as nearly as possible upon a par in point of cost. The fate of the locomotive in a great measure depended on this very engine. Its speed was not beyond that of a horse's walk, and the heating surface presented to the fire being comparatively small, sufficient steam could not be raised to enable it to accomplish more on an average than about three miles an hour. The result was anything but decisive; and the locomotive might have been condemned as useless had not Mr. Stephenson at this juncture applied the steam blast [carrying the escape of steam from the cylinders of the engine into the chimney or smoke-stack of the furnace], and at once more than doubled the power of the engine." A second engine, embodying this and other improvements, was constructed in 1815, with funds provided by Mr. Ralph Dodds. "It is perhaps not too much to say that this engine, as a mechanical contrivance, contained the germ of all that has since been effected. . . . It is somewhat remarkable that, although George Stephenson's locomotive engines were in daily use for many years on the Killingworth railway, they excited comparatively little interest." But in 1821, Mr. Stephenson was employed to construct a line of railway from Witton Colliery, near Darlington, to Stockton, and to build three locomotives for use upon it. The Stockton and Darlington line was opened for traffic on the 27th of September, 1825, with great success. In 1826 the building of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway was begun, with George Stephenson as the chief engineer of the work, and the public opening of the line took place on the 15th of September, 1830. The directors had offered, in the previous year, a prize of £500 for the best locomotive engine to be designed for use on their road, and the prize was won by Stephenson's famous "Rocket," which attained a speed of 35 miles an hour. It was at the ceremonial of the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway that Mr. Huskisson, then Prime Minister of England, was struck down by the "Rocket" and fatally injured, expiring the same night.— S. Smiles, *Life of George Stephenson, ch.* 9-24.— "Whatever credit is due to the construction of the first railroad ever built in America is usually claimed for the State of Massachusetts. Every one who has ever looked into a school history of the United States knows something of the Quincy railway of 1826. Properly speaking, however, this was never — or at least, never until the year 1871,— a railroad at all. It was nothing but a specimen of what had been almost from time immemorial in common use in England, under the name of 'tram-ways.' . . . This road, known as the Granite railway, built by those interested in erecting the Bunker Hill Monument, for the purpose of getting the stone down from the Quincy quarries to a wharf on Neponset River, from which it was shipped to its destination. The whole distance was three miles, and the cost of the road was about $34,000. . . . Apart, however, from the construction of the Granite railway, Massachusetts was neither particularly early nor particularly energetic in its railroad development. At a later day many of her sister States were in advance of her, and especially was this true of South Carolina. There is, indeed, some reason for believing that the

South Carolina Railroad was the first ever constructed in any country with a definite plan of operating it exclusively by locomotive steam power. . . . On the 15th of January 1831,—exactly four months after the formal opening of the Manchester & Liverpool road,—the first anniversary of the South Carolina Railroad was celebrated with due honor A queer looking machine, the outline of which was sufficient in itself to prove that the inventor owed nothing to Stephenson, had been constructed at the West Point Foundry Works in New York during the summer of 1830—a first attempt to supply that locomotive which the Board had, with a sublime confidence in possibilities, unanimously voted on the 14th of the preceding January should alone be used on the road The name of Best Friend was given to this very simple product of native genius . . In June, 1831, a second locomotive, called the West Point, had arrived in Charleston; and this at last was constructed on the principle of Stephenson's Rocket In its general aspect, indeed, it greatly resembled that already famous prototype. There is a very characteristic and suggestive cut representing a trial trip made with this locomotive on March 5th, 1831 About six months before . there had actually been a trial of speed between a horse and one of the pioneer locomotives, which had not resulted in favor of the locomotive It took place on the present Baltimore & Ohio road upon the 28th of August, 1830. The engine in this case was contrived by no other than Mr Peter Cooper

The Cooper engine, however, was scarcely more than a working model Its active minded inventor hardly seems to have aimed at anything more than a demonstration of possibilities The whole thing weighed only a ton, and was of one horse power . Poor and crude as the country was, however, America showed itself far more ready to take in the far reaching consequences of the initiative which Great Britain gave in 1830 than any other country in the world It might almost be said that there was a railroad mania Massachusetts led off in 1826, Pennsylvania followed in 1827, and in 1828 Maryland and South Carolina. Of the great trunk lines of the country, a portion of the New York Central was chartered in 1825; the construction of the Baltimore & Ohio was begun on July 4th, 1828 The country, therefore, was not only ripe to accept the results of the Rainhill contest, but it was anticipating them with eager hope Accordingly, after 1830 trial trips with new locomotives followed hard upon each other To-day it was the sensation in Charleston; to-morrow in Baltimore; the next day at Albany Reference has already been made to a cut representing the excursion train of March 5th, 1831, on the South Carolina Railroad. There is, however, a much more familiar picture of a similar trip made on the 9th of August of the same year from Albany to Schenectady, over the Mohawk Valley road. This sketch, moreover, was made at the time and on the spot by Mr. W. H. Brown."—C. F. Adams, Jr., *Railroads: Their Origin and Problems, ch.* 1.

STEAM NAVIGATION, The beginnings.—"The earliest attempt to propel a vessel by steam is claimed by Spanish authorities . . . to have been made by Blasco de Garay, in the harbor of Barcelona, Spain, in 1543. . . . The account seems somewhat apochryphal, and it certainly led to no useful results. . . . In 1690, Papin proposed to use his piston-engine to drive paddle-wheels to propel vessels; and in 1707 he applied the steam-engine, which he had proposed as a pumping-engine, to driving a model boat on the Fulda at Cassel [see above—STEAM ENGINE THE BEGINNINGS, &c.]. . . . In the year 1736, Jonathan Hulls took out an English patent for the use of a steam-engine for ship-propulsion, proposing to employ his steamboat in towing. . . . There is no positive evidence that Hulls ever put his scheme to the test of experiment, although tradition does say that he made a model, which he tried with such ill-success as to prevent his prosecution of the experiment further. . . . A prize was awarded by the French Academy of Science, in 1752, for the best essay on the manner of impelling vessels without wind. It was given to Bernoulli, who, in his paper, proposed a set of vanes like those of a windmill—a screw in fact—one to be placed on each side the vessel and two more behind. . . . But a more remarkable essay is quoted by Figuier—the paper of l' Abbé Gauthier, published in the 'Memoires de la Société Royale des Sciences et Lettres de Nancy' A little later (1760), a Swiss clergyman, J A. Genevois, published in London a paper relating to the improvement of navigation, in which his plan was proposed of compressing springs by steam or other power, and applying their effort while recovering their form to ship propulsion It was at this time that the first attempts were made in the United States to solve this problem. . . William Henry was a prominent citizen of the then little village of Lancaster, Pa., and was noted as an ingenious and successful mechanic. . . . In the year 1760 he went to England on business, where his attention was attracted to the invention—then new, and the subject of discussion in every circle—of James Watt He saw the possibility of its application to navigation and to driving carriages, and, on his return home, commenced the construction of a steam-engine, and finished it in 1763 Placing it in a boat fitted with paddle-wheels, he made a trial of the new machine on the Conestoga River, near Lancaster, where the craft, by some accident, sank, and was lost. He was not discouraged by this failure, but made a second model, adding some improvements. Among the records of the Pennsylvania Philosophical Society is, or was, a design, presented by Henry in 1782, of one of his steamboats. . . . John Fitch, whose experiments will presently be referred to, was an acquaintance and frequent visitor to the house of Mr Henry, and may probably have there received the earliest suggestions of the importance of this application of steam. About 1777 . . . Robert Fulton, then twelve years old, visited him, to study the paintings of Benjamin West, who had long been a friend and protégé of Henry. He, too, not improbably, received there the first suggestion which afterward . . . made the young portrait-painter a successful inventor and engineer. . . . In France, the Marquis de Jouffroy was one of the earliest to perceive that the improvements of Watt, rendering the engine more compact, more powerful, and, at the same time, more regular and positive in its action, had made it, at last, readily applicable to the propulsion of vessels. . . . Comte d'Auxiron and Chevalier Charles

Mounin, of Follenai, friends and companions of Jouffroy, were similarly interested, and the three are said to have united in devising methods of applying the new motor In the year 1770, D'Auxiron determined to attempt the realization of the plans which he had conceived He resigned his position in the army," obtained from the King a patent of monopoly for fifteen years, and formed a company for the undertaking "The first vessel was commenced in December, 1772 When nearly completed, in September, 1774, the boat sprung a leak, and, one night, foundered at the wharf" Quarrels and litigation ensued, D'Auxiron died, and the company dissolved "The heirs of D'Auxiron turned the papers of the deceased inventor over to Jouffroy, and the King transferred to him the monopoly held by the former M Jacques Perier, the then distinguished mechanic, was consulted, and prepared plans, which were adopted in place of those of Jouffroy The boat was built by Périer, and a trial took place in 1774 [1775] on the Seine The result was unsatisfactory" Jouffroy was still undiscouraged, and pursued experiments for several years, at his country home and at Lyons, until he had impoverished himself and was forced to abandon the field "About 1785, John Fitch and James Rumsey were engaged in experiments having in view the application of steam to navigation Rumsey's experiments began in 1774, and in 1786 he succeeded in driving a boat at the rate of four miles an hour against the current of the Potomac at Shepherdstown, W. Va., in presence of General Washington His method of propulsion has often been reinvented since . . Rumsey employed his engine to drive a great pump which forced a stream of water aft, thus propelling the boat forward, as proposed earlier by Bernouilli . . Rumsey died of apoplexy, while explaining some of his schemes before a London society a short time later, December 23, 1793, at the age of 50 years A boat, then in process of construction from his plans, was afterward tried on the Thames, in 1793, and steamed at the rate of four miles an hour . . . John Fitch was an unfortunate and eccentric, but very ingenious, Connecticut mechanic. After roaming about until 40 years of age, he finally settled on the banks of the Delaware, where he built his first steamboat . . . The machinery [of Fitch's first model] was made of brass, and the boat was impelled by paddle-wheels. . . . In September, 1785, Fitch presented to the American Philosophical Society, at Philadelphia, a model in which he had substituted an endless chain and floats for the paddle-wheels." His first actual steamboat, however, which he tried at Philadelphia in August, 1787, before the members of the Federal Constitutional Convention, was fitted with neither paddle-wheels nor floats, but with a set of oars or paddles on each side, worked by the engine His second boat, finished in 1788, was similarly worked, but the oars were placed at the stern. This boat made a trip to Burlington, 20 miles from Philadelphia. "Subsequently the boat made a number of excursions on the Delaware River, making three or four miles an hour. Another of Fitch's boats, in April, 1790, made seven miles an hour. . . . In June of that year it was placed as a passenger-boat on a line from Philadelphia to Burlington, Bristol, Bordentown, and Trenton. . . . During this period, the boat probably ran between 2,000 and 3,000 miles, and with no serious accident. During the winter of 1790–'91, Fitch commenced another steamboat, the 'Perseverance,'" which was never finished Although he obtained a patent from the United States, he despaired of success in this country, and went, in 1793, to France, where he fared no better "In the year 1796, Fitch was again in New York City, experimenting with a little screw steamboat on the 'Collect' Pond, which then covered that part of the city now occupied by the 'Tombs,' the city prison. This little boat was a ship's yawl fitted with a screw, like that adopted later by Woodcroft, and driven by a rudely made engine Fitch, while in the city of Philadelphia at about this time, met Oliver Evans, and discussed with him the probable future of steam navigation, and proposed to form a company in the West" Soon afterwards, he settled on a land grant in Kentucky, where he died in 1798 "During this period, an interest which had never diminished in Great Britain had led to the introduction of experimental steamboats in that country Patrick Miller, of Dalswinton, had commenced experimenting, in 1786–'87, with boats having double or triple hulls, and propelled by paddle-wheels placed between the parts of the compound vessel" On the suggestion of James Taylor, he placed a steam engine in a boat constructed upon this plan, in 1788, and attained a speed of five miles an hour The next year, with a larger vessel, he made seven miles an hour But for some reason, he pursued his undertaking no further "In the United States, several mechanics were now at work besides Fitch. Samuel Morey and Nathan Read were among these. Nicholas Roosevelt was another . . . In Great Britain, Lord Dundas and William Symington, the former as the purveyor of funds and the latter as engineer, followed by Henry Bell, were the first to make the introduction of the steam engine for the propulsion of ships so completely successful that no interruption subsequently took place in the growth of the new system of water-transportation . . Symington commenced work in 1801 The first boat built for Lord Dundas, which has been claimed to have been the 'first practical steamboat,' was finished ready for trial early in 1802 The vessel was called the 'Charlotte Dundas,' in honor of a daughter of Lord Dundas . . Among those who saw the Charlotte Dundas, and who appreciated the importance of the success achieved by Symington, was Henry Bell, who, 10 years afterward, constructed the Comet, the first passenger-vessel built in Europe This vessel was built in 1811, and completed January 18, 1812. . . . Bell constructed several other boats in 1815, and with his success steam-navigation in Great Britain was fairly inaugurated" Meantime this practical success had been anticipated by a few years in the United States, through the labors and exertions of Stevens, Livingston, Fulton, and Roosevelt. Fulton's and Livingston's first experiments were made in France (1803), where the latter was Ambassador from the United States. Three years later they renewed them in America, using an engine ordered for the purpose from Boulton & Watt. "In the spring of 1807 the 'Clermont,' as the new boat was christened, was launched from the ship-yard of Charles Brown, on the East River, New York. In August the machinery was on board and in successful operation.

The hull of this boat was 133 feet long, 18 feet wide, and 9 deep. The boat soon made a trip to Albany, running the distance of 150 miles in 32 hours running time, and returning in 30 hours. . . . This was the first voyage of considerable length ever made by a steam vessel; and Fulton, though not to be classed with James Watt as an inventor, is entitled to the great honor of having been the first to make steam-navigation an every-day commercial success. . . . The success of the Clermont on the trial-trip was such that Fulton soon after advertised the vessel as a regular passenger-boat between New York and Albany. During the next winter the Clermont was repaired and enlarged, and in the summer of 1808 was again on the route to Albany; and, meantime, two new steamboats — the Raritan and the Car of Neptune — had been built by Fulton. In the year 1811 he built the Paragon. . . . A steam ferry-boat was built to ply between New York and Jersey City in 1812, and the next year two others, to connect the metropolis with Brooklyn. . . . Fulton had some active and enterprising rivals." The prize gained by him "was most closely contested by Colonel John Stevens, of Hoboken," who built his first steamboat in 1804, propelling it by a screw with four blades, and his second in 1807, with two screws. He was shut out from New York waters by a monopoly which Fulton and Livingston had procured, and sent his little ship by sea to Philadelphia. "After Fulton and Stevens had thus led the way, steam-navigation was introduced very rapidly on both sides of the ocean." Nicholas J. Roosevelt, at Pittsburgh, in 1811, built, from Fulton's plans, the first steamer on the western rivers, and took her to New Orleans. "The first steamer on the Great Lakes was the Ontario, built in 1816, at Sackett's Harbor."—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 5.

Also in: The same, *Robert Fulton.*—C. D. Colden, *Life of Robert Fulton.*—T. Westcott, *Life of John Fitch.*

On the Ocean.—"In 1819 the Atlantic was first crossed by a ship using steam. This was the Savannah, of 380 tons, launched at Corlear's Hook, New York, August 22, 1818. She was built to ply between New York and Savannah as a sailing packet. She was however, purchased by Savannah merchants [by a Mr. Scarborough] and fitted with steam machinery, the paddle-wheels being constructed to fold up and be laid upon the deck when not in use, her shaft also having a joint for that purpose. She left Savannah on the 26th of May, and reached Liverpool in 25 days, using steam 18 days. The log book, still preserved, notes several times taking the wheels in on deck in thirty minutes. In August she left Liverpool for Cronstadt. An effort was made to sell her to Russia, which failed. She sailed for Savannah, touching at Copenhagen and Arendal, and arrived in 53 days. Her machinery later was taken out, and she resumed her original character as a sailing packet, and ended her days by being wrecked on the south coast of Long Island. But steam-power had by 1830 grown large enough to strike out more boldly. The Savannah's effort was an attempt in which steam was only an auxiliary, and one, too, of a not very powerful kind. Our coastwise steamers, as well as those employed in Great Britain, as also the voyage of the Enterprise to Calcutta in 1825 (though she took 113 days in doing it), had settled the possibility of the use of steam at sea, and the question had now become whether a ship could be built to cross the Atlantic depending entirely on her steam power. It had become wholly a question of fuel consumption. The Savannah, it may be said, used pitch-pine on her outward voyage, and wood was for a very long time the chief fuel for steaming purposes in America. . . . In 1836, under the influence of Brunel's bold genius, the Great Western Steamship Company was founded as an off-shoot of the Great Western Railway, whose terminus was then Bristol." The Company's first ship was the Great Western. She was of unprecedented size — 236 feet length and 35 feet 4 inches breadth — "determined on by Brunel as being necessary for the requisite power and coal carrying capacity. . . . The Great Western was launched on July 19, 1837, and was towed from Bristol to the Thames to receive her machinery, where she was the wonder of London. She left for Bristol on March 31, 1838; and arrived, after having had a serious fire on board, on April 2d. In the meantime others had been struck with the possibility of steaming to New York; and a company, of which the moving spirit was Mr. J. Laird, of Birkenhead, purchased the Sirius, of 700 tons, employed between London and Cork, and prepared her for a voyage to New York. The completion of the Great Western was consequently hastened; and she left Bristol on Sunday, April 8, 1838, at 10 A. M. with 7 passengers on board, and reached New York on Monday, the 23d, the afternoon of the same day with the Sirius, which had left Cork Harbor (where she had touched en route from London) four days before the Great Western had left Bristol. The latter still had nearly 200 tons of coal, of the total of 800, on board on arrival; the Sirius had consumed her whole supply, and was barely able to make harbor. It is needless to speak of the reception of these two ships at New York. It was an event which stirred the whole country, and with reason; it had practically, at one stroke, reduced the breadth of the Atlantic by half. . . . The Great Western started on her return voyage, May 7th, with 66 passengers. This was made in 14 days, though one was lost by a stoppage at sea." Within a few years following several steamers were placed in the transatlantic trade, among them the Royal William, the British Queen, the President, the Liverpool, and the Great Britain, the latter a screw steamer, built of iron and put afloat by the Great Western Company. In 1840 the long famous Cunard line was founded by Mr. Samuel Cunard, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, in company with Mr. George Burns of Glasgow and Mr. David McIver of Liverpool. The screw propeller (taking the place of the paddle-wheel), which made its first appearance in ocean navigation with the Great Britain, obtained its practical introduction through the labors of the great Swedish engineer, John Ericsson, though an idea of it had been in the minds of many inventors for a century and a half. Ericsson, induced by Francis B. Ogden and Captain Robert F. Stockton, U. S. N., came to the United States in 1839, and the introduction of the screw-propeller occurred rapidly after that date, the paddle-wheel disappearing from ocean steamships first, and more slowly from the steamers

engaged in lake and river navigation.—F. E. Chadwick, *The Development of the Steamship* (*"Ocean Steamships," ch* 1)

ALSO IN: A. J. Maginnis, *The Atlantic Ferry, ch.* 1-2.—R. H. Thurston, *Hist. of the Growth of the Steam Engine, ch.* 5.—W. C. Church, *Life of Ericsson, ch* 6-10 (*v.* 1).

STEDMAN, FORT, The capture of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH—APRIL: VIRGINIA)

STEEL BOYS. See IRELAND: A. D 1760-1798

STEEL YARD, The Association of the. See HANSA TOWNS.

STEENWYK: Siege and relief (1581). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581.

STEIN, Prussian reform measures of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY — AUGUST); 1807-1808; and 1808.

STEINKIRK, OR STEENKERKE, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D 1692

STELA, OR STELE.—"This is one of the words most frequently used in Egyptian archæology, because it designates a monument which is found in hundreds The stela is a rectangular flat stone generally rounded at the summit, and it was made use of by the Egyptians for all sorts of inscriptions These stelæ were, generally speaking, used for epitaphs; they also served, however, to transcribe texts which were to be preserved or exhibited to the public, and in this latter case the stela became a sort of monumental placard."—A. Mariette, *Monuments of Upper Egypt, p.* 29, *foot-note*

STENAY: A. D. 1654.—Siege and capture by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1653-1656

A. D. 1659.—Ceded to France. See FRANCE: A D. 1659-1661

STEPHANUS, OR ESTIENNE, Robert and Henry, The Press of. See PRINTING &c A. D 1496-1598.

STEPHEN (of Blois), King of England, A. D. 1135-1154. . .**Stephen I., Pope,** A D 752, March. . . . .**Stephen I. (called Saint), King of Hungary,** 997-1038. . . . .**Stephen II., Pope,** 752-757 . . . .**Stephen II., King of Hungary,** 1114-1131. . . . .**Stephen III., Pope,** 768-772. . . . . **Stephen III. and IV. (in rivalry), Kings of Hungary,** 1161-1173. . . . .**Stephen IV., Pope,** 816-817. . . . .**Stephen V., Pope,** 885-891. . . **Stephen V., King of Hungary,** 1270-1272. . . . . **Stephen VI., Pope,** 896-897. . . .**Stephen VII., Pope,** 928-931. . . . .**Stephen VIII., Pope,** 939-942 . . . .**Stephen IX., Pope,** 1057-1058. . . . . **Stephen Batory, King of Poland,** 1575-1586. . . . .**Stephen Dushan, The Empire of.** See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1341-1356.

STEPHENS, Alexander H.—Opposition to Secession. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JANUARY — FEBRUARY). . . . .**Election to the Vice-Presidency of the rebellious "Confederate States."** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (FEBRUARY). . . . .**The Hampton Roads Peace Conference.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY).

STEPHENSON, George, and the beginning of railroads. See STEAM LOCOMOTION.

STETTIN: A. D. 1630.—Occupied by Gustavus Adolphus and his Swedes. See GERMANY: A. D. 1630-1631.

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

A. D. 1677.—Siege and capture by the Elector of Brandenburg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN). A. D 1644-1697.

A. D. 1720.—Cession by Sweden to Prussia. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719-1721

STEUBEN, Baron, in the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.. A. D 1777 (JANUARY—DECEMBER); 1780-1781.

STEVENS, Thaddeus, and the Reconstruction Committee. See UNITED STATES OF AM: A D 1865-1866 (DECEMBER—APRIL), to 1868-1870.

STEVENS INSTITUTE. See EDUCATION, MODERN AMERICA: A D 1824-1893, and MODERN. REFORMS A D 1865-1893

STEWART DYNASTY, The. See SCOTLAND A D 1370, and ENGLAND. A D 1603, to 1688

STILICHO, Ministry of. See ROME: A. D. 394-395, to 404-408

STILLWATER, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

STIRLING, Earl of, The American grant to. See NEW ENGLAND A D 1621-1631.

STIRLING, General Lord, and the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D 1776 (AUGUST)

STIRLING, Wallace's victory at (1297). See SCOTLAND A D 1290-1305

STIRLING CASTLE, Sieges of.—Stirling Castle was taken in 1303 by Edward I. of England after a three months' siege, which he conducted in person and which he looked upon as his proudest military achievement Eleven years later, in 1314, it was besieged and recaptured by the Scots, under Edward Bruce, and it was in a desperate attempt of the English to relieve the castle at that time that the battle of Bannockburn was fought.—J H. Burton, *Hist of Scotland, ch.* 22-23 (*v* 2).—See SCOTLAND A D 1314.

STOA, The.—In the architecture of the Greeks, the stoa was a colonnade, either connected with a building or erected separately for ornament and for a place of promenade and meeting In the latter use, the form was that of either a single or a double colonnade, on one or both sides of a wall, the latter frequently adorned with pictures —E Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans, pt.* 1, *sect.* 27.

STOCKACH, Battle of (1799). See FRANCE: A. D 1798-1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

STOCKBRIDGE INDIANS. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES. STOCKBRIDGE INDIANS.

STOCKHOLM: A. D. 1471.—Battle of the Brunkeberg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1397-1527.

A. D. 1521-1523.—Siege by Gustavus Vasa. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES. A. D. 1397-1527.

A. D. 1612.—Attacked by the Danes. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1611-1629.

STOCKHOLM, Treaty of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813.

STOCKTON AND DARLINGTON RAILWAY. See STEAM LOCOMOTION IN ENGLAND.

STOLA, The.—The Roman ladies wore, by way of under garment, a long tunic descending to the feet, and more particularly denominated "stola."

STOLHOFEN, The breaking of the lines of (1707). See GERMANY: A. D. 1706–1711.

STONE AGE.—BRONZE AGE.—IRON AGE.—"Human relics of great antiquity occur, more or less abundantly, in many parts of Europe. . . . The antiquities referred to are of many kinds—dwelling-places, sepulchral and other monuments, forts and camps, and a great harvest of implements and ornaments of stone and metal. In seeking to classify these relics and remains according to their relative antiquity, archæologists have selected the implements and ornaments as affording the most satisfactory basis for such an arrangement, and they divide prehistoric time into three periods, which are termed respectively the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age. Of these periods the earliest was the Stone Age, when implements and ornaments were formed exclusively of stone, wood, horn, and bone. The use of metal for such purposes was then quite unknown. To the Stone Age succeeded the Age of Bronze, at which time cutting instruments, such as swords and knives and axes, began to be made of copper, and an alloy of that metal and tin. When in the course of time iron replaced bronze for cutting-instruments, the Bronze Age came to an end and the Iron Age supervened. . . . The archæological periods are simply so many phases of civilization, and it is conceivable that Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages might have been contemporaneous in different parts of one and the same continent. . . . It has been found necessary within recent years to subdivide the Stone Age into two periods, called respectively the Old Stone and New Stone Ages; or, to employ the terms suggested by Sir John Lubbock, and now generally adopted, the Palæolithic and Neolithic Periods. The stone implements belonging to the older of these periods show but little variety of form, and are very rudely fashioned, being merely roughly chipped into shape, and never ground or polished."—J. Geikie, *Prehistoric Europe, pp.* 5–11.

STONE OF DESTINY, The. See LIA-FAIL.

STONE RIVER, OR MURFREESBOROUGH, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862–1863 (DEC.—JAN.: TENNESSEE).

STONE STREET.—An old Roman road which runs from London to Chichester.

STONEHENGE. See ABURY.

STONEMAN'S RAID. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL—MAY).

STONEY CREEK, The Surprise at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813 (APRIL—JULY).

STONINGTON, Bombardment of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813–1814.

STONY POINT, The storming of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778–1779.

STORTHING, The. See THING; and CONSTITUTION OF NORWAY.

STORY, Judge, and his judicial services. See LAW, EQUITY: A. D. 1813.

STRAFFORD (Wentworth, Earl of) and Charles I. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1634–1637, 1640, and 1640–1641; also, IRELAND: A. D. 1633–1639.

STRAITS SETTLEMENTS, The.—"The Straits Settlements are the British possessions in or near the Malay peninsula, deriving their name from the Straits of Malacca, which divide that peninsula from the great island of Sumatra. Taken from North to South, they consist of the island of Penang with the strip of mainland opposite, known as Province Wellesley, the territory and islands of the Dindings, the territory of Malacca, and the island of Singapore." Penang was ceded to the English East India Company in 1786, by the rajah of Kedah. In 1800 the opposite strip of mainland was bought from the rajah. In 1819 a factory was established at Singapore, and in 1824 it was acquired by treaty from the sultan of Johor. In the same year, English possessions in Sumatra were exchanged with the Dutch for Malacca. In 1826 the three settlements were united under one government. In 1867 these Malay dependencies were separated from the Indian administration and constituted a crown colony. The seat of government is at Singapore. "Outside British territory, the peninsula from the isthmus of Kra to the Southern extremity is divided into a number of states, governed by native rulers, and partly independent, partly more or less subject to foreign influence."—C. P. Lucas, *Historical Geography of the British Colonies, v.* 1, *sect.* 2, *ch.* 3.

STRALSUND: A. D. 1628.—Unsuccessful siege by Wallenstein.—Swedish protection. See GERMANY: A. D. 1627–1629.

A. D. 1678.—Siege and capture by the Elector of Brandenburg. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644–1697.

A. D. 1715.—Siege and capture by the Danes and Prussians. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707–1718.

A. D. 1720.—Restoration by Denmark to Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1719–1721.

A. D. 1809.—Occupied by the Patriot Schill.—Stormed and captured by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (APRIL—JULY).

STRASBURG: A. D. 357.—Julian's victory.—The most serious battle in Julian's campaigns against the Alemanni was fought in August, A. D. 357, at Strasburg (then a Roman post called Argentoratum) where Chnodomar had crossed the Rhine with 35,000 warriors. The result was a great victory for the Romans.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 19.—See GAUL: A. D. 355–361.

A. D. 842.—The Oaths.—During the civil wars which occurred between the grandsons of Charlemagne, in 842, the year following the great battle at Fontainelles, the two younger of the rivals, Karl and Ludwig, formed an alliance against Lothaire. Karl found his support in Aquitaine and Neustria; Ludwig depended on the East Franks and their German kindred. The armies of the two were assembled in February at Strasburg (Argentaria) and a solemn oath of friendship and fidelity was taken by the kings in the presence of their people and repeated by the latter. The oath was repeated in the German language, and in the Romance language—then just acquiring form in southern Gaul,—and it has been preserved in both. "In the Romance form of this oath, we have the earliest monument of the tongue out of which the modern French was formed."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul, ch.* 18.

ALSO IN: J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French Under the Carlovingians; tr. by Bellingham, ch. 8.*

A. D. 1525.—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522–1525.

A. D. 1529.—Joined in the Protest which gave rise to the name Protestants. See PAPACY. A D 1525–1529

A. D. 1674-1675.—The passage of the Rhine given to the Germans. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND) A D 1674–1678

A. D. 1681.—Seizure and annexation to France.—Overthrow of the independence of the town as an Imperial city. See FRANCE A D 1679–1681

A. D. 1697.—Ceded to France by the Treaty of Ryswick. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697

A. D. 1870.—Siege and capture by the Germans. See FRANCE: A D 1870 (JULY—AUGUST), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER)

A. D. 1871.—Acquisition (with Alsace) by Germany. See FRANCE A D. 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

STRATEGI.—In Sparta, the Strategi were commanders appointed for armies not led by one of the kings. At Athens, the direction of the military system belonged to a board of ten Strategi.

STRATHCLYDE. See CUMBRIA; also, SCOTLAND: 7TH CENTURY.

STRELITZ, OR STRELTZE. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1697–1704.

STRONGBOW'S CONQUEST OF IRELAND. See IRELAND: A D 1169–1175.

STUART, General J. E. B., The Raid of. See UNITED STATES OF AM A. D. 1862 (JUNE VIRGINIA)

STUARTS, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D 1370; and ENGLAND. A. D 1603

STUM, Battle of (1629). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN). A. D. 1611–1629.

STUNDISTS, The.—In the neighborhood of Kherson, in southern Russia, the Stundist religious movement arose, about 1858. As its name implies, it "had a German origin. As far back as 1778 the great Empress Catherine had colonized Kherson with peasants from the Suabian land, who brought with them their religion, their pastors, and their industrious, sober ways For many years national prejudices and the barriers of language kept Russians and Germans apart from each other. But sooner or later true life begins to tell. . . Some of the Russian peasants who had been helped in their poverty or ministered to in their sickness by their German neighbours began to attend their services —to keep the 'stunden,' or 'hours,' of praise and prayer; they learned to read, were furnished with the New Testament in their own language, and eventually some of them found the deeper blessing of eternal life. In this simple scriptural fashion this memorable movement began. Men told their neighbours what God had done for their souls, and so the heavenly contagion spread from cottage to cottage, from village to village, and from province to province, till at length the Russian Stundists were found in all the provinces from the boundaries of the Austrian Empire in the West to the land of the Don Cossack in the East, and were supposed to number something like a quarter-of-a-million souls. . . . M. Dalton, a Lutheran clergyman, long resident in St. Petersburg, and whose knowledge of religious movements in Russia is very considerable, goes so far as to say that they are two millions strong. . . . Compared with the enormbus population of the Russian Empire, the number of Stundists, whether two millions or only a quarter of a million, is insignificant; but the spirit of Stundism . . is slowly but surely leavening the whole mass."—J. Brown, ed., *The Stundists.*

STUYVESANT, Peter, The administration of. See NEW YORK. A D 1647–1664, to 1664.

STYLES IN ARCHITECTURE.—The evolution of the Classic Greek, the Romanesque, and the Gothic.—In a work of this nature it is impossible to give anything that would represent the history of Architecture in even a moderately satisfactory way. The most that seems practicable is to quote some such sketch as the following (from the late Professor Freeman), of the historical development of an artistic use of the two fundamental principles or forms of building—that of the entablature and that of the arch—in producing the styles of Architecture known as the Classic, or Greek, the Romanesque, and the Gothic "The two great principles of mechanical construction which pervade all architectural works may be most conveniently taken as the types of the two groups under which we may primarily arrange all styles of architecture. These are the entablature and the arch, two forms of construction which will be found to form an absolutely exhaustive division. . . . As two straight lines cannot form a mathematical figure, so two uprights, be they walls, posts, or pillars, can hardly constitute an architectural work, circumstances will continually occur, in which two points must be connected, and that not by a third wall, but by something supported by the points to be connected The different ways of effecting this constitute the grand distinction which is at the root of all varieties of architectural style The entablature effects the union by simply laying on the top of the two uprights a third horizontal mass, held together by mere cohesion, the uprights being placed, as Mr Pugin says, 'just so far apart that the blocks laid on them would not break by their own weight' It is manifest that this is totally independent of material, the construction is precisely the same, whether the materials be beams of wood or blocks of stone In the other form, that of the arch, the connection is effected, not by a single block kept together by cohesion, but by a series bound together, without visible support, by a wonderful law of the mechanical powers. This again is abstractedly independent of material . . . As all buildings must be constructed on one of these two principles, architectural styles may be most naturally divided accordingly. . . . Every definite style of architecture has for its animating principle of construction either the entablature or the arch; its forms and details adapt themselves to this construction, and it is the different ways in which this construction is sought to be decorated, and the different degrees of excellence attained by each, which constitute the subordinate distinctions among the members of the two main groups. . . . The question of the first introduction of the arch is one of the very greatest interest, and at the same time of the greatest difficulty. . . . We find it hard to realize the position of civilised nations, possessing a finished and graceful style of architecture, employing it on the

erection of sumptuous and magnificent edifices, and yet totally ignorant of any mode of connecting walls or pillars save by the mere horizontal block of stone or timber Still more incomprehensible does it seem to us that any people should have been aware of so great a mechanical advantage, and yet have but rarely employed it, and never allowed it to become a leading feature of construction, or enter in the least degree into the system of decoration Yet . . such was the case with some of the most famous nations of antiquity, the bare knowledge both of the arched *form* and the arched *construction* seems certain in Egypt, probable in Greece, yet it never entered into either style of architecture . . . It is undoubtedly to the nations of ancient Italy, to the inhabitants of Etruria, and the Romans to whom they communicated their arts, that we owe the first regular and systematic employment of the arch. . . In Grecian architecture we have the entablature system completely developed; the mechanical structure, common to it with the rudest cromlech or the most unadorned Cyclopean gateway, is now enriched in the most simple and consistent manner, a perfect system of ornament embraces every feature, and refines all into consummate dignity and beauty The three orders of Grecian architecture afford forms of perfection unsurpassed by mere human skill; it was only the yearnings of the heaven ward spirit, the inspiration of the Church's ritual, that could conceive aught more noble; not purer, not lovelier, but vaster in conception, more majestic in execution, and holier in its end Yet even here we see the inherent incapacity of the entablature system to attain the highest perfection either of building or architecture The exceeding difficulty, verging on impossibility, of roofing a large space by its means, unless with materials then unknown, presents insuperable difficulties. Grecian architecture produced one form of the most perfect beauty, but it could produce one only · every structure is cast in precisely the same type, with the same outline, the same features both constructive and decorative" In the systematic employment of the arch, "we have first the classical Roman, the style of Rome herself in her days of greatest power, in which the aboriginal arch system of the Italians and the entablature of the Greeks are mingled together in a style of great boldness and splendour, but utterly devoid of architectural consistency. . . When, towards the close of the empire, the entablature began to be dropped, and the arch made the principal feature, a consistent round-arched style at once reappears; we have now the germ of Romanesque, a style subsequently developed by the northern nations into many forms of great splendour. . . . This great family includes many national varieties; Byzantine, Lombard, German, Provençal, Saxon, Norman: presenting great diversities among themselves, but agreeing in several general features of Roman origin, of which the most prominent, and the true badge of the style, is the round arch, which is employed in all important positions, and made, as it should be, the chief feature of the decorative system. The architecture of the Saracens, which from them has spread, under certain modifications, into all countries which have bowed to the faith of Mahomet, is of Roman origin, and its earlier forms might in strictness be considered as varieties of Romanesque. It is a style highly enriched and magnificent, yet mixed, fantastic, and incongruous, and not easily admitting of a comprehensive definition. . . . To the Romanesque, after a transitional period, succeeds the Gothic architecture. We now feel at once that we have arrived at the most perfect form which the art can assume. . . . All the different forms of this matchless style, all the countless varieties of outline and detail for which it is so conspicuous, aim, each of them with greater or less success, at the carrying out of the one idea which is the soul of all, that of vertical extension. To the upward aspiration of every feature, we owe, not indeed the invention, but the adaptation and general employment of the outward badge of the style, the pointed arch; from the same source . . . arise its accessories, the round or polygonal abacus, the peculiar style of moulding, the clustered pillar, the confirmed use of vaulting. Then again, externally, the high gable, the spire, the pinnacle, the flying buttress, the pyramidal outline which in its best examples is given to the whole structure, are all expressions of this one great idea"—E A Freeman, *A History of Architecture, introd., ch* 3

STYRIA: Origin, and annexation to Austria. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 805–1246.

A D. 1576.—Annexation of Croatia. See HUNGARY. A. D. 1567–1604.

17th Century.—Suppression of the Reformation. See GERMANY A. D. 1608–1618.

SUABIA, The Imperial House of. See GERMANY. A. D. 1138–1268; and ITALY: A. D. 1154–1162, to 1183–1250.

SUABIA AND SUABIANS, Ancient. See SUEVI; and ALEMANNI

SUABIAN BUND, OR LEAGUE, The. See LANDFRIEDE, &c.; also CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, and FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

SUABIAN CIRCLE, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493–1519; also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504.

SUABIAN WAR (1496-1499). See SWITZERLAND. A D. 1396–1499.

SUARDONES, The. See AVIONES.

SUBLICIAN BRIDGE.—The Pons Sublicius was the single bridge in ancient Rome with which the Tiber was originally spanned.

SUBLIME PORTE, The.—"The figurative language of the institutes of Mahomet II. [Sultan, A. D. 1451–1481], still employed by his successors, describes the state under the martial metaphor of a tent. The Lofty Gate of the Royal Tent (where Oriental rulers of old sate to administer justice) denotes the chief seat of government. The Italian translation of the phrase, 'La Porta Sublima,' has been adopted by Western nations, with slight modifications to suit their respective languages; and by 'The Sublime Porte' we commonly mean the Imperial Ottoman Government. The Turkish legists and historians depict the details of their government by imagery drawn from the same metaphor of a royal tent. The dome of the state is supported by four pillars. These are formed by, 1st, the Viziers; 2nd, the Kadiaskers (judges); 3rd, the Defterdars (treasurers); and 4th, the Nischandyis (the secretaries of state). Besides these, there are the Outer Agas, that is to say, the military rulers: and the Inner Agas, that is to say, the rulers employed in the court. There is also the

order of the Ulema, or men learned in the law. The Viziers were regarded as constituting the most important pillar that upheld the fabric of the state In Mahomet II 's time the Viziers were four in number Their chief, the Grand Vizier, is the highest of all officers. . . . The . . . high legal dignitaries (who were at that time next in rank to the Kadiaskers) were, 1st, the Kho dya, who was the tutor of the Sultan and the Princes Royal, 2nd, the Mufti, the authoritative expounder of the law, and, 3rdly, the Judge of Constantinople . The great council of state was named the Divan, and, in the absence of the Sultan, the Grand Vizier was its president The Divan was also attended by the Reis Effendi, a general secretary, whose power afterwards became more important than that of the Nis chandyis, by the Grand Chamberlain, and the Grand Marshal, and a train of other officers of the court "—Sir E S Creasy, *Hist of the Ottoman Turks, pp.* 96–97.—See, also, PHARAOHS.

SUB-TREASURY, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM A D 1837

SUBURA, at Rome, The.—"Between the converging points of the Quirinal and Esquiline hills lay the Subura, a district of ill fame, much abused by the poets and historians of imperial times. It was one of the most ancient district communities ('pagi') of Rome, and gave name to one of the four most ancient regions Nor was it entirely occupied by the lowest class of people, as might be inferred from the notices of it in Martial and Horace Julius Cæsar is said to have lived in a small house here . . . The Subura was a noisy, bustling part of Rome, full of small shops, and disreputable places of various kinds."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna, ch* 6, *pt* 1

SUCCESSION, The Austrian: The Question and War of. See AUSTRIA, A D. 1718–1738, 1740, and to 1744–1745, NETHERLANDS: A D. 1745, and 1746–1747; ITALY: A D. 1741–1748, to 1746–1747, AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. THE CONGRESS

SUCCESSION, The Spanish: The question and war of. See SPAIN. A D 1698–1700, to 1713–1725, and UTRECHT: A D 1712–1714.

SUCCOTH. See JEWS: THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

SUDAN, OR SOUDAN, The.—"Forming a natural frontier to the Great Desert is that section of Africa known by the somewhat vague name of Sudan. By this term is understood the region south of the Sahara, limited on the west and south by the Atlantic Ocean as far as it reaches. From the Gulf of Guinea inland, there is no definite southern border line. It may, however, be assumed at the fifth degree of north latitude. . . . [The] Nile region is generally taken as the eastern frontier of Sudan, although it properly reaches to the foot of the Abyssinian highlands. Hence modern maps have introduced the appropriate expression 'Egyptian Sudan' for those eastern districts comprising Senaar, Kordofan, Darfur, and some others. Sudan is therefore, strictly speaking, a broad tract of country reaching right across the whole continent from the Atlantic seaboard almost to the shores of the Red Sea, and is the true home of the Negro races. When our knowledge of the interior has become sufficiently extended to enable us accurately to fix the geographical limits of the Negroes, it may become desirable to make the term Sudan convertible with the whole region inhabited by them."—Hellwald-Johnston, *Africa* (*Stanford's Compendium*), *ch* 9

A. D. 1855-1894.—French conquests in the Western Sudan. See AFRICA: A D 1855, and after

A. D. 1870-1885.—Egyptian conquest.—General Gordon's government.—The Mahdi's rebellion.—The British campaign.—Death of Gordon. See EGYPT: A D 1870–1888, and 1884–1885.

SUDOR ANGLICUS. See SWEATING SICKNESS and PLAGUE A D 1485–1593

SUDRAS. See CASTE SYSTEM OF INDIA.

SUEVI, OR SUEBI, The.—"I must now speak of the Suevi, who are not one nation as are the Chatti and Tencteri, for they occupy the greater part of Germany, and have hitherto been divided into separate tribes with names of their own, though they are called by the general designation of 'Suevi' A national peculiarity with them is to twist their hair back and fasten it in a knot This distinguishes the Suevi from the other Germans, as it also does their own freeborn from their slaves "—"Suevia would seem to have been a comprehensive name for the country between the Elbe and the Vistula as far north as the Baltic Tacitus and Cæsar differ about the Suevi Suabia is the same word as Suevia "—Tacitus, *Germany, tr. by Church and Brodribb, ch* 38, *with geog note*—"The Suebi, that is the wandering people or nomads . . . Cæsar's Suebi were probably the Chatti, but that designation certainly belonged in Cæsar's time, and even much later, to every other German stock which could be described as a regularly wandering one."—T Mommsen, *Hist of Rome, bk.* 5, *ch* 7, *with note*—"The name of the country called Suabia is a true ethnological term, even as Francouia is one The one means the country occupied by the Suevi, the other the country occupied by the Franks. . . . At what time the name first became an unequivocal geographical designation of what now, in the way of politics, coincides with the Grand Duchy of Baden and part of Wurtemburg, and, in respect to its physical geography, is part of the Black Forest, is uncertain It was not, however, later than the reign of Alexander Severus (ending A. D. 235). . . Therein, Alamannia and Suevia appear together — as terms for that part of Germany which had previously gone under the name of 'Decumates agri,' and the parts about the 'Limes Romanus.' With this, then, begins the history of the Suevi of Suabia, or, rather, of the Suabians. Their alliances were chiefly with the Alamanni and Burgundians; their theatre the German side of France, Switzerland, Italy, and (in conjunction with the Visigoths) Spain. Their epoch is from the reign of Alexander to that of Augustulus, in round numbers, from about A. D. 225 to A. D. 475 "—R. G. Latham, *The Germania of Tacitus, ethnogeneon, sect.* 20.—See, also, ALEMANNI, and BAVARIA: THE ETHNOLOGY,

B. C. 58.—Expulsion from Gaul by Cæsar.—A large body of the Suevi, a formidable German tribe, the name of which has survived in modern Suabia, crossed the Rhine and entered Gaul about B. C. 61. They came at the invitation of the Arverni and Sequani of Gaul, who

were forming a league against the Æduí, their rivals, and who sought the aid of the German warriors. The latter responded eagerly to the call, and, having lodged themselves in the country of the Sequani, summoned fresh hordes of their countrymen to join them. The Gauls soon found that they had brought troublesome neighbors into their midst, and they all joined in praying Cæsar and his Roman legions to expel the insolent intruders. Cæsar had then just entered on the government of the Roman Gallic provinces and had signalized his first appearance in the field by stopping the attempted migration of the Helvetii, destroying two thirds of them, and forcing the remnant back to their mountains. He welcomed an opportunity to interfere further in Gallic affairs and promptly addressed certain proposals to the Suevic chieftain, Ariovistus, which the latter rejected with disdain. Some negotiations followed, but both parties meant war, and the question, which should make a conquest of Gaul, was decided speedily at a great battle fought at some place about 80 miles from Vesontio (modern Besançon) in the year 58 B. C. The Germans were routed, driven into the Rhine and almost totally destroyed. Ariovistus, with a very few followers, escaped across the river, and died soon afterwards.—C. Merivale, *History of the Romans, ch.* 6.

ALSO IN: Cæsar, *Gallic Wars, bk.* 1, *ch.* 31–53.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar, bk.* 3, *ch.* 4.

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

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

A. D. 409-573.—Their history in Spain.—"The Suevi kept their ground for more than half a century in Spain, before they embraced the Christian religion and became Arians. Being surrounded on all sides by the Visigoths, their history contains merely an account of the wars which they had to maintain against their neighbours: they were long and bloody; 164 years were passed in fighting before they could be brought to yield. In 573, Leovigild, king of the Visigoths, united them to the monarchy of Spain."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 7 (*v.* 1).—See, also, VANDALS: A. D. 428, and GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 507–712.

A. D. 460-500.—In Germany.—Those tribes of the Suevic confederacy which remained on the German side of the Rhine, while their brethren pressed southwards, along with the Vandals and Burgundians, in the great invasive movement of 406, "dwelt in the south-west corner of Germany, in the region which is now known as the Black Forest, and away eastwards along the Upper Danube, perhaps as far as the river Lech. They were already mingled with the Alamanni of the mountains, a process which was no doubt carried yet further when, some thirty years after the time now reached by us [about 460] Clovis overthrew the monarchy of the Alamanni [A. D. 496], whom he drove remorselessly forth from all the lands north of the Neckar. The result of these migrations and alliances was the formation of the two great Duchies with which we are so familiar in the mediæval history of Germany—Suabia and Franconia. Suabia, which is a convertible term with Alamannia, represents the land left to the mingled Suevi and Alamanni; Franconia that occupied east of the Rhine by the intrusive Franks."—T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders, bk.* 4, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 8).—See, also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504.

SUEVIC SEA.—Ancient name of the Baltic.

SUEZ CANAL. See EGYPT: A. D. 1840–1869; and COMMERCE, MODERN: RECENT REVOLUTION.

SUFFERERS' LANDS, The. See OHIO: A. D. 1786–1796.

SUFFETES.—"The original monarchical constitution [of Carthage]—doubtless inherited from Tyre—was represented (practically in Aristotle's time, and theoretically to the latest period) by two supreme magistrates called by the Romans Suffetes. Their name is the same as the Hebrew Shofetim, mistranslated in our Bible, Judges. The Hamilcars and Hannos of Carthage were, like their prototypes, the Gideons and the Samsons of the Book of Judges, not so much the judges as the protectors and rulers of their respective states."—R. B. Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians, ch.* 1.—See, also, JEWS: ISRAEL UNDER THE JUDGES.

SUFFOLK RESOLVES, The. See BOSTON: A. D. 1774.

SUFFRAGE, Woman. See WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

SUFFRAGE QUALIFICATION IN ENGLAND. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884–1885.

SUFIS.—A sect of Mahometan mystics. "The final object of the Sufi devotee is to attain to the light of Heaven, towards which he must press forward till perfect knowledge is reached in his union with God, to be consummated, after death, in absorption into the Divine Being."—J. W. H. Stobart, *Islam and its Founder, ch.* 10.

SUGAMBRI, OR SICAMBRI. See USIPETES; also FRANKS: ORIGIN, and A. D. 253.

SUGAR ACT, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1763–1764.

SUGAR-HOUSE PRISONS, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776–1777 PRISONERS AND EXCHANGES.

SUIONES, The.—"Next [on the Baltic] occur the communities of the Suiones, seated in the very Ocean, who, besides their strength in men and arms, also possess a naval force. . . . These people honour wealth."—Tacitus, *Germany, Oxford Trans., ch.* 44.—"The Suiones inhabited Sweden and the Danish isles of Funen, Langland, Zeeland, Laland, etc. From them and the Cimbri were derived the Normans."—*Note to same.*

SULIOTES, The.—"The heroic struggle of the little commonwealth over a number of years [1787–1804] against all the resources and ingenuity of Ali Pacha [vizir of Jannina] is very stirring and full of episode. . . . The origin of the Suliotes is lost in obscurity. . . . The chief families traced their origin to different villages and districts; and, though their language was Greek, they appear to have consisted, for the most part, of Christian Albanians, with a small admixture of Greeks, who, flying from the oppression of the invaders, had taken refuge in the well-nigh inaccessible mountains of Chamouri (Chimari) [in Epirus], and had there established a curious patriarchal community. . . . At the time when they became conspicuous in history the Suliotes were possessed of four villages in the great ravine of Suli, namely, Kiapha, Avarikо, Samoniva, and Kako-Suli, composing a group known as the Tetrachorion; and seven

villages in the plains, whose inhabitants, being considered genuine Suliotes, were allowed to retire into the mountain in time of war . . . They also controlled between 50 and 60 tributary villages, with a mixed population of Greeks and Albanians; but these were abandoned to their fate in war. In the early part of the last century the Suliotes are said not to have had more than 200 fighting men, although they were almost always engaged in petty warfare and marauding expeditions, and at the period of their extraordinary successes the numbers of the Suliotes proper never exceeded 5,000 souls, with a fighting strength of 1,500 men, who were, however, reinforced at need by the women. Their government was purely patriarchal; they had neither written laws nor law courts, and the family formed the political unit of the State."—R. Rodd, *The Customs and Lore of Modern Greece, ch.* 10

SULLA, Proscriptions by and Dictatorship of. See ROME: B. C. 88-78.

SULLIVAN, General John. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST); 1776 (AUGUST); 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

SULTAN, The Title.—Gibbon (ch. 57) represents that the title of Sultan was first invented for Mahmud the Gaznevide, by the ambassador of the Caliph of Bagdad, "who employed an Arabian or Chaldaic word that signifies 'lord' and 'master.'" But Dr. William Smith in a note to this passage in Gibbon, citing Weil, says: "It is uncertain when the title of Sultan was first used, but it seems at all events to have been older than the time of Mahmud . . . According to Ibn Chaldun it was first assumed by the Bowides." See TURKS: A. D. 999-1183.

SUMATRA.—Sumatra, next to Borneo the largest island in the Malay Archipelago, has an area of more than 128,000 geographical square miles, and is about 1,100 miles in length. The Dutch began to establish settlements on the eastern coast in 1618, and have gradually become masters of almost the entire island, though large parts of it are still undeveloped and little explored. Until lately, an independent sovereign, the sultan of Achin, ruled a considerable dominion in the northern extremity of Sumatra, but the Achinese have been subjugated, after an obstinate war. Generally the natives are Mohammedans, and of the Malayan race, but in widely differing tribes. Among the most barbarous are the Bataks, of the interior, who are pagans and cannibals, though quite advanced in several arts.

SUMBAWA. See MALAY ARCHIPELAGO, and TIMOR.

SUMIR. See BABYLONIA, PRIMITIVE.

SUMNER, CHARLES, The assault on. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1856.

SUMTER, The Confederate cruiser. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1861-1862.

SUMTER, Fort: A. D. 1860.—Occupied and held by Major Anderson, for the United States Government. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER).

A. D. 1861 (April).—Bombardment and reduction by the Rebel batteries. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1863.—Attack and repulse of the Monitors. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL: SOUTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1863.—Bombardment and unsuccessful assault. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA).

A. D. 1865 (February—April).—Recovery by the nation.—The restoring of the flag. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (FEBRUARY: SOUTH CAROLINA).

SUNDA ISLANDS.—A name applied differently by different geographers to islands in the Malay Archipelago. Most frequently, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Celebes, and some contiguous smaller islands, are called the Greater Sunda Islands, while the Timor group (Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores) are styled the Lesser Sunda.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.—Originated by Robert Raikes, at Gloucester, Eng., in 1780.

SUNNAH, The. See ISLAM.

SUNNI SECT, The. See ISLAM.

SUOVETAURILIA.—Sacrifices by the Romans at the end of a lustrum and after a triumph.

SUPERIOR, Lake, The discovery of. See CANADA: A. D. 1634-1673.

SUPREMACY, The Acts of.—The first Act of Supremacy, which established the independence of the Church of England and broke its relations with Rome, was passed by the English Parliament during the reign of Henry VIII., in 1534. It enacted "that the King should be taken and reputed 'the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England called Ecclesia Anglicana.' . . with full power to visit, reform, and correct all heresies, errors, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities which, by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought to be reformed or corrected"—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Const Hist., ch.* 11.—The Act of Supremacy was repealed in the reign of Mary and re-enacted with changes in that of Elizabeth, 1559. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1527-1534; and 1559.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, The.—"On the 24th day of September, 1789, the act organizing the Supreme Court was passed. The Court was constituted with a Chief Justice and five associates. John Jay was appointed the first Chief Justice by Washington. Webster said of him that when the ermine fell upon his shoulders, it touched a being as spotless as itself. The Court first convened in February, 1790, in New York. It does not appear from the reports that any case then came before it. Jay remained Chief Justice until 1795, when he resigned to become governor of the State of New York. A Chief Justice in our day would hardly do this. His judicial duties were so few that he found time, in 1794, to accept the mission to England to negotiate the treaty so famous in history as 'Jay's Treaty.' John Rutledge of South Carolina was appointed to succeed Jay, but he was so pronounced in his opposition to the treaty, and so bitter in his denunciation of Jay himself, that the federal Senate refused to confirm him. William Cushing of Massachusetts, one of the associate justices, was then nominated by Washington, and was promptly confirmed; but he preferred to remain associate justice, and Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut was made Chief Justice. He held the office until 1801, when John Marshall of Virginia was appointed by President Adams. Marshall held the office thirty-four years. He was known at the time of his appointment as an ardent Federalist. In our time

he is known as 'the great Chief Justice.' Roger B. Taney was the next incumbent. He was appointed by President Jackson. His political enemies styled him a renegade Federalist, and said that his appointment was his reward for his obsequious obedience, while Secretary of the Treasury, to President Jackson But Taney, despite the Dred Scott decision, was an honest man and a great judge. His opinions are models of lucid and orderly discussion, and are of admirable literary form. He held the office for twenty-eight years, and upon his death in 1864, President Lincoln appointed Salmon P Chase, of Ohio. Chief Justice Chase died in 1874 President Grant then appointed Morrison R. Waite of Ohio. He died in 1888 Melville W. Fuller, of Illinois, is the present [1889] incumbent, his appointment having been made by President Cleveland. . . . In 1807 an associate judge was added by Congress; two more were added in 1837, and one in 1863 They were added to enable the Court to perform the work of the circuits, which increased with the growth of the country"—J S. Landon, *The Const Hist and Gov't of the U. S., lect.* 10 —"The Supreme court is directly created by Art. iii , sect 1 of the Constitution, but with no provision as to the number of its judges. Originally there were six, at present there are nine, a chief justice, with a salary of $10,500 (£2,100), and eight associate judges (salary $10,000) The justices are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate They hold office during good behaviour, i e they are removable only by impeachment They have thus a tenure even more secure than that of English judges, for the latter may be removed by the Crown on an address from both Houses of Parliament. . . . The Fathers of the Constitution were extremely anxious to secure the independence of their judiciary, regarding it as a bulwark both for the people and for the States against aggressions of either Congress or the President. They affirmed the life tenure by an unanimous vote in the Convention of 1787, because they deemed the risk of the continuance in office of an incompetent judge a less evil than the subserviency of all judges to the legislature, which might flow from a tenure dependent on legislative will. The result has justified their expectations. The judges have shown themselves independent of Congress and of party, yet the security of their position has rarely tempted them to breaches of judicial duty. Impeachment has been four times resorted to, once only against a justice of the Supreme court, and then unsuccessfully. Attempts have been made, beginning from Jefferson, who argued that judges should hold office for terms of four or six years only, to alter the tenure of the Federal judges, as that of the State judges has been altered in most States; but Congress has always rejected the proposed constitutional amendment. The Supreme court sits at Washington from October till July in every year."—J. Bryce, *The Am. Commonwealth, pt.* 1, *ch.* 22 (*v.* 1) —"It is, I believe, the only national tribunal in the world which can sit in judgment on a national law, and can declare an act of all the three powers of the Union to be null and void. No such power does or can exist in England. Any one of the three powers of the state, King, Lords, or Commons, acting alone, may act illegally; the three acting together cannot act illegally. An act of parliament is final; it may be repealed by the power which enacted it; it cannot be questioned by any other power. For in England there is no written constitution; the powers of Parliament, of King, Lords, and Commons, acting together, are literally boundless. But in your Union, it is not only possible that President, Senate, or House of Representatives, acting alone, may act illegally; the three acting together may act illegally For their powers are not boundless, they have no powers but such as the terms of the constitution, that is, the original treaty between the States, have given them. Congress may pass, the President may assent to, a measure which contradicts the terms of the constitution. If they so act, they act illegally, and the Supreme Court can declare such an act to be null and void. This difference flows directly from the difference between a written and an unwritten constitution. It does not follow that every state which has a written constitution need vest in its highest court such powers as are vested in yours, though it certainly seems to me that, in a federal constitution, such a power is highly expedient. My point is simply that such a power can exist where there is a written constitution. where there is no written constitution, it cannot."—E. A. Freeman, *The English People in its Three Homes: Lectures to American Audiences, pp.* 191–192.

SURA, Battle of (A. D. 530). See PERSIA: A D 226–627

SURENA.—The title of the commander-in-chief or field marshal of the Parthian armies, whose rank was second only to that of the king. This title was sometimes mistaken by Greek writers for an individual name, as in the case of the Parthian general who defeated Crassus.—G. Rawlinson, *Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy, p.* 28.

SURGERY. See MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SURINAM. See GUIANA: A. D. 1580–1814.

SURPLUS, The distribution of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D. 1835–1837.

SURRATT, Mrs.: The Lincoln Assassination Conspiracy. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A D 1865 (APRIL 14TH).

SUSA.—SUSIANA.—SHUSHAN.—Originally the capital of the ancient kingdom of Elam, Shushan, or Susiana, or Susa, as it has been variously called, was in later times made the principal capital of the Persian empire, and became the scene of the Biblical story of Esther. A French expedition, directed by M. Dieulafoy and wife, undertook an exploration of the ruins of Susa in 1885 and has brought to light some remarkably interesting and important remains of ancient art. The name Susiana was applied by the Greeks to the country of Elam, as well as to the capital city, and it is sometimes still used in that sense.—Z. A. Ragozin, *Story of Media, Babylon and Persia, app. to ch.* 10.—See, also, ELAM; and BABYLONIA: PRIMITIVE.

SUSIAN GATES.—A pass in the mountains which surrounded the plain of Persepolis, the center of ancient Persia proper. Alexander had difficulty in forcing the Gates.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 93.

SUSIANA. See SUSA.

SUSMARSHAUSEN, Battle of (1648). See GERMANY: A. D. 1646–1648.

SUSQUEHANNA COMPANY, The. See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1753–1799.

SUSQUEHANNAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNAS.

SUSSEX.—Originally the kingdom formed by that body of the Saxon conquerors of Britain in the 5th and 6th centuries which acquired the name of the South Saxons. It is nearly represented in territory by the present counties of Sussex and Surrey. See ENGLAND: A. D. 477–527.

SUTRIUM, Battle of.—A victory of the Romans over the Etruscans, among the exploits ascribed to the veteran Q. Fabius Maximus.—W. Ihne, *Hist of Rome, bk.* 3, *ch.* 10.

SUTTEE, Suppression of, in India. See INDIA: A. D. 1828–1833.

SUVARROF, OR SUWARROW, Campaigns of. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1762–1796; also FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL); 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER), and (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

SVASTIKA, The. See TRI-SKELION.

SWAANENDAEL. See DELAWARE: A. D. 1629–1631.

SWABIA. See SUABIA.

SWAMP ANGEL, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA).

SWAN, The Order of the.—A Prussian order of knighthood, instituted in the 15th century, which disappeared in the century following, and was revived in 1843.

SWANS, The Road of the. See NORMANS.

SWEATING SICKNESS, The.—The "Sudor Anglicus," or Sweating Sickness, was a strange and fearful epidemic which appeared in England in 1485 or 1486, and again in 1507, 1518, 1529, and 1551. In the last three instances it passed to the continent. Its first appearance was always in England, from which fact it took one of its names. Its peculiar characteristic was the profuse sweating which accompanied the disease. The mortality from it was very great.—J. H. Baas, *Outlines of the History of Medicine, pp.* 318–319.—See, also, PLAGUE, ETC.: A. D. 1485–1593.

SWEDEN: Early inhabitants. See SUIONES.

History. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES.

Constitution. See CONSTITUTION OF SWEDEN.

SWEDENBORG, and the New Church.—"Swedenborg was born in 1688, and died in 1772. The son of a Lutheran Bishop of Sweden, a student at several universities, and an extensive traveler throughout all the principal countries of Europe, he had exceptional opportunities for testing the essential quality of contemporaneous Christianity. . . . Until he was more than fifty years of age, Swedenborg had written nothing on religious subjects, and apparently given them no special attention. He was principally known, in his own country, as Assessor Extraordinary of the Board of Mines, and an influential member of the Swedish Diet; and not only there, but throughout Europe, as a writer on many branches of science and philosophy. In this field he acquired great distinction; and the number and variety of topics which he treated was remarkable. Geometry and algebra, metallurgy and magnetism, anatomy, physiology, and the relation of the soul to the body were among the subjects which received his attention. There is to be noticed in the general order of his publications a certain gradual, but steady, progression from lower to higher themes,—from a contemplation of the mere external phenomena of nature to a study of their deep and hidden causes. He was always full of devout spiritual aspirations. In all his scientific researches he steadfastly looked through nature up to nature's God. . . . Maintaining this inflexible belief in God and revelation, and in the essential unity of truth, Swedenborg, in his upward course, at last reached the boundary line between matter and spirit. Then it was that he entered on those remarkable experiences by which, as he affirms, the secrets of the other world were revealed to him. He declares that the eyes of his spirit were opened, and that he had, from that time forward, conscious daily intercourse with spirits and angels. His general teaching on this subject is that the spiritual world is an inner sphere of being,—not material, and in no wise discernible to natural senses, yet none the less real and substantial,—and that it is the ever-present medium of life to man and nature."—J. Reed, *Why am I a New Churchman?* (*North Am. Rev., Jan.*, 1887).—"The doctrine of Correspondence is the central idea of Swedenborg's system. Everything visible has belonging to it an appropriate spiritual reality. The history of man is an acted parable; the universe, a temple covered with hieroglyphics. Behmen, from the light which flashes on certain exalted moments, imagines that he receives the key to these hidden significances,—that he can interpret the 'Signatura Rerum.' But he does not see spirits, or talk with angels. According to him, such communications would be less reliable than the intuition he enjoyed. Swedenborg takes opposite ground. 'What I relate,' he would say, 'comes from no such mere inward persuasion. I recount the things I have seen. I do not labour to recall and to express the manifestation made me in some moment of ecstatic exaltation. I write you down a plain statement of journeys and conversations in the spiritual world, which have made the greater part of my daily history for many years together. I take my stand upon experience. I have proceeded by observation and induction as strict as that of any man of science among you. Only it has been given me to enjoy an experience reaching into two worlds—that of spirit, as well as that of matter.'. . . According to Swedenborg, all the mythology and the symbolisms of ancient times were so many refracted or fragmentary correspondences—relics of that better day when every outward object suggested to man's mind its appropriate divine truth. Such desultory and uncertain links between the seen and the unseen are so many imperfect attempts toward that harmony of the two worlds which he believed himself commissioned to reveal. The happy thoughts of the artist, the imaginative analogies of the poet, are exchanged with Swedenborg for an elaborate system. All the terms and objects in the natural and spiritual worlds are catalogued in pairs."—R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics, bk.* 12, *ch.* 1 (*v.* 2).—"It is more than a century since the foundation of this church [the New Church] was laid, by the publication of the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. For more than half of that time, individuals and societies have been active in translating them, and in publishing them widely. There have been many preachers of these doctrines, and not a few writers of books

and periodicals. The sale of Swedenborg's writings, and of books intended to present the doctrines of the church, has been constant and large. How happens it, under these circumstances, that the growth of this church has been and is so slow, if its doctrines are all that we who hold them suppose them to be? There are many answers to this question. One among them is, that its growth has been greater than is apparent. It is not a sect. Its faith does not consist of a few specific tenets, easily stated and easily received. It is a new way of thinking about God and man, this life and another, and every topic connected with these. And this new way of thinking has made and is making what may well be called great progress. It may be discerned everywhere, in the science, literature, philosophy, and theology of the times; not prevalent in any of them, but existing, and cognizable by all who are able to appreciate these new truths with their bearings and results. . . . Let it not be supposed that by the New-Church is meant the organized societies calling themselves by that name. In one sense, that is their name. Swedenborg says there are three essentials of this Church: a belief in the Divinity of the Lord, and in the sanctity of the Scriptures, and a life of charity, which is a life governed by a love of the neighbor. Where these are, there is the Church. Whoever holds these essentials in faith and life is a member of the New-Church, whatever may be his theological name or place. Only in the degree in which he so holds these essentials is any one a member of that church. Those who, holding or desiring to hold these essentials in faith and life, unite and organize that they may be assisted and may assist each other in so holding them, constitute the visible or professed New-Church. But very false would they be to its doctrines, if they supposed themselves to be exclusively members of that Church, or if they founded their membership upon their profession or external organization."—T. Parsons, *Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg, ch.* 14, *sect.* 5.

ALSO IN. E. Swedenborg, *The four leading Doctrines of the New Church.*—G F. E. Le Boys Des Guays, *Letters to a Man of the World.*—B. F. Barrett, *Lect's on the New Dispensation.*

SWEENEY, Peter B., and the Tweed Ring. See NEW YORK A. D. 1863–1871.

SWERKER I., King of Sweden, A. D., 1155. . . . . Swerker II., King of Sweden, 1199–1210.

SWERKERSON. See CHARLES SWERKERSON; and JOHN SWERKERSON.

SWERRO, King of Norway, A. D. 1186–1202.

SWEYN I., King of Denmark, A. D. 991–1014. . . . . Sweyn II., King of Denmark, 1047–1076. . . . Sweyn III., King of Denmark, 1156–1157. . . . . Sweyn Canutson, King of Norway, 1030–1035

SWISS CONFEDERATION AND CONSTITUTION. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890; and CONSTITUTION OF SWITZERLAND.

SWITZERLAND.

Early inhabitants. See HELVETII; ALEMANNI: A. D. 496–504; BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 443–451; also, below: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

The Three Forest Cantons, their original Confederation (Eidgenossenschaft), and their relations with the House of Austria.—History divested of Legend.—"It is pretty clear that among those Helvetii with whom Cæsar had his cruel struggle [see HELVETII, THE ARRESTED MIGRATION OF THE], and who subsequently became an integral portion of the empire, there were no people from the Forest Cantons of Schwytz, Uri, and Unterwalden. The men who defied the Roman eagles were inhabitants of the mountain slopes between the lakes of Geneva and Constance. On the North, the authority of the Romans penetrated no farther in the direction of the mountainous Oberland than to Zurich or Turicum. They, no doubt, ascended far up the valley of the Rhone, where they have left their mark in the speech of the people to this day; but they did not climb the mountain passes leading across the great chain of the Alps. It may be questioned if the higher valleys of Switzerland were then, or for centuries after the fall of the Western Empire, inhabited. . . . In the district of these Forest Cantons no remains of lake inhabitancy have yet been found. . . . Yet none of the places where they are met with could have been more naturally suited for lake-dwellings than these. The three Forest Cantons began the political history of Switzerland, having established among themselves that political centre round which the other Cantons clustered. In ethnological history, they were the latest members of the Swiss family, since their territory remained without occupants after the more accessible portions of the country had been peopled. In the same sense, the canton from which the confederation derived its name—that of Schwytz—is the youngest of all. When the Irish monk, afterwards canonised as St. Gall, settled near the Lake of Constance in the 7th century, he had gone as completely to the one extreme of the inhabited world, as his brother Columba had gone to the other when he sailed to Iona. If the districts of Thurgau, Appenzell, and St. Gall were at that period becoming gradually inhabited, it is supposed that Schwytz was not occupied by a permanent population until the latter half of the 9th century. . . . M. Rilliet [in 'Les Origines de la Confédération Suisse,' par Albert Rilliet] is one of the first writers who has applied himself to the study of . . . original documents [title-deeds of property, the chartularies of religious houses, records of litigation, etc.] as they are still preserved in Switzerland, for the purpose of tracing the character and progress of the Swiss people and of their free institutions. It was among the accidents propitious to the efforts of the Forest Cantons, that, among the high feudal or manorial rights existing within their territory, a large proportion was in the hands of monastic bodies. Throughout Europe the estates of the ecclesiastics were the best husbanded, and inhabited by the most prosperous vassals. These bodies ruled their vassals through the aid of a secular officer, a Vogt or advocate, who sometimes was the master, sometimes the servant, of the community. In either case there

was to some extent a division of rule, and it was not the less so that in these Cantons the larger estates were held by nuns The various struggles for supremacy in which emperors and competitors for empire, the successive popes, and the potentates struggling for dominion, severally figured, gave many opportunities to a brave and sagacious people, ever on the watch for the protection of their liberties; but the predominant feature in their policy — that, indeed, which secured their final triumph — was their steady adherence in such contests to the Empire, and their acknowledgment of its supremacy. This is the more worthy of notice since popular notions of Swiss history take the opposite direction, and introduce us to the Emperor and his ministers as the oppressors who drove an exasperated people to arms. In fact, there still lurk in popular history many fallacies and mistakes about the nature of the 'Holy Roman Empire' as an institution of the middle ages [see ROMAN EMPIRE, THE HOLY] . . . It is not natural or easy indeed to associate that mighty central organisation with popular liberty and power, and yet in the feudal ages it was a strong and effective protector of freedom. . . . Small republics and free cities were scattered over central Europe and protected in the heart of feudalism. . . . M. Rilliet aptly remarks, that in the Swiss valleys, with their isolating mountains, and their narrow strips of valuable pasture, political and local conditions existed in some degree resembling those of a walled city." The election, in 1273, of Rudolph of Hapsburg, as King of the Romans, was an event of great importance in the history of the Swiss Cantons, owing to their previous connexion with the House of Hapsburg (see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246–1282), "a connexion geographically so close that the paternal domains, whence that great family takes its ancient name, are part of the Swiss territory at the present day." Such agencies as belonged naturally to the most powerful family in the district fell to the House of Hapsburg. Its chiefs were the chosen advocates or champions of the religious communities neighbor to them; and "under such imperial offices as are known by the title Bailiff, Procurator, or Reichsvogt, they occasionally exercised what power the Empire retained over its free communities. Such offices conferred authority which easily ripened into feudal superiorities, or other forms of sovereignty. M. Rilliet attributes considerable, but not, it seems to us, too much importance to a rescript bearing date the 26th May, 1281. It is granted by Henry VII., King of the Romans, or more properly of the aggregated German communities, as acting for his father, the Emperor Frederic II. This instrument revokes certain powers over the people of the community of Uri, which had been granted at a previous time by Frederic himself to the Count of Hapsburg. It addresses the people of Uri by the term Universitas — high in class among the enfranchised communities of the Empire — and promises to them that they shall no more under any pretext be withdrawn from the direct jurisdiction of the Empire. . . . The great point reached through this piece of evidence, and corroborated by others, is, that at this remote period the district which is now the Canton of Uri was dealt with as a Roman Universitas — as one of the communities of the Empire, exempt from the immediate authority of any feudal chief. . . . M. Rilliet's researches show that Uri is the Canton in which the character of a free imperial community was first established, perhaps we should rather say it was the Canton in which the privilege was most completely preserved from the dangers that assailed it. The Hapsburgs and their rivals had a stronger hold on Schwytz. . . . In many of the documents relating to the rights of Rudolph over this district, bearing date after he became Cæsar, it is uncertain whether he acts as emperor or as immediate feudal lord. . . . Rudolph, however, found it, from whatever cause, his policy to attach the people of Schwytz to his interests as emperor rather than as feudal lord; and he gave them charters of franchise which seem ultimately to have made them, like their neighbours of Uri, a free community of the Empire, or to have certified their right to that character. In the fragmentary records of the three Cantons, Unterwalden does not hold rank as a free community of the Empire at so early a time even as Schwytz. It is only known that in 1291 Unterwalden acted with the other two as an independent community. In the disputes for supremacy between the Empire and the Church all three had been loyal to the Empire. There are some indications that Rudolph had discovered the signal capacity of these mountaineers for war, and that already there were bands of Swiss among the imperial troops The reign of Rudolph lasted for 18 years. . . . During his 18 years of possession he changed the character of the Cæsarship, and the change was felt by the Swiss. In the early part of his reign he wooed them to the Empire — before its end he was strengthening the territorial power of his dynasty. . . . When Rudolph died in 1291, the imperial crown was no longer a disputable prize for a chance candidate. There was a conflict on the question whether his descendants should take it as a hereditary right, or the electors should show that they retained their power by another choice. The three Cantons felt that there was danger to their interests in the coming contest, and took a great step for their own protection. They formed a league or confederacy [Eidgenossenschaft] for mutual co-operation and protection. Not only has it been handed down to us in literature, but the very parchment has been preserved as a testimony to the early independence of the Forest Cantons, the Magna Charter of Switzerland. This document reveals the existence of unexplained antecedents by calling itself a renewal of the old league — the Antique Confederatio. . . . Thus we have a Confederation of the Three Cantons, dated in 1291, and referring to earlier alliances; while popular history sets down the subsequent Confederation of 1314 as the earliest, for the purpose of making the whole history of Swiss independence arise out of the tragic events attributed to that period. If this leads the way to the extinction of the story on which the Confederation is based, there is compensation in finding the Confederation in active existence a quarter of a century earlier. But the reader will observe that the mere fact of the existence of this anterior league overturns the whole received history of Switzerland, and changes the character of the alleged struggle with the House of Austria, prior to the battle of Morgarten. There is nothing in this document or in contemporary events breathing of disloyalty to the Empire. The two parties whom the Swiss

held in fear were the Church, endeavouring to usurp the old prerogatives of the Empire in their fullness; and the feudal barons, who were encroaching on the imperial authority. Among the three the Swiss chose the chief who would be least of a master. . . . Two years before the end of the 13th century [by the election of Albert, son of Rudolph, the Hapsburg family] . . . again got possession of the Empire, and retained it for ten years. It passed from them by the well-known murder of the Emperor Albert. The Swiss and that prince were ill-disposed to each other at the time of the occurrence, and indeed the murder itself was perpetrated on Swiss ground; yet it had no connexion with the cause of the quarrel which was deepening between the House of Hapsburg and the Cantons. . . . There exist in contemporary records no instances of wanton outrage and insolence on the Hapsburg side. It was the object of that power to obtain political ascendancy, not to indulge its representatives in lust or wanton insult. . . . There are plentiful records of disputes in which the interests of the two powers were mixed up with those of particular persons. Some of these were trifling and local, relating to the patronage of benefices, the boundaries of parishes, the use of meadows, the amount of toll duties, and the like; others related to larger questions, as to the commerce of the lake of the Four Cantons, or the transit of goods across the Alps. But in these discussions the symptoms of violence, as is natural enough, appear rather on the side of the Swiss communities than on that of the aggrandising imperial house. The Canton of Schwytz, indeed, appears to have obtained by acts of violence and rapacity the notoriety which made its name supreme among the Cantons. . . . We are now at a critical point, the outbreak of the long War of Swiss Independence, and it would be pleasant if we had more distinct light than either history or record preserves of the immediate motives which brought Austria to the point of invading the Cantons. . . . The war was no doubt connected with the struggle for the Empire [between Frederic of Austria and Louis of Bavaria — see GERMANY: A. D. 1314–1347]; yet it is not clear how Frederic, even had he been victorious over the three Cantons, could have gained enough to repay him for so costly an expedition. . . . We are simply told by one party among historical writers that his army was sent against his rebellious subjects to reduce them to obedience, and by the other that it was sent to conquer for the House of Hapsburg the free Cantons. That a magnificent army did march against them, and that it was scattered and ruined by a small body of the Swiss at Morgarten, on the 15th November, 1315, is an historical event too clearly attested in all its grandeur to stand open to dispute. After the battle, the victorious Cantons renewed their Confederation of 1291, with some alterations appropriate to the change of conditions. The first bond or confederation comes to us in Latin, the second is in German. . . . Such was the base around which the Cantons of the later Swiss Confederation were gradually grouped. . . . To this conclusion we have followed M. Rilliet without encountering William Tell, or the triumvirate of the meadow of Rütli, and yet with no consciousness that the part of Hamlet has been left out of the play." According to the popular tradition, the people of the Three Cantons were maddened by wanton outrages and insolences on the part of the Austrian Dukes, until three bold leaders, Werner Stauffacher, Arnold of the Melkthal, and Walter Fürst, assembled them in nightly meetings on the little meadow of Grütli or Rütli, in 1307, and bound them by oaths in a league against Austria, which was the beginning of the Swiss Confederation. This story, and the famous legend of William Tell, connected with it, are fading out of authentic history under the light which modern investigation has brought to bear on it.—*The Legend of Tell and Rütli* (*Edinburgh Rev., January*, 1869).

ALSO IN: O. Delepierre, *Historical Difficulties.*—J. Heywood, *The Establishment of Swiss Freedom, and the Scandinavian Origin of the Legend of William Tell* (*Royal Hist. Soc. Trans., v.* 5).

4-11th Centuries. See BURGUNDY.

A. D. 1207-1401.—Extension of the dominions of the House of Savoy beyond Lake Geneva.—The city of Geneva surrounded. See SAVOY: 11-15TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1332-1460.—The extension of the old Confederation, or "Old League of High Germany."—The Three Cantons increased to Eight.—"All the original cantons were German in speech and feeling, and the formal style of their union was 'the Old League of High Germany.' But in strict geographical accuracy there was . . . a small Burgundian element in the Confederation, if not from the beginning, at least from its aggrandizement in the 13th and 14th centuries. That is to say, part of the territory of the states which formed the old Confederation lay geographically within the kingdom of Burgundy, and a further part lay within the Lesser Burgundy of the Dukes of Zähringen. But, by the time when the history of the Confederation begins, the kingdom of Burgundy was pretty well forgotten, and the small German-speaking territory which it took in at its extreme north-east corner may be looked on as practically German ground. . . . It is specially needful to bear in mind, first, that, till the last years of the 13th century, not even the germ of modern Switzerland had appeared on the map of Europe; secondly, that the Confederation did not formally become an independent power till the 17th century; lastly, that, though the Swiss name had been in common use for ages, it did not become the formal style of the Confederation till the 19th century. Nothing in the whole study of historical geography is more necessary than to root out the notion that there has always been a country of Switzerland, as there has always been a country of Germany, Gaul, or Italy. And it is no less needful to root out the notion that the Swiss of the original cantons in any way represent the Helvetii of Cæsar. The points to be borne in mind are that the Swiss Confederation is simply one of many German Leagues, which was more lasting and became more closely united than other German Leagues—that it gradually split off from the German Kingdom—that in the course of this process, the League and its members obtained a large body of Italian and Burgundian allies and subjects—lastly, that these allies and subjects have in modern times been joined into one Federal body with the original German Confederates. The three Swabian lands [the Three Forest Cantons] which formed the kernel of the Old League lay

at the point of union of the three Imperial kingdoms, parts of all of which were to become members of the Confederation in its later form. . . . The Confederation grew for a while by the admission of neighbouring lands and cities as members of a free German Confederation, owning no superior but the Emperor First of all [1332], the city of Luzern joined the League. Then came the Imperial city of Zürich [1351], which had already begun to form a little dominion in the adjoining lands Then [1352] came the land of Glarus and the town of Zug with its small territory And lastly came the great city of Bern [1353], which had already won a dominion over a considerable body of detached and outlying allies and subjects These confederate lands and towns formed the Eight Ancient Cantons Their close alliance with each other helped the growth of each canton separately, as well as that of the League as a whole Those cantons whose geographical position allowed them to do so, were thus able to extend their power, in the form of various shades of dominion and alliance, over the smaller lands and towns in their neighbourhood . . Zürich, and yet more Bern, each formed, after the manner of an ancient Greek city, what in ancient Greece would have passed for an empire In the 15th century [1415–1460], large conquests were made at the expense of the House of Austria, of which the earlier ones were made by direct Imperial sanction The Confederation, or some or other of its members, had now extended its territory to the Rhine and the Lake of Constanz The lands thus won, Aargau, Thurgau, and some other districts, were held as subject territories in the hands of some or other of the Confederate States . . . No new states were admitted to the rank of confederate cantons Before the next group of cantons was admitted, the general state of the Confederation and its European position had greatly changed It had ceased to be a purely German power. The first extension beyond the original German lands and those Burgundian lands which were practically German began in the direction of Italy Uri had, by the annexation of Urseren, become the neighbour of the Duchy of Milan, and in the middle of the 15th century, this canton acquired some rights in the Val Levantina on the Italian side of the Alps This was the beginning of the extension of the Confederation on Italian ground. But far more important than this was the advance of the Confederates over the Burgundian lands to the west"—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog of Europe, ch. 8, sect. 6*

A. D. 1386-1388.—Austrian defeats at Sempach and Naefels.—"Seldom, if ever, has Switzerland seen a more eventful month than that of July, 1386, for in that month she fought and won the ever-memorable battle of Sempach. To set down all the petty details as to the causes which led to this engagement would be tedious indeed. It is sufficient to point out . . . that there is seldom much love lost between oppressor and oppressed, and Austria and the Swiss Confederation had for some time held that relation to each other. A ten years' peace had indeed been concluded between the two powers, but it was a sham peace, and the interval had been used by both to prepare for new conflicts. . . . Zurich laid siege to Rapperswyl with the intent to destroy the odious Austrian toll-house; Lucerne levelled with the ground the Austrian fort Rothenburg, and entered into alliances with Entlebuch and Sempach to overthrow the Austrian supremacy. This was equal to a declaration of war, and war was indeed imminent. Duke Leopold III., of Austria, was most anxious to bring the quarrel to an issue, and to chastise the insolent Swiss citizens and peasantry. . . . The nobles of Southern Germany rallied round the gallant swordsman, and made him their leader in the expeditions against the bourgeoisie and peasantry. And no sooner had the truce expired (June, 1386), than they directed their first attack on the bold Confederation. . . . Leopold's plan was to make Lucerne the centre of his military operations, but in order to draw away attention from his real object, he sent a division of 5,000 men to Zurich to simulate an attack on that town Whilst the unsuspecting Confederates lay idle within the walls of Zurich, he gathered reinforcements from Burgundy, Swabia, and the Austro-Helvetian Cantons, the total force being variously estimated at from 12,000 to 24,000 men He marched his army in the direction of Lucerne, but by a round-about way, and seized upon Willisau, which he set on fire, intending to punish Sempach 'en passant' for her desertion But the Confederates getting knowledge of his stratagem left Zurich to defend herself, and struck straight across the country in pursuit of the enemy Climbing the heights of Sempach, . they encamped at Meyersholz, a wood fringing the hilltop The Austrians leaving Sursee, for want of some more practicable road towards Sempach, made their way slowly and painfully along the path which leads from Sursee to the heights, and then turns suddenly down upon Sempach Great was their surprise and consternation when at the junction of the Sursee and Hilisrieden roads they came suddenly upon the Swiss force The Swiss . drew up in battle order, their force taking a kind of wedge shaped mass, the shorter edge foremost, and the bravest men occupying the front positions . The onset was furious, and the Austrian Hotspurs, each eager to outstrip his fellows in the race for honour, rushed on the Swiss, drove them back a little, and then tried to encompass them and crush them in their midst. . . All the fortune of the battle seemed against the Swiss, for their short weapons could not reach a foe guarded by long lances But suddenly the scene changed. 'A good and pious man,' says the old chronicler, deeply mortified by the misfortune of his country, stepped forward from the ranks of the Swiss—Arnold von Winkelried. Shouting to his comrades in arms, 'I will cut a road for you; take care of my wife and children!' he dashed on the enemy, and, catching hold of as many spears as his arms could encompass, he bore them to the ground with the whole weight of his body. His comrades rushed over his corpse, burst through the gap made in the Austrian ranks, and began a fierce hand-to-hand encounter. . . . A fearful carnage followed, in which no mercy was shown, and there fell of the common soldiers 2,900 men, and no fewer than 700 of the nobility. The Swiss lost but 120 men. . . . This great victory . . . gave to the Confederation independence, and far greater military and political eminence. . . . The story of Winkelried's heroic action has given rise to much fruitless but interesting discussion.

The truth of the tale, in fact, can neither be confirmed nor denied, in the absence of any sufficient proof. But Winkelried is no myth, whatever may be the case with the other great Swiss hero, Tell. There is proof that a family of the name of Winkelried lived at Unterwalden at the time of the battle. . . . The victory of Naefels [April, 1388] forms a worthy pendant to that of Sempach . The Austrians, having "recovered their spirits after the terrible disaster," invaded the Glarus valley in strong force, and met with another overthrow, losing 1,700 men "In 1389 a seven years' peace was arranged This peace was first prolonged for 20 years, and afterwards, in 1412, for 50 years "— Mrs. L Hug and R Stead, *The Story of Switzerland, ch* 15

A. D. 1396-1499.—The Grey Leagues.—Democratic Independence of Graubünden (Grisons) achieved.—Their Alliance with the Swiss Cantons.—The Swabian War.—Practical separation of the Confederacy from the Empire.— "It was precisely at this epoch [the later years of the 14th century] that the common people of Graubünden [or the Grisons] felt the necessity of standing for themselves alone against the world Threatened by the Habsburgs, suspicious of the See of Chur [see TYROL], ill governed by their decadent dynastic nobles, encouraged by the example of the Forest Cantons, they began to form leagues and alliances for mutual protection and the preservation of peace within the province Nearly a century was occupied in the origination and consolidation of those three Leagues which turned what we now call Graubünden into an independent democratic state The town of Chur, which had been steadily rising in power, together with the immediate vassals of the See, took the lead They combined into an association, which assumed the name of the Gotteshaus bund; and of which the Engadine [the upper valley of the Inn] formed an important factor Next followed a league between the Abbot of Dissentis, the nobles of the Oberland the Communes of that district, and its outlying dependencies. This was called the Grey League — according to popular tradition because the folk who swore it wore grey serge coats, but more probably because it was a League of Counts, Gräfen, Grawen. The third league was formed after the final dispersion of the great inheritance of Vaz, which passed through the Counts of Toggenburg into the hands of females and their representatives. This took the name of Zehn Gerichte, or Ten Jurisdictions, and embraced Davos, Belfort, Schanfigg, the Prättigau, and Maienfeld The date of the formation of the Gotteshausbund is uncertain, but its origin may be assigned to the last years of the 14th century [some writers date it 1396]. That of the Grey League, or Graue Bund, or Obere Theil, as it is variously called, is traditionally 1424 (It is worth mentioning that this League took precedence of the other two, and that the three were known as the Grey Leagues.) That of the Zehn Gerichte is 1436. In 1471 these three Leagues formed a triple alliance, defensive and offensive, protective and aggressive, without prejudice to the Holy Roman Empire of which they still considered themselves to form a part, and without due reservation of the rights acquired by inheritance or purchase by the House of Austria within their borders. This important revolution, which defeudalized a considerable Alpine territory, and which made the individual members of its numerous Communes sovereigns by the right of equal voting, was peaceably effected . . . The constitution of Graubünden after the formation of the Leagues, in theory and practise, . . . was a pure democracy, based on manhood suffrage . . . The first difficulties with which this new Republic of peasants had to contend, arose from the neighbourhood of feudal and imperial Austria. The Princes of the House of Habsburg had acquired extensive properties and privileges in Graubünden . These points of contact became the source of frequent rubs, and gave the Austrians opportunities for interfering in the affairs of the Grey Leagues. A little war which broke out in the Lower Engadine in 1475, a war of raids and reprisals, made bad blood between the people of Tirol and their Grisons neighbours. But the real struggle of Graubünden with Austria began in earnest, when the Leagues were drawn into the so called Swabian War (1496–1499) The Emperor Maximilian promoted an association of south German towns and nobles, in order to restore his Imperial authority over the Swiss Cantons They resisted his encroachments, and formed a close alliance with the Grey Leagues That was the commencement of a tie which bound Graubünden, as a separate political entity, to the Confederation, and which subsisted for several centuries Graubünden acted as an independent Republic, but was always ready to cooperate with the Swiss. Fighting side by side [in the Swabian War] with the men of Uri, Glarus, Zürich, the Bündners learned the arts of warfare in the lower Rheinthal. Afterwards, in 1499, they gained the decisive battle of this prolonged struggle on their own ground and unassisted In a narrow gorge called Calven, just where the Münsterthal opens out into the Vintschgau above Glurns, 5,000 men of the Grey Leagues defeated the whole chivalry and levies of Tirol. Many thousands of the foe (from 4,000 to 5,000 is the mean estimate) were left dead upon the field " Maximilian hastened to the scene with a fresh army, but found only deserted villages, and was forced by famine to retreat "The victory of Calven raised the Grisons to the same rank as the Swiss, and secured their reputation in Europe as fighting men of the best quality. It also led to a formal treaty with Austria, in which the points at issue between the two parties were carefully defined."— J. A Symonds, *Hist. of Graubünden* (*in Strickland's "The Engadine," pp.* 29–33) — During the Swabian War, in 1499, the Swiss concluded a treaty with France. "Willibald Pirkheimer, who was present with 400 red-habited citizens of Nuremberg, has graphically described every incident of this war. The imperial reinforcements arrived slowly and in separate bodies; the princes and nobles fighting in real earnest, the cities with little inclination. The Swiss were, consequently, able to defeat each single detachment before they could unite, and were in this manner victorious in ten engagements " The Emperor, "dividing his forces, despatched the majority of his troops against Basle, under the Count von Fürstenburg, whilst he advanced towards Geneva, and was occupied in crossing the lake when the news of Fürstenburg's defeat and death, near Dornach, arrived. The princes, little desirous of staking their honour against their low-born opponents, instantly returned home in great numbers, and the emperor

was therefore compelled to make peace [1499]. The Swiss retained possession of the Thurgau and of Basle, and Schaffhausen joined the confederation, which was not subject to the imperial chamber, and for the future belonged merely in name to the empire, and gradually fell under the influence of France."—W. Menzel, *Hist of Germany, ch.* 191 (*v.* 2).

A. D. 1476-1477.—Defeat of Charles the Bold. See BURGUNDY (THE FRENCH DUKEDOM): A. D. 1476–1477.

A. D. 1481-1501.—Disagreements over the spoils of the war with Charles the Bold.—Threatened rupture.—The Convention of Stanz.—Enlargement of the Confederacy.—Its loose and precarious constitution.—"In the war with Charles the Bold, Bern had gained greatly in extent on the west, while the immense booty taken in battle and the tributes laid on conquered cities seemed to the country cantons to be unfairly divided, for all were supposed to receive an equal share. The cities protested that it was no fair division of booty to give each one of the country states, who had altogether furnished 14,000 men for the war, an even share with Bern which had sent out 40,000. Another bone of contention was the enlargement of the union. The cities had for a long time desired to bring the cantons of Freiburg and Solothurn into the League. . . . But these were municipal governments, and the Forest States, unwilling to add more to the voting strength of the cities and thereby place themselves in the minority, refused again and again to admit these cantons. The situation daily grew more critical Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden made an agreement with Glarus to stand by each other in case of attack Luzern, Bern, and Zürich made a compact of mutual citizenship, a form of agreement by which they sought to circumvent the oath they had taken in the League of Eight to enter into no new alliances Just at this point there was alleged to have been discovered a plot to destroy the city of Luzern by countrymen of Obwalden and Entlibuch. The cities were thrown into a frenzy and peace was strained to the utmost. Threats and recriminations passed from side to side, but finally, as an almost hopeless effort toward reconciliation, a Diet was called to meet at Stanz on the 8th of December, 1481 The details of this conference read like romance, so great was the transformation which took place in the feelings of the confederates. . . . Just as the Diet was about to break up in confusion a compromise was effected, and an agreement was drawn up which is known as the Convention of Stanz (Stanzerverkomniss). . . . As to the matter latest in contention, it was agreed that movable booty should be divided according to the number of men sent into war, but new acquisitions of territory should be shared equally among the states participating. Thus the principle of state-rights was preserved and the idea of popular representation received its first, and for 300 years almost its only recognition. In another agreement, made the same day, Freiburg and Solothurn were admitted to the League on equal terms with the others. In 1501 the confederation was enlarged by the admission of Basel, which, on account of its situation and importance, was a most desirable acquisition, and in the same year the addition of Schaffhausen, like Basel, a free imperial city with outlying territories, still further strengthened the Union. The next, and for 285 years the last, addition to the inner membership of the alliance was Appenzell. . . . Connected with the confederacy there were, for varying periods and in different relationships, other territories and cities more or less under its control. One class consisted of the so-called Allied Districts ('Zugewandte and Verbündete Orte'), who were attached to the central body not as equal members, but as friends for mutual assistance. This form of alliance began almost with the formation of the league, and gradually extended till it included St. Gallen, Biel, Neuchatel, the Bishopric of Basel (which territory lay outside the city), the separate confederacies of Graubünden and Valais, Geneva and several free imperial cities of Germany, at one time so distant as Strassburg. More closely attached to the confederation were the 'Gemeine Vogteien,' or subject territories [Aargau, Thurgau, etc], whose government was administered by various members of the league in partnership. These lands had been obtained partly by purchase or forfeiture of loans and partly by conquest . Before the middle of the 16th century nearly all the territory now included in Switzerland was in some way connected with the confederation. Upon this territorial basis of states, subject lands and allies, the fabric of government stood till the close of the 18th century It was a loose confederation, whose sole organ of common action was a Diet in which each state was entitled to one vote . Almost the only thread that held the Swiss Confederation together was the possession of subject lands In these they were interested as partners in a business corporation. . . . These common properties were all that prevented complete rupture on several critical occasions"—J. M Vincent, *State and Federal Gov't in Switzerland, ch.* 1

A. D. 1515.—Defeat by the French at Marignano.—Treaties of perpetual alliance with Francis I. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515; and 1515–1518

A. D. 1519.—Geneva in civic relations with Berne and Freiburg. See GENEVA. A D. 1504–1535

A. D. 1519-1524.—Beginning of the Reformation at Zurich, under Zwingli. See PAPACY: A. D 1519–1524

A. D. 1528-1531.—The spreading of the Reformation.—Adhesion of the Forest Cantons to Romanism.—Differences between the Swiss Reformers and the German Protestants.—The Conference at Marburg.—Civil war among the Cantons.—Death of Zwingli.—From Zurich, "the reformed faith penetrated, but only gradually, into the northern and eastern cantons. Bern was reached in 1528, after a brilliant disputation held in that city. Basel and Schaffhausen followed in 1529, and then St. Gall, Appenzell, Graubünden, and Solothurn, though some of them had serious struggles within themselves and fell in only partly with the reforms. But in the Central or Forest Cantons it was that the fiercest opposition was encountered. . . . From the very simplicity of their lives the people ignored the degeneracy of the priesthood, and amongst these pastoral peoples the priests were of simpler manners and more moral life than those in the cities; they disliked learning and enlightenment. Then there was the old feeling of antipathy to the cities, coupled with a

strong dislike for the reforms which had abolished 'Reislaufen' [military service under foreign pay], that standing source of income to the cantons. Lucerne, bought with French gold, struggled with Zurich for the lead So far was the opposition carried that the Catholic districts by a majority of votes insisted (at the Diet) on a measure for suppressing heresy in Zurich, whilst some were for expelling that canton from the league. The Forest Cantons issued orders that Zwingli should be seized should he be found within their territories; consequently he kept away from the great convocation at Baden, 1526. . . . Wider and wider grew the chasm between the two religious parties, and Zwingli at length formed a 'Christian League' between the Swiss Protestants and some of the German cities and the Elector of Hesse. On the other hand, the Catholics entered into an alliance with Ferdinand of Austria, a determined enemy to the reformed religion. At last the Protestant party was exasperated beyond bearing, and Zurich declared war on the Forest Cantons, Zwingli himself joining in the vicissitudes of the campaign His camp presented the 'picture of a well organized, God fearing army of a truly Puritan stamp' The encounter at Kappel, in June, 1529, however, took a peaceful turn, thanks to the mediation of Landammann Aebli, of Glarus, greatly to the disgust of Zwingli, who prophetically exclaimed that some day the Catholics would be the stronger party, and then they would not show so much moderation All ill feeling, indeed, subsided when the two armies came within sight of each other The curious and touching episode known as the 'Kappeler Milchsuppe' took place here A band of jolly Catholics had got hold of a large bowl of milk, but lacking bread they placed it on the boundary line between Zug and Zurich At once a group of Zurich men turned up with some loaves, and presently the whole party fell to eating the 'Milchsuppe' right merrily A peace was concluded on the 29th of June, 1529, by which the Austrian League was dissolved, and freedom of worship granted to all. By his treatise, 'De verâ et falsâ religione' (1525), Zwingli had, though unwillingly, thrown the gauntlet into the Wittenberg camp. The work was intended to be a scientific refutation of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and a war of words arose. The contest was by each disputant carried on 'suo more;' by Luther with his usual authoritative and tempestuous vehemence, by Zwingli in his own cool reasoning, dignified, and courteous style and republican frankness Presently there came a strong desire for a union between the German Protestants, and the Swiss Reformers [called Sacramentarians by the Lutherans], . . . the impulse to it being given by Charles V.'s 'Protest' against the Protestants. Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the political leader of the German reformers, invited Luther and Zwingli to meet at his castle of Marburg [1529], with the view of reconciling the two sections. The religious colloquium was attended by many savants, princes, nobles, and all the chief leaders of the Reformation, and might have done great things, but came to grief through the obstinacy of Luther, as is well known, or rather through his determination to approve of no man's views except they should agree exactly with his own. Luther insisted on a literal interpretation of the words 'This is my body,' whilst Zwingli saw in them only a metaphorical or symbolical signification . . . To return for a moment to home politics The peace of 1529 was a short-lived one. Zwingli, anxious only to spread the reformed faith over the whole republic, did not realize clearly the hatred of the Forest district against the new creed. . . . War was imminent, and was indeed eagerly desired on both sides. Bern, finding that war was likely to be injurious to her private ends, insisted on a stoppage of mercantile traffic between the opposing districts, but Zwingli scorned to use such a means to hunger the enemy and so bring them to submit. However Zurich was outvoted in the Christian League (May 16th), and the Forest was excluded from the markets of that city and Bern. The rest may be easily guessed. On Zurich was turned all the fury of the famished Forest men, and they sent a challenge in October, 1531. A second time the hostile armies met at Kappel, but the positions were reversed. Zurich was unprepared to meet a foe four times as numerous as her own, and Bern hesitated to come to her aid However Göldlin, the captain of the little force, recklessly engaged with the opposing army, whether from treachery or incapacity is not known, but he was certainly opposed to the reformed faith Zwingli had taken leave of his friend Bullinger, as though foreseeing his own death in the coming struggle, and had joined the Zurich force He was with the chief banner, and, with some 500 of his overmatched comrades, fell in the thickest of the battle. . . . But the reformation was far too deeply rooted to be thus destroyed Bullinger, the friend of Zwingli, and, later on, of Calvin, worthily succeeded to the headship of the Zurich reformers"—Mrs L. Hug and R Stead, *Switzerland, ch* 22.

Also in. J H Merle d'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation in the 16th century, bk* 11 *and* 15–16 (*v* 3–4) — L. von Ranke, *Hist of the Reformation in Germany, bk* 6, *ch.* 2–4 (*v.* 3)

A. D. 1531-1648.—Religious divisions and conflicts.—Annexations of territory.—Peace with the Duke of Savoy.—The coming of Protestant refugees.—Industrial progress.—Peace.—"A peace at Dennikon in 1531 marks the acknowledgement of the principle of each Canton's independence. . . . The Confederacy was now fatally divided There is, perhaps, no other instance of a State so deeply and so permanently sundered by the Reformation. Other governments adopted or rejected the reformed religion for their dominions as a whole; the Confederacy, by its constitution, was constrained to allow each Canton to determine its religion for itself; and the presence of Catholic and Reformed States side by side, each clinging with obstinacy to the religion of their choice, became the origin of jealousies and wars which have threatened more than once to rend asunder the ties of union. Next to the endless but uninteresting theme of religious differences comes the history of the annexations" by which the Confederacy extended its limits "In the direction of the Jura was a country divided between many governments, which the princes of Savoy, the Hapsburgs of the West, had once effectually ruled, but which had become morselled among many claimants during a century and a half of weakness, and which Duke Charles III. of Savoy was now seeking to reconcile to his authority. Geneva was

the chief city of these parts. . . . Factions in favour of or against [the rule of the Duke of Savoy] . . . divided the city [see GENEVA: A. D. 1504–1535]. The alliance of Bern and Freyburg was at length sought for; and the conclusion of a treaty of co-citizenship in 1526 opened at once the prospect of a collision between the House of Savoy and the Confederacy. That collision was not long delayed In 1536, after repeated acts of provocation by Charles III, 7,000 men of Bern appeared within Geneva To reach the city they had traversed the Pays de Vaud, after entering it they passed onwards to the provinces of Gex and Chablais. All that they traversed they annexed. Even the city which they had entered they would have ruled, had not some sparks of honour and the entreaties of its inhabitants restrained them from the annihilation of the liberties which they had been called on to defend The men of Freyburg and of the Valais at the same time made humbler conquests from Savoy Later, the strong fortress of Chillon, and the rich bishopric of Lausanne, were seized upon by Bern. A wide extent of territory was thus added to the Confederacy, and again a considerable population speaking the French tongue was brought under the dominion of the Teutonic Cantons These acquisitions were extended, in 1555, by the cession of the county of Gruyère, through the embarrassments of its last impoverished Count They were diminished, however, by the loss of Gex and Chablais in 1564 The jealousy of many of the cantons at the good fortune of their confederates, and the reviving power of the House of Savoy, had made the conquests insecure. Emmanuel Philibert, the hero of St Quentin, the ally of the great sovereigns of France and Spain, asked back his provinces, and prudence counselled the surrender of the two, in order to obtain a confirmation of the possession of the rest [see SAVOY AND PIEDMONT: A. D. 1559–1580]. The southern side of the Lake Leman, which had thus been momentarily held, and which nature seemed to have intended to belong to the Confederacy, was thus abandoned. The frontiers, however, which were now secured became permanent ones. The Dukes of Savoy had transferred much of their ambition, with their capital, beyond the Alps; and the Confederates remained secure in their remaining possessions. The Confederacy might now have added further to its power by admitting new members to its League. . . . Constance . . . had urged its own incorporation. The religious tendencies of its inhabitants, however, had made it suspected; and it was allowed to fall, in 1548, without hope of recovery, under the dominion of Austria. Geneva . . . was pleading loudly for admission The jealousy of Bern, and later the hostility of the Catholic Cantons to the faith of which the city had become the centre, refused the request. She remained a mere ally, with even her independence not always ungrudgingly defended against the assaults of her enemies. Religious zeal indeed was fatal during this century to political sagacity. Under its influence the alliance with the rich city of Mulhausen, which had endured for more than a hundred years, was thrown off in 1587; the overtures of Strasburg for alliance were rejected; the proposals of the Grisons Leagues were repulsed. The opportunities of the Confederates were thus neglected, while those of their neighbours became proportionately increased. . . . The progress that is to be traced during the 16th century is such as was due to the times rather than to the people. The cessation of foreign wars and the fewer inducements for mercenary service gave leisure for the arts of peace; and agriculture and trade resumed their progress. Already Switzerland began to be sought by refugees from England, France, and Italy. The arts of weaving and of dyeing were introduced, and the manufacture of watches began at Geneva. . . . War, which had been almost abandoned except in the service of others, comes little into the annals of the Confederation as a State . . . As another century advances, there is strife at the very gates of the Confederation . . . But the Confederacy itself was never driven into war."—C. F. Johnstone, *Historical Abstracts, ch.* 7.

ALSO IN: H. Zschokke, *Hist. of Switzerland, ch.* 33–41

A. D. 1536-1564.—Calvin's Ecclesiastical State at Geneva. See GENEVA: A. D. 1536–1564.

A. D. 1579-1630.—The Catholic revival and rally.—The Borromean or Golden League.—"Pre-eminent amongst those who worked for the Catholic revival was the famous Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan and nephew of Pius IV. He lived the life of a saint, and in due time was canonized To his see belonged the Swiss bailliages in the Ticino and Valtellina Indefatigable in his labours, constantly visiting every part of his diocese, toiling up to the Alpine huts, he gathered the scattered flocks into the Papal fold, whether by mildness or by force . . . For the spread of Catholic doctrines he hit upon three different means. He called into being the Collegium Helveticum in 1579 at Milan, where the Swiss priests were educated free He sent the Jesuits into the country, and placed a nuncio at Lucerne, in 1580 In 1586 was signed, between the seven Catholic cantons, the Borromean or Golden League, directed against the reformers, and in the following year a coalition was, by the same cantons, excepting Solothurn, entered into with Philip of Spain and with Savoy. The Jesuits settled themselves in Lucerne and Freiburg, and soon gained influence amongst the rich and the educated, whilst the Capuchins, who fixed themselves at Altorf, Stanz, Appenzell, and elsewhere, won the hearts of the masses by their lowliness and devotion. In this way did Rome seek to regain her influence over the Swiss peoples, and the effect of her policy was soon felt in the semi-Protestant and subject lands. . . . In the Valais, the Protestant party, though strong, was quite swept out by the Jesuits, before 1630."—Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *Switzerland, ch.* 25.

A. D. 1620-1626.—The Valtelline revolt and war with the Grisons. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624–1626.

A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Acknowledged independence and separation from the German Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1652-1789.—The Peasant Revolt and the Toggenburg War.—Religious conflicts.—Battles of Villmergen.—The Peace of Aarau.—"About the middle of the 17th century there was growing up, in all the cantons except the Waldstätten, a feeling of strong discontent among the peasants, who still suffered from

many of the tyrannies which had descended to them from the old days of serfdom. They felt the painful contrast between their lot and that of the three old cantons, where every peasant voted for his own magistrates and his own laws, and helped to decide the taxes and contributions which he should pay. . . . Now that their liberty had been proclaimed at Westphalia, they were inspired with the idea of trying to make it a reality . They rose on the occasion of the reduction of the value of their copper coinage. . . Opposition began among the Entlibuchers of Lucerne, a tall and sturdy race, that lived in the long, fertile valley on the banks of the Emmen. . . . Their spirit was soon quenched, however, by the threats of Zurich and Berne, but though they yielded for the moment, their example had spread, and there were popular risings, excited in the large canton of Berne by the same causes, which were not so easily checked There was a second revolt in Lucerne, which was intended to be nothing less than a league of all the lower classes throughout the ten cantons The peasants of Lucerne, Berne, Basel, Solothurn, and the territory of Aargau, all joined in this and held an assembly at Sumiswald, in April 1653, where they chose Nicholas Leuenberger as their chief, and proclaimed their purpose of making themselves free as the Small Cantons. To this union, unfortunately, they brought neither strength of purpose nor wisdom

Meanwhile the cities were not idle Zurich, the capital, gave the order for the whole confederacy to arm, in May 1653 The struggle was short and decisive For a few weeks Leuenberger's soldiers robbed and murdered where they could, and made feeble and futile attempts upon the small cities of Aargau Towards the end of May he met, near Herzogenbuchsee, the Bernese troops. . . . A desperate fight ensued, but the insurgents were soon overpowered . . . This battle ended the insurrection" Leuenberger was beheaded. "No sooner was this revolt of the peasants over than the smouldering fires of religious hatred, zealously fanned by the clergy on both sides, broke out again . Several families of Arth, in Schwyz had been obliged by the Catholics to abjure their faith, or fly from their homes" Zurich took up their cause, and "a general war broke out . . . Berne first despatched troops to protect her own frontier, and then sent 40 banners to the help of Zurich" The Bernese troops were so careless that they allowed themselves to be surprised (January 14, 1656) by 4,000 Lucerners, in the territory of Villmergen, and were ruinously defeated, losing 800 men and eleven guns. "Soon afterwards a peace was concluded, where everything stood much as it had stood at the beginning of this war, which had lasted only nine weeks. . . . A second insurrection, on a smaller scale than the peasants' revolt, took place in St. Gall in the first years of the 18th century. The Swiss, free in the eyes of the outside world, were, as we have already seen, mere serfs in nearly all the cantons, and such was their condition in the country of Toggenburg. . . . The greater part of the rights over these estates had been sold to the abbot of St. Gall in 1468. In the year 1700, the abbey of St. Gall was presided over by Leodegar Burgisser as sovereign lord. . . . He began by questioning all the commune rights of the Toggenburgers, and called the people his serfs, in order that they might become so used to the name as not to rebel against the hardness of the condition. Even at the time when he became abbot, there was very little, either of right or privilege, remaining to these poor people. . . . When, in 1701, Abbot Leodegar ordered them to build and keep open, at their own expense, a new road through the Hummelwald, crushed as they had been, they turned." After much fruitless remonstrance and appeal they took up arms, supported by the Protestant cantons and attacked by the Catholics, with aid contributed by the nuncio of the pope, himself. "The contest was practically ended on the 25th of July, 1712, by a decisive victory by the Protestants on the battle field of Villmergen, where they had been beaten by the Lucerne men 56 years before. The battle lasted four hours, and 2,000 Catholics were slain

In the month of August, a general peace was concluded at Aarau, to the great advantage of the conquerors. The five Catholic cantons were obliged to yield their rights over Baden and Rapperswyl, and to associate Berne with themselves in the sovereignty over Thurgau and the Rheinfeld. By this provision the two religions became equalized in those provinces . . . The Toggenburgers came once more under the jurisdiction of an abbot of St Gall, but with improved rights and privileges, and under the powerful protection of Zurich and Berne The Catholic cantons were long in recovering from the expenses of this war . . During 86 years from the peace of Aarau, the Swiss were engaged in neither foreign nor civil war, and the disturbances which agitated the different cantons from time to time were confined to a limited stage. But real peace and union were as far off as ever. Religious differences, plots, intrigues, and revolts, kept people of the same canton and village apart, until the building which their forefathers had raised in the early days of the republic was gradually weakened and ready to fall, like a house of cards, at the first blow from France"—H. D S Mackenzie, *Switzerland, ch.* 15-16

Also in H Zschokke, *Hist. of Switzerland, ch.* 42-56

A. D. 1792-1798.—The ferment of the French Revolution.—Invasion and subjugation by the French.—Robbing of the treasure of Berne.—Formation of the Helvetic Republic.—"The world rang with arms and cries of war, with revolutions, battles and defeats. The French promised fraternity and assistance to every people who wished to make themselves free. . . . Their arms advanced victorious through Savoy and the Netherlands and over the Rhine. Nearer and nearer drew the danger around the country of the Alpine people But the government of the Confederate states showed no foresight in view of the danger. They thought themselves safe behind the shield of their innocence and their neutrality between the contending parties. They had no arms and prepared none; they had no strength and did not draw closer the bands of their everlasting compact. Each canton, timidly and in silence, cared for its own safety, but little for that of the others. . . . All kinds of pamphlets stirred up the people. At Lausanne, Vevey, Rolle and other places, fiery young men, in noisy assemblages, drank success to the arms of emancipated France. Although public order was nowhere disturbed by such proceedings, the gov-

ernment of Berne thought it necessary to put a stop to them by severe measures and to compel silence by wholesome fear. They sent plenipotentiaries supported by an armed force. The guilty and even the innocent were punished More fled This silenced Vaud, but did not quell her indignation The fugitives breathed vengeance . In foreign countries dwelt sadly many of those who, at various times, had been banished from the Confederacy because they had, by word or deed, too boldly or importunately defended the rights and freedom of their fellow citizens Several of these addressed the chiefs of the French republic . Such addresses pleased the chiefs of France They thought in their hearts that Switzerland would be an excellent bulwark for France, and a desirable gate, through which the way would be always open to Italy and Germany They also knew of and longed for the treasures of the Swiss cities And they endeavored to find cause of quarrel with the magistrates of the Confederates . . . Shortly afterwards, came the great general Napoleon Buonaparte, and marched through Savoy into Italy against the forces of the emperor . In a very few months, though in many battles, Buonaparte vanquished the whole power of Austria, conquered and terrified Italy from one end to the other, took the whole of Lombardy and compelled the emperor to make peace. He made Lombardy a republic, called the Cisalpine. When the subjects of Grisons in Valtelina Chiavenna and Bormio saw this, they preferred to be citizens of the neighboring Cisalpine republic, rather than poor subjects of Grisons For their many grievances and complaints were rarely listened to But Buonaparte said to Grisons: 'If you will give freedom and equal rights to these people, they may be your fellow-citizens, and still remain with you I give you time; decide and send word to me at Milan'. . When the last period for decision had passed, Buonaparte became indignant and impatient, and united Valtelina, Chiavenna and Bormio to the Cisalpine republic (22d Oct, 1797) . . . So the old limits of Switzerland were unjustly contracted; four weeks afterwards also, that part of the bishopric of Bâle which had hitherto been respected on account of its alliance with the Swiss, was added to France. Thereat great fear fell on the Confederates. . Then the rumor spread that a French army was approaching the frontiers of Switzerland to protect the people of Vaud. They had called for the intervention of France in virtue of ancient treaties. But report said that the French intended to overthrow the Confederate authorities and to make themselves masters of the country . . Almost the whole Confederacy was in a state of confusion and dissolution. The governments of the cantons, powerless, distrustful and divided, acted each for itself, without concert. . . In the mean while a large army of French advanced. Under their generals Brune and Schauenberg they entered the territory of the Confederates, and Vaud, accepting foreign protection, declared herself independent of Berne. Then the governments of Switzerland felt that they could no longer maintain their former dominion. Lucerne and Schauffhausen declared their subjects free and united to themselves. Zurich released the prisoners of Stafa, and promised to ameliorate her constitution to the advantage of the people. . . . Even Freiburg now felt that the change must come for which Chenaur had bled. And the council of Berne received into their number 52 representatives of the country and said: 'Let us hold together in the common danger.' All these reforms and revolutions were the work of four weeks; all too late. Berne, indeed, with Freiburg and Solothurn, opposed her troops to the advancing French army. Courage was not wanting; but discipline, skill in arms and experienced officers. . . . On the very first day of the war (2d March, 1798), the enemy's light troops took Freiburg and Solothurn, and on the fourth (5th March), Berne itself. . . . France now authoritatively decided the future fate of Switzerland and said: 'The Confederacy is no more. Henceforward the whole of Switzerland shall form a free state, one and indivisible, under the name of the Helvetian republic. All the inhabitants, in country as well as city, shall have equal rights of citizenship. The citizens in general assembly shall choose their magistrates, officers, judges and legislative council; the legislative council shall elect the general government; the government shall appoint the cantonal prefects and officers' The whole Swiss territory was divided into 18 cantons of about equal size For this purpose the district of Berne was parcelled into the cantons of Vaud, Oberland, Berne and Aragau, several small cantons were united in one, as Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden and Zug in the canton of Waldstatten; St Gallen district, Rheinthal and Appenzell in the canton of Santis, several countries subject to the Confederacy, as Baden, Thurgau, Lugano and Bellinzona, formed new cantons. Valais was also added as one; Grisons was invited to join, but Geneva, Muhlhausen and other districts formerly parts of Switzerland, were separated from her and incorporated with France So decreed the foreign conquerors They levied heavy war-taxes and contributions. They carried off the tons of gold which Berne, Zurich and other cities had accumulated in their treasure-chambers during their dominion. . . . But the mountaineers of Uri, Nidwalden, Schwyz and Glarus, original confederates in liberty, said: 'In battle and in blood, our fathers won the glorious jewel of our independence, we will not lose it but in battle and in blood.' . . Then they fought valiantly near Wollrau and on the Schindellegi, but unsuccessfully. . . . But Aloys Reding reassembled his troops on the Rothenthurm, near the Morgarten field of victory. There a long and bloody battle took place. . . . Thrice did the French troops renew the combat: thrice were they defeated and driven back to Aegeri in Zug. It was the second of May. Nearly 2,000 of the enemy lay slain upon that glorious field. Gloriously also fought the Waldstatten on the next day near Arth. But the strength of the heroes bled away in their very victories. They made a treaty, and, with sorrow in their hearts, entered the Helvetian republic. Thus ended the old Bond of the Confederates. Four hundred and ninety years had it lasted; in seventy-four days it was dissolved."—H. Zschokke, *The History of Switzerland, ch. 57 and 60.*—"A system of robbery and extortion, more shameless even than that practised in Italy, was put in force against the cantonal governments, against the monasteries, and against private individuals. In compensation for the material losses inflicted upon the country, the new Helvetic Republic, one and in-

divisible, was proclaimed at Aarau. It conferred an equality of political rights upon all natives of Switzerland, and substituted for the ancient varieties of cantonal sovereignty a single national government, composed, like that of France, of a Directory and two Councils of Legislature. The towns and districts which had been hitherto excluded from a share in government welcomed a change which seemed to place them on a level with their former superiors the mountain-cantons fought with traditional heroism in defence of the liberties which they had inherited from their fathers, but they were compelled, one after another, to submit to the overwhelming force of France, and to accept the new constitution Yet, even now, when peace seemed to have been restored, and the whole purpose of France attained, the tyranny and violence of the invaders exhausted the endurance of a spirited people. The magistrates of the Republic were expelled from office at the word of a French Commission, hostages were seized, at length an oath of allegiance to the new order was required as a condition for the evacuation of Switzerland by the French army It was refused by the mountaineers of Unterwalden, and a handful of peasants met the French army at the village of Stanz, on the eastern shore of the Lake of Lucerne (Sept 8) There for three days they fought with unyielding courage Their resistance inflamed the French to a cruel vengeance slaughtered families and burning villages renewed, in this so called crusade of liberty, the savagery of ancient war"—C A Fyffe, *Hist of Modern Europe*, *v* 1, *ch* 4—"Geneva at the same time [1798] fell a prey to the ambition of the all engrossing Republic This celebrated city had long been an object of their desire, and the divisions by which it was now distracted afforded a favourable opportunity for accomplishing the object The democratic party loudly demanded a union with that power, and a commission was appointed by the Senate to report upon the subject Their report, however, was unfavourable; upon which General Gerard, who commanded a small corps in the neighbourhood, took possession of the town, and the Senate, with the bayonet at their throats, formally agreed to a union with the conquering Republic"—Sir A Alison, *Hist of Europe*, 1789–1815, *ch* 25 (*v.* 6)

ALSO IN A. Thiers, *Hist of the Fr. Rev.* (*Am ed*), *v.* 4, *pp* 248–252—Mallet du Pan, *Memoirs and Cor*, *v.* 2, *ch.* 13–14.

A. D. 1797. — Bonaparte's dismemberment of the Graubünden. See FRANCE. A. D 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER)

A. D. 1798-1799.—Battlefield of the second Coalition against France. See FRANCE. A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1799 (August — December). — Campaign of the French against the Russians.—Battle of Zurich.—Carnage in the city.—Suwarrow's retreat. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER)

A. D. 1800.—Bonaparte's passage of the Great St. Bernard. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800–1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1802.—Revolution instigated and enforced by Bonaparte. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801–1802.

A. D. 1803-1848.—Napoleon's Act of Mediation.—Independence regained and Neutrality guaranteed by the Congress of Vienna.—Geneva, the Valais, and Neuchâtel.—The Federal Pact of 1815.—The Sonderbund and Civil War.—The Federal Constitution of 1848.—"Bonaparte summoned deputies of both parties to Paris, and after long consultation with them he gave to Switzerland, on the 2d February 1803, a new Constitution termed the Act of Mediation. Old names were restored, and in some cases what had been subject lands were incorporated in the League, which now consisted of 19 Cantons, each having a separate Constitution The additional six were St. Gallen, the Grisons, Aargau, Thurgau, Ticino, and Vaud. This was the fifth phase of the Confederation. A Diet was created, there being one deputy to each Canton, but still with limited powers, for he could only vote according to his instructions. The 19 deputies had, however, between them 25 votes, because every deputy who represented a Canton with more than 100,000 inhabitants possessed two votes, and there were six of these Cantons The Diet met once a year in June, by turns at Zürich, Bern, Luzern, Freiburg, Solothurn, and Basel, the Cantons of which these were the capitals becoming successively directing Cantons Three were Catholic and three Protestant The head of the directing Canton for the time being was Landammann of Switzerland and President of the Diet The Act of Mediation was not acceptable to all parties, and before Switzerland could become entirely independent there was to be one more foreign intervention. The fall of the Emperor Napoleon brought with it the destruction of his work in that country, the neutrality and independence of which were recognized by the Congress of Vienna [see VIENNA, CONGRESS OF], though upon condition of the maintenance in the Confederation of the new Cantons, and in 1814 the Valais (a Republic allied to the Confederation from the Middle Ages till 1798), Neuchâtel (which, from being subject to the King of Prussia, had been bestowed by Napoleon upon Marshal Berthier), and Geneva (which had been annexed to France under the Directory in 1798, but was now independent and rendered more compact by the addition of some territory belonging to France and Savoy) were added to the existing Cantons. Finally, the perpetual neutrality of Switzerland and the inviolability of her territory were guaranteed by Austria, Great Britain, Portugal, Prussia, and Russia, in an Act signed at Paris on the 20th November 1815. Neuchâtel, however, only really gained its independence in 1857, when it ceased to be a Prussian Principality. The Confederation now consisted of 22 Cantons, and a Federal Pact, drawn up at Zürich by the Diet in 1815, and accepted by the Congress of Vienna, took the place of the Act of Mediation, and remained in force till 1848. It was in some respects a return to the state of things previous to the French Revolution, and restored to the Cantons a large portion of their former sovereignty. . . . Then came an epoch of agitation and discord. The Confederation suffered from a fundamental vice, i. e. the powerlessness of the central authority. The Cantons had become too independent, and gave to their deputies instructions differing widely from each other. The fall of the Bourbons in 1830 had its echo in Switzerland, the patricians of Bern and the aristocratic class in other Cantons lost the ascendency which they had grad-

ually recovered since the beginning of the century, and the power of the people was greatly increased. In several months 12 Cantons, among which were Luzern and Freiburg, modified their Constitutions in a democratic sense, some peaceably, others by revolution . . . Between 1830 and 1847 there were in all 27 revisions of cantonal Constitutions To political disputes religious troubles were added In Aargau the Constitution of 1831, whereby the Grand Council was made to consist of 200 members, half being Protestants and half Catholics, was revised in 1840, and by the new Constitution the members were no longer to be chosen with any reference to creed, but upon the basis of wide popular representation, thus giving a numerical advantage to the Protestants Discontent arose among the Catholics, and eventually some 2,000 peasants of that faith took up arms, but were beaten by Protestants of Aargau at Villmergen in January 1841, and the consequence was the suppression of the eight convents in that Canton, and the confiscation of their most valuable property . . . A first result of the suppression of these convents was the fall of the Liberal government of Luzern, and the advent to power of the chiefs of the Ultramontane party in that Canton. Two years later the new government convoked delegates of the Catholic Cantons at Rothen, near Luzern, and there in secret conferences, and under the pretext that religion was in danger, the bases of a separate League or Sonderbund were laid, embracing the four Forest Cantons, Zug, and Freiburg. Subsequently the Valais joined the League, which was clearly a violation not only of the letter but also of the spirit of the Federal Pact. In 1844 the Grand Council of Luzern voted in favour of the Jesuits' appeal to be entrusted with the direction of superior public education, and this led to hostilities between the Liberal and Ultramontane parties. Bands of volunteers attacked Luzern and were defeated, the expulsion of the Jesuits became a burning question, and finally, when the ordinary Diet assembled at Bern in July 1847, the Sonderbund Cantons declared their intention of persevering in their separate alliance until the other Cantons had decreed the re-establishment of the Aargau convents, abandoned the question of the Jesuits, and renounced all modifications of the Pact. These conditions could evidently not be accepted. . . . On the 4th November 1847, after the deputies of the Sonderbund had left the Diet, this League was declared to be dissolved, and hostilities broke out between the two contending parties. A short and decisive campaign of 25 days ensued, Freiburg was taken by the Federal troops, under General Dufour, later Luzern opened its gates, the small Cantons and the Valais capitulated and the strife came to an end. . . . As soon as the Sonderbund was dissolved, it became necessary to proceed to the revision of the Federal Pact."—Sir F. O. Adams and C. D. Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation, ch.* 1.

A. D. 1810.—Annexation of the Valais to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1817.—Accession to the Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1832.—Educational reforms. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—SWITZERLAND.

A. D. 1848-1890.—The existing Federal Constitution.—On the conclusion of the Sonderbund Secession and War, the task of drawing up a Constitution for the Confederacy was confided to a committee of fourteen members, and the work was finished on the 8th of April, 1848 "The project was submitted to the Cantons, and accepted at once by thirteen and a half, others joined during the summer, and the new Constitution was finally promulgated with the assent of all on the 12th September. Hence arose the seventh and last phase of the Confederation, by the adoption of a Federal Constitution for the whole of Switzerland, being the first which was entirely the work of Swiss, without any foreign influence, although its authors had studied that of the United States . . . It was natural that, as in process of time commerce and industry were developed, and as the differences between the legislation of the various Cantons became more apparent, a revision of the first really Swiss Constitution should be found necessary. This was proposed both in 1871 and 1872, but the partisans of a further centralization, though successful in the Chambers, were defeated upon an appeal to the popular vote on the 12th May 1872, by a majority of between five and six thousand, and by thirteen Cantons to nine The question was, however, by no means settled, and in 1874 a new project of revision, more acceptable to the partisans of cantonal independence, was adopted by the people, the numbers being 340,199, to 198,013 The Cantons were about two to one in favour of the revision, 14½ declaring for and 7½ against it This Constitution bears date the 29th May 1874, and has since been added to and altered in certain particulars"—Sir F O. Adams and C. D Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation, ch.* 1.—"Since 1848 . . . Switzerland has been a federal state, consisting of a central authority, the Bund, and 19 entire and 6 half states, the Cantons, to foreign powers she presents an united front, while her internal policy allows to each Canton a large amount of independence. . . . The basis of all legislative division is the Commune or 'Gemeinde,' corresponding in some slight degree to the English 'Parish' The Commune in its legislative and administrative aspect or 'Einwohnergemeinde' is composed of all the inhabitants of a Commune. It is self-governing and has the control of the local police; it also administers all matters connected with pauperism, education, sanitary and funeral regulations, the fire brigade, the maintenance of public peace and trusteeships. . . . At the head of the Commune is the 'Gemeinderath,' or 'Communal Council,' whose members are elected from the inhabitants for a fixed period. It is presided over by an 'Ammann,' or 'Mayor,' or 'President.' . . . Above the Commune on the ascending scale comes the Canton. . . . Each of the 19 Cantons and 6 half Cantons is a sovereign state, whose privileges are nevertheless limited by the Federal Constitution, particularly as regards legal and military matters; the Constitution also defines the extent of each Canton, and no portion of a Canton is allowed to secede and join itself to another Canton. . . . Legislative power is in the hands of the 'Volk'; in the political sense of the word the 'Volk' consists of all the Swiss living in the Canton, who have passed their 20th year and are not under disability from

crime or bankruptcy. The voting on the part of the people deals mostly with alterations in the cantonal constitution, treaties, laws, decisions of the First Council involving expenditures of Frs. 100,000 and upward, and other decisions which the Council considers advisable to subject to the public vote, which also determines the adoption of propositions for the creation of new laws, or the alteration or abolition of old ones, when such a plebiscite is demanded by a petition signed by 5,000 voters . . The First Council (Grosse Rath) is the highest political and administrative power of the Canton It corresponds to the 'Chamber' of other countries Every 1,800 inhabitants of an electoral circuit send one member. . . . The Kleine Rath or special council (corresponding to the 'Ministerium' of other continental countries) is composed of three members and has three proxies It is chosen by the First Council for a period of two years. It superintends all cantonal institutions and controls the various public boards . . The populations of the 22 sovereign Cantons constitute together the Swiss Confederation . . . The highest power of the Bund is exercised by the 'Bundesversammlung,' or Parliament, which consists of two chambers, the 'Nationalrath,' and the 'Ständerath' The Nationalrath corresponds to the English House of Commons, and the Ständerath partially to the House of Lords, the former represents the Swiss people, the latter the Cantons The Nationalrath consists of 145 members. . . Every Canton or half Canton must choose at least one member, and for the purpose of election Switzerland is divided into 49 electoral districts The Nationalrath is triennial . . The Ständerath consists of 44 members, each Canton having two representatives and each half Canton one. . . . A bill is regarded as passed when it has an absolute majority in both chambers, but it does not come into force until either a plebiscite is not demanded for a space of three months, or, if it is demanded (for which the request of 30,000 voters is necessary) the result of the appeal to the people is in favor of the bill. This privilege of the people to control the decision of their representatives is called Das Referendum [see REFERENDUM]. . . . The highest administrative authority in Switzerland is the Bundesrath, composed of seven members, which [like the Bundesversammlung] . . . meets in Bern Its members are chosen by the Bundesversammlung and the term of office is ten years . . The president of the Confederation (Bundespresident) is chosen by the Bundesversammlung from the members of the Bundesrath for one year The administration of justice, so far as it is exercised by the Bund, is entrusted to a Court, the Bundesgericht, consisting of nine members "—P. Hauri, *Sketch of the Const of Switzerland* (*in Strickland's "The Engadine"*)

ALSO IN: Sir F O Adams and C. D Cunningham, *The Swiss Confederation.*—J M. Vincent, *State and Federal Gov't in Switzerland.*—*Old South Leaflets, gen. series, no.* 18.—*Univ. of Penn., Pub's, no* 8.—For the text of the Swiss Constitution, see CONSTITUTION OF SWITZERLAND

A. D. 1871.—Exclusion of Jesuits. See JESUITS A D. 1769-1871

A. D. 1894.—The President of the Swiss Federal Council for 1894 is Émile Frey, the Vice President, Joseph Zemp According to the latest census, taken in 1888, the population of Switzerland was 2,917,740

SWORD, German Order of the. See LIVONIA 12-13TH CENTURIES.

SWORD, Swedish Order of the.—An Order, ascribed to Gustavus Vasa It was revived, after long neglect, by King Frederick I in 1748.

SYAGRIUS, Kingdom of. See GAUL. A. D 457-486

SYBARIS.—SYBARITES.—Sybaris and Kroton were two ancient Greek cities, founded by Achæan colonists, on the coast of the gulf of Tarentum, in southern Italy. "The town of Sybaris was planted between two rivers, the Sybaris and the Krathis (the name of the latter borrowed from a river of Achaia); the town of Kroton about twenty-five miles distant, on the river Æsarus. . . . The fatal contest between these two cities, which ended in the ruin of Sybaris, took place in 510 B C, after the latter had subsisted in growing prosperity for 210 years . . . We are told that the Sybarites, in that final contest, marched against Kroton with an army of 300,000 men . . . The few statements which have reached us respecting them touch, unfortunately, upon little more than their luxury, fantastic self-indulgence and extravagant indolence, for which qualities they have become proverbial in modern times as well as in ancient. Anecdotes illustrating these qualities were current, and served more than one purpose in antiquity."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

SYBOTA, Naval Battle of.—Fought, B. C. 432, between the fleets of Corinth and Corcyra, in the quarrel which led up to the Peloponnesian War The Athenians had ten ships present, as allies of the Corcyreans, intending only to watch affairs, but at the end they were drawn into the fight The Corcyreans were beaten.—Thucydides, *History, bk* 1, *sect* 46

SYCOPHANTS.—"Not until now [about B C 428, when the demagogue Cleon rose to power at Athens] did the activity of the Sycophants attain to its full height; a class of men arose who made a regular trade of collecting materials for indictments, and of bringing their fellow citizens before a legal tribunal. These denunciations were particularly directed against those who were distinguished by wealth, birth and services, and who therefore gave cause for suspicion, for the informers wished to prove themselves zealous friends of the people and active guardians of the constitution. . . . Intrigues and conspiracies were suspected in all quarters, and the popular orators persuaded the citizens to put no confidence in any magistrate, envoy or commission, but rather to settle everything in full assembly and themselves assume the entire executive. The Sycophants made their living out of this universal suspicion. . . . They threatened prosecutions in order thus to extort money from guilty and innocent alike; for even among those who felt free from guilt were many who shunned a political prosecution beyond all other things, having no confidence in a jury."—E. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece, bk.* 4, *ch.* 2 (*v.* 3).

SYDENHAM, and Rational Medicine. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17TH CENTURY.

SYDNEY: First settlement (1788). See AUSTRALIA: A. D. 1601–1800.

SYLLA. See SULLA

SYLLABARIES.—"A good deal of the [Assyrian] literature was of a lexical and grammatical kind, and was intended to assist the Semitic student in interpreting the old Accadian texts Lists of characters were drawn up with their pronunciation in Accadian and the translation into Assyrian of the words represented by them. Since the Accadian pronunciation of a character was frequently the phonetic value attached to it by the Assyrians, these syllabaries, as they have been termed—in consequence of the fact that the cuneiform characters denoted syllables and not letters—have been of the greatest possible assistance in the decipherment of the inscriptions "—A. H Sayce, *Assyria, its Princes, Priests and People, ch* 4.

SYLLABUS OF 1864, The. See PAPACY: A D. 1864

SYLVANIA, The proposed State of. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.. A. D. 1784.

SYLVESTER II., Pope, A D 999–1003 . . .Sylvester III., Antipope, 1044

SYMMACHIA.—An offensive and defensive alliance between two states was so called by the Greeks

SYMMORIÆ, The.—"In the archonship of Nausinicus in Olymp 100,3 (B. C. 378) the institution of what were called the symmoriæ (collegia, or companies), was introduced [at Athens] in relation to the property taxes The object of this institution, as the details of the arrangement themselves show, was through the joint liability of larger associations to confirm the sense of individual obligation to pay the taxes, and to secure their collection, and also, in case of necessity, to cause those taxes which were not received at the proper time to be advanced by the most wealthy citizens "—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of the Athenians (tr. by Lamb), bk.* 4, *ch* 9.

SYMPOSIUM.—The Symposium of the ancient Greeks was that part of a feast which ensued when the substantial eating was done, and which was enlivened with wine, music, conversation, exhibitions of dancing, etc —C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern, course* 2, *lect* 5.

SYNHEDRION, OR SYNEDRION, The. See SANHEDRIM.

SYNOECIA. See ATHENS: THE BEGINNING.

SYNOD OF THE OAK, The. See ROME: A. D. 400–518.

SYRACUSE: B. C. 734.—The Founding of the city.—"Syracuse was founded the year after Naxos, by Corinthians, under a leader named Archias, a Heracleid, and probably of the ruling caste, who appears to have been compelled to quit his country to avoid the effects of the indignation which he had excited by a horrible outrage committed in a family of lower rank. . . . Syracuse became, in course of time, the parent of other Sicilian cities, among which Camarina was the most considerable. . . . Forty-five years after Syracuse, Gela was founded by a band collected from Crete and Rhodes, chiefly from Lindus, and about a century later (B. C. 582) sent forth settlers to the banks of the Acragas, where they built Agrigentum."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece, ch.* 12.—The first settlement at Syracuse was on the islet of Ortygia. "Ortygia, two English miles in circumference, was separated from the main island only by a narrow channel, which was bridged over when the city was occupied and enlarged by Gelôn in the 72nd Olympiad, if not earlier. It formed only a small part, though the most secure and best-fortified part, of the vast space which the city afterwards occupied. But it sufficed alone for the inhabitants during a considerable time, and the present city in its modern decline has again reverted to the same modest limits. Moreover, Ortygia offered another advantage of not less value. It lay across the entrance of a spacious harbour, approached by a narrow mouth, and its fountain of Arethusa was memorable in antiquity both for the abundance and goodness of its water."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch.* 22.

B. C. 480.—Defeat of the Carthaginians at Himera. See SICILY: B. C. 480.

B. C. 415-413.—Siege by the Athenians.—The Greek city of Syracuse, in Sicily, having been founded and built up by colonization from Corinth, naturally shared the deep hatred of Athens which was common among the Dorian Greeks, and which the Corinthians particularly found many reasons to cherish. The feeling at Athens was reciprocal, and, as the two cities grew supreme in their respective spheres and arrogant with the consciousness of superior power, mutual jealousies fed their passion of hostility, although nothing in their affairs, either politically or commercially, brought them really into conflict with one another But Syracuse, enforcing her supremacy in Sicily, dealt roughly with the Ionian settlements there, and Athens was appealed to for aid The first call upon her was made (B C. 428) in the midst of the earlier period of the Peloponnesian War, and came from the people of Leontini, then engaged in a struggle with Syracuse into which other Sicilian cities had been drawn. The Athenians were easily induced to respond to the call, and they sent a naval force which took part in the Leontine War, but without any marked success. The result was to produce among the Sicilians a common dread of Athenian interference, which led them to patch up a general peace. But fresh quarrels were not long in arising, in the course of which Leontini was entirely destroyed, and another Sicilian city, Egesta, which Athens had before received into her alliance, claimed help against Syracuse. This appeal reached the Athenians at a time (B. C. 416) when their populace was blindly following Alcibiades, whose ambition craved war, and who chafed under the restraints of the treaty of peace with Sparta which Nicias had brought about. They were carried by his influence into the undertaking of a great expedition of conquest, directed against the Sicilian capital—the most costly and formidable which any Greek state had ever fitted out. In the summer of B. C. 415 the whole force assembled at Corcyra and sailed across the Ionian sea to the Italian coast and thence to Sicily. It consisted of 134 triremes, with many merchant, ships and transports, bearing 5,100 hoplites, 480 bowmen and 700 Rhodian slingers. The commanders were Nicias, Lamachus and Alcibiades. On the arrival of the expedition in Sicily a disagreement among the generals made efficient action impossible and gave the Syracusans time to prepare a stubborn resistance. Meantime the enemies of Alcibiades

at Athens had brought about a decree for his arrest, on account of an alleged profanation of the sacred Eleusinian mysteries, and, fearing to face the accusation, he fled, taking refuge at Sparta, where he became the implacable enemy of his country Three months passed before Nicias, who held the chief command, made any attempt against Syracuse He then struck a single blow, which was successful, but which led to nothing, for the Athenian army was withdrawn immediately afterwards and put into winter quarters In the following spring the regular operations of a siege and blockade were undertaken, at sea with the fleet and on land by a wall of circumvallation The undertaking promised well at first and the Syracusans were profoundly discouraged But Sparta where Alcibiades worked passionately in their favor, sent them a general, Gylippus, who proved to be equal to an army, and promised reinforcements to follow The more vigorous Athenian general, Lamachus, had been killed, and Nicias, with incredible apathy suffered Gylippus to gather up a small army in the island and to enter Syracuse with it, in defiance of the Athenian blockade From that day the situation was reversed The besieged became the assailants and the besiegers defended themselves Nicias sent to Athens for help and maintained his ground with difficulty through another long winter, until a second great fleet and army arrived, under the capable general Demosthenes, to reinforce him But it was too late Syracuse had received powerful aid, in ships and men, from Corinth, from Sparta and from other enemies of Athens, had built a navy and trained sailors of her own, and was full of confident courage The Athenians were continually defeated, on land and sea, and hoped for nothing at last but to be able to retreat Even the opportunity to do that was lost for them in the end by the weakness of Nicias, who delayed moving on account of an eclipse, until his fleet was destroyed in a final sea-fight and the island roads were blocked by an implacable enemy The flight when it was undertaken proved a hopeless attempt, and there is nothing in history more tragical than the account of it which is given in the pages of Thucydides On the sixth day of the struggling retreat the division under Demosthenes gave up and surrendered to the pursuers who swarmed around it On the next day Nicias yielded with the rest, after a terrible massacre at the river Assinarus Nicias and Demosthenes were put to the sword, although Gylippus interceded for them Their followers were imprisoned in the Syracusan quarries. "There were great numbers of them and they were crowded in a deep and narrow place At first the sun by day was still scorching and suffocating, for they had no roof over their heads, while the autumn nights were cold, and the extremes of temperature engendered violent disorders. Being cramped for room they had to do everything on the same spot. The corpses of those who died from their wounds, exposure to the weather, and the like, lay heaped one upon another. The smells were intolerable; and they were at the same time afflicted by hunger and thirst. During eight months they were allowed only about half a pint of water and a pint of food a day. Every kind of misery which could befall man in such a place befell them This was the condition of all the captives for about ten weeks At length the Syracusans sold them, with the exception of the Athenians and of any Sicilian or Italian Greeks who had sided with them in the war The whole number of the public prisoners is not accurately known, but they were not less than 7,000 Of all the Hellenic actions which took place in this war, or indeed of all Hellenic actions which are on record, this was the greatest — the most glorious to the victors, the most ruinous to the vanquished, for they were utterly and at all points defeated, and their sufferings were prodigious Fleet and army perished from the face of the earth; nothing was saved, and of the many who went forth few returned home Thus ended the Sicilian expedition "— Thucydides, *History* (*tr. by Jowett*), *bk* 6–7

Also in E A Freeman, *Hist of Sicily*, *v.* 3. —G Grote, *Hist of Greece*, *pt* 2, *ch* 58–60.—Sir E Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles*, *ch.* 2 — See, also, Athens B C 415–413

B. C. 397-396.—Dionysius and the Carthaginians.—Eighteen years after the tragic deliverance of Syracuse from the besieging host and fleet of the Athenians, the Sicilian capital experienced a second great peril and extraordinary escape of like kind The democratic government of Syracuse had meantime fallen and a new tyrant had risen to power Dionysius, who began life in a low station, made his way upward by ruthless energy and cunning, practising skilfully the arts of a demagogue until he had won the confidence of the people, and making himself their master in the end When the sovereignty of Dionysius had acquired firmness and the fortifications and armament of his city had been powerfully increased, it suited his purposes to make war upon the Carthaginians, which he did, B C 397 He attacked Motye, which was the most important of their cities in Sicily, and took it after a siege of some months' duration, slaughtering and enslaving the wretched inhabitants But his triumph in this exploit was brief. Imilkon, or Himilco, the Carthaginian commander, arrived in Sicily with a great fleet and army and recaptured Motye with ease That done he made a rapid march to Messene, in the northeastern extremity of the island, and gained that city almost without a blow. The inhabitants escaped, for the most part, but the town is said to have been reduced to an utter heap of ruins — from which it was subsequently rebuilt. From Messene he advanced to Syracuse, Dionysius not daring to meet him in the field. The Syracusan fleet, encountering that of the Carthaginians, near Katana, was almost annihilated, and when the vast African armament, numbering more than seventeen hundred ships of every description, sailed into the Great Harbor of Syracuse, there was nothing to oppose it. The city was formidably invested, by land and sea, and its fate would have appeared to be sealed. But the gods interposed, as the ancients thought, and avenged themselves for insults which the Carthaginians had put upon them. Once more the fatal pestilence which had smitten the latter twice before in their Sicilian Wars appeared and their huge army was palsied by it. "Care and attendance upon the sick, or even interment of the dead, became impracticable; so that the whole camp presented a scene of deplorable agony, aggravated by the horrors and stench of

150,000 unburied bodies. The military strength of the Carthaginians was completely prostrated by such a visitation. Far from being able to make progress in the siege, they were not even able to defend themselves against moderate energy on the part of the Syracusans; who . . . were themselves untouched by the distemper." In this situation the Carthaginian commander basely deserted his army. Having secretly bribed Dionysius to permit the escape of himself and the small number of native Carthaginians in his force, he abandoned the remainder to their fate (B. C. 394). Dionysius took the Iberians into his service, but the Libyans and other mercenaries were either killed or enslaved. As for Imilkon, soon after his return to Carthage he shut himself in his house and died, refusing food. The blow to the prestige of Carthage was nearly fatal, producing a rebellion among her subjects which assumed a most formidable character; but it lacked capable command and was suppressed —G. Grote, *Hist of Greece, pt.* 2, *ch* 82

B. C. 394-384.—Conquests and dominion of Dionysius.—"The successful result of Dionysios' first Punic War seems to have largely spread his fame in Old Greece," while it increased his prestige and power at home But "he had many difficulties. He too, like the Carthaginians, had to deal with a revolt among his mercenaries, and he had to give up to them the town of Leontinoi. And the people of Naxos and Katanê, driven out by himself, and the people of Messana, driven out by Himilkôn, were wandering about, seeking for dwelling places. He restored Messana, but he did not give it back to its old inhabitants. He peopled it with colonists from Italy and from Old Greece. . He also planted a body of settlers from the old Messenian land in Peloponnêsos," at Tyndaris. "Thus the north-eastern corner of Sicily was held by men who were really attached to Dionysios. And he went on further to extend his power along the north coast . . . The Sikel towns were now fast taking to Greek ways, and we hear of commonwealths and tyrants among them, just as among the Greeks. Agyris, lord of Agyrium, was said to be the most powerful prince in Sicily after Dionysios himself. . . . With him Dionysios made a treaty, and also with other Sikel lords and cities." But he attacked the new Sikel town of Tauromenion, and was disastrously repulsed. "This discomfiture at Tauromenion checked the plans of Dionysios for a while. Several towns threw off his dominion. . . . And the Carthaginians also began to stir again. In B. C. 393 their general Magôn, seemingly without any fresh troops from Africa, set out from Western Sicily to attack Messana." But Dionysios defeated him, and the next year he made peace with the Carthaginians, as one of the consequences of which he captured Tauromenion in 391. "Dionysios was now at the height of his power in Sicily. . . . He commanded the whole east coast, and the greater part of the north and south coasts. . . . Dionysios and Carthage might be said to divide Sicily between them, and Dionysios had the larger share." Being at peace with the Carthaginians, he now turned his arms against the Greek cities in Southern Italy, and took Kaulônia, Hippônion, and Rhêgion (B. C. 387), making himself, "beyond all doubt, the chief power, not only in Sicily, but in Greek Italy also." Three years later (B. C. 384) Dionysios sent a splendid embassy to the Olympic festival in Greece. "Lysias called on the assembled Greeks to show their hatred of the tyrant, to hinder his envoys from sacrificing or his chariots from running. His chariots did run; but they were all defeated. Some of the multitude made an attack on the splendid tents of his envoys. He had also sent poems of his own to be recited, but the crowd would not hear them."—E. A. Freeman, *The Story of Sicily, ch.* 10.

B. C. 383.—War with Carthage. See SICILY. B. C. 383.

B. C. 344.—Fall of the Dionysian tyranny.—The elder Dionysius,—he who climbed by cunning demagoguery from an obscure beginning in life to the height of power in Syracuse, making himself the typical tyrant of antiquity,—died in 367 B. C. after a reign of thirty-eight years. He was succeeded by his son, Dionysius the younger, who inherited nothing in character from his father but his vices and his shameless meannesses. For a time the younger Dionysius was largely controlled by the admirable influence of Dion, brother in law and son in-law of the elder tyrant (who had several wives and left several families). Dion had Plato for his teacher and friend, and strove with the help of the great Athenian—who visited Sicily thrice—to win the young tyrant to a life of virtue and to philosophical aims. The only result was to finally destroy the whole influence with which they began, and Dion, ere long, was driven from Syracuse, while Dionysius abandoned himself to debaucheries and cruelties After a time Dion was persuaded to lead a small force from Athens to Syracuse and undertake the overthrow of Dionysius. The gates of Syracuse were joyfully opened to him and his friends, and they were speedily in possession of the whole city except the island-stronghold of Ortygia, which was the entrenchment of the Dionysian tyranny. Then ensued a protracted and desperate civil war in Syracuse, which half ruined the magnificent city. In the end Ortygia was surrendered, Dionysius having previously escaped with much treasure to his dependent city of Lokri, in southern Italy. Dion took up the reins of government, intending to make himself what modern times would call a constitutional monarch. He wished the people to have liberty, but such liberty as a philosopher would find best for them. He was distrusted,—misunderstood,—denounced by demagogues, and hated, at last, as bitterly as the tyrants who preceded him. His high-minded ambitions were all disappointed and his own character suffered from the disappointment. At the end of a year of sovereignty he was assassinated by one of his own Athenian intimates, Kallippus, who secured the goodwill of the army and made himself despot. The reign of Kallippus was maintained for something more than a year, and he was then driven out by Hipparinus, one of the sons of Dionysius the elder, and half-brother to the younger of that name. Hipparinus was presently murdered and another brother, Nysæus, took his place. Then Nysæus, in turn, was driven out by Dionysius, who returned from Lokri and re-established his power. The condition of Syracuse under the restored despotism of Dionysius was worse than it ever had been in the past, and the great city seemed likely to perish. At the last extremity of suffering, in

344 B. C., its people sent a despairing appeal to Corinth (the mother-city of Syracuse) for help. The Corinthians responded by despatching to Sicily a small fleet of ten triremes and a meagre army of 1,200 men, under Timoleon. It is the first appearance in history of a name which soon shone with immortality; for Timoleon proved himself to be one of the greatest and the noblest of Greeks. He found affairs in Sicily complicated by an invasion of Carthaginians, co-operating with one Hiketas, who had made himself despot of Leontini and who hoped to become master of Syracuse. By skilfully using the good fortune which the gods were believed to have lavished upon his enterprise, Timoleon, within a few months, had defeated Hiketas in the field; had accepted the surrender of Dionysius in Ortygia and sent the fallen tyrant to Corinth; had caused such discouragement to the Carthaginians that they withdrew fleet and army and sailed away to Africa. The whole city now fell quickly into his hands. His first act was to demolish the stronghold of tyranny in Ortygia and to erect courts of justice upon its site. A free constitution of government was then re-established, all exiled citizens recalled, a great immigration of Greek inhabitants invited, and the city revivified with new currents of life. The tyranny in other cities was overthrown and all Sicily regenerated. The Carthaginians returning were defeated with fearful losses in a great battle on the Krimesus, and a peace made with them which narrowed their dominion in Sicily to the region west of the Halykus. All these great achievements completed, Timoleon resigned his generalship, declined every office, and became a simple citizen of Syracuse, living only a few years, however, to enjoy the grateful love and respect of its people.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 84–85.*

ALSO IN: Plutarch, *Timoleon.*

B. C. 317-289.—Under Agathokles.—A little more than twenty years after Timoleon expelled the brood of the tyrant Dionysius from Syracuse, and liberated Sicily, his work was entirely undone and a new and worse despot pushed himself into power. This was Agathokles, who rose, like his prototype, from a humble grade of life, acquired wealth by a lucky marriage, was trusted with the command of the Syracusan army — of mercenaries, chiefly — obtained a complete ascendancy over these soulless men, and then turned them loose upon the city, one morning at daybreak (B. C. 317), for a carnival of unrestrained riot and massacre. "They broke open the doors of the rich, or climbed over the roofs, massacred the proprietors within, and ravished the females. They chased the unsuspecting fugitives through the streets, not sparing even those who took refuge in the temples. . . . For two days Syracuse was thus a prey to the sanguinary, rapacious, and lustful impulses of the soldiery; 4,000 citizens had been already slain, and many more were seized as prisoners. The political purposes of Agathokles, as well as the passions of the soldiers, being then sated, he arrested the massacre. He concluded this bloody feat by killing such of his prisoners as were most obnoxious to him, and banishing the rest. The total number of expelled or fugitive Syracusans is stated at 6,000." In a city so purged and terrorized, Agathokles had no difficulty in getting himself proclaimed by acclamation sole ruler or autocrat, and he soon succeeded in extending his authority over a large part of Sicily. After some years he became involved in war with the Carthaginians, and suffered a disastrous defeat on the Himera (B. C. 310). Besieged in Syracuse, as a consequence, he resorted to bolder tactics than had been known before his time and "carried the war into Africa." His invasion of Carthage was the first that the Punic capital ever knew, and it created great alarm and confusion in the city. The Carthaginians were repeatedly beaten, Tunes, and other dependent towns, as well as Utica, were captured, the surrounding territory was ravaged, and Agathokles became master of the eastern coast. But all his successes gained him no permanent advantage, and, after four years of wonderful campaigning in Africa, he saw no escape from the difficulties of his situation except by basely stealing away from his army, leaving his two sons to be killed by the furious soldiers when they discovered his flight. Returning to Sicily, the wonderfully crafty and unscrupulous abilities which he possessed enabled him to regain his power and to commit outrage after outrage upon the people of Syracuse, Egesta, and other towns, until his death in 289 B. C.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece, pt. 2, ch. 97.*

B. C. 212.—Siege by the Romans. See PUNIC WARS: THE SECOND.

A. D. 279.—Sacked by Franks.—The Emperor Probus, who expelled from Gaul, A. D. 277, the invaders then beginning to swarm upon the hapless province, removed a large body of captive Franks to the coast of Pontus, on the Euxine, and settled them there. The restive barbarians soon afterwards succeeded (A. D. 279) in capturing a fleet of vessels, in which they made their way to the Mediterranean, plundering the shores and islands as they passed towards the west. "The opulent city of Syracuse, in whose port the navies of Athens and Carthage had formerly been sunk, was sacked by a handful of barbarians, who massacred the greatest part of the trembling inhabitants." This was the crowning exploit of the escaping Franks, after which they continued their voyage.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 12.*

A. D. 878.—Siege and capture by the Saracens. See SICILY: A. D. 827–878.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1769–1884.

SYRIA.—"Between the Arabian Desert and the eastern coast of the Levant there stretches — along almost the full extent of the latter, or for nearly 400 miles — a tract of fertile land varying from 70 to 100 miles in breadth. This is so broken up by mountain range and valley, that it has never all been brought under one native government; yet its well-defined boundaries — the sea on the west, Mount Taurus on the north, and the desert to east and south — give it a certain unity, and separate it from the rest of the world. It has rightly, therefore, been covered by one name, Syria. Like that of Palestine, the name is due to the Greeks, but by a reverse process. As 'Palestina,' which is really Philistina, was first the name of only a part of the coast, and thence spread inland to the desert, so Syria, which is a shorter form of Assyria, was originally applied by the Greeks to the whole of the Assyrian Empire from the Caucasus to the

Levant, then shrank to this side of the Euphrates, and finally within the limits drawn above. . . . Syria is the north end of the Arabian world. . . . The population of Syria has always been essentially Semitic [see SEMITES] . . Syria's position between two of the oldest homes of the human race made her the passage for the earliest intercourse and exchanges of civilisation. It is doubtful whether history has to record any great campaigns . . . earlier than those which Egypt and Assyria waged against each other across the whole extent of Syria [see EGYPT. ABOUT B. C. 1700–1400, to B. C 670–525] . . . The Hittites came south from Asia Minor over Mount Taurus, and the Ethiopians came north from their conquest of the Nile. Towards the end of the great duel between Assyria and Egypt, the Scythians from north of the Caucasus devastated Syria When the Babylonian Empire fell, the Persians made her a province of their empire, and marched across her to Egypt [see EGYPT. B C 525–832] At the beginning of our era, she was overrun by the Parthians. The Persians invaded her a second time, just before the Moslem invasion of the seventh century [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST A. D 632–639], she fell, of course, under the Seljuk Turks in the eleventh [see TURKS A D 1063–1073, and after], and in the thirteenth and fourteenth the Mongols thrice swept through her Into this almost constant stream of empires and races, which swept through Syria from the earliest ages, Europe was drawn under Alexander the Great [see MACEDONIA. B C 334–330, and after]. . . . She was scoured during the following centuries by the wars of the Seleucids and Ptolemies, and her plains were planted all over by their essentially Greek civilisation [see SELEUCIDÆ; and JEWS· B C 332–167]. Pompey brought her under the Roman Empire, B C 65 [see ROME: B. C 69–63; and JEWS. B C 166–40], and in this she remained till the Arabs took her, 634 A. D. [see MAHOMETAN CONQUEST: A. D. 632–639] The Crusaders held her for a century, 1098–1187, and parts of her for a century more [see CRUSADES. A. D 1096–1099] . . . Napoleon the Great made her the pathway of his ambition towards that empire on the Euphrates and Indus whose fate was decided on her plains, 1799 [see FRANCE: A. D 1798–1799 (AUGUST—AUGUST)]. Since then, Syria's history has mainly consisted in a number of sporadic attempts on the part of the Western world to plant upon her both their civilisation and her former religion."—George Adam Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land, bk.* 1, *ch.* 1.

ALSO IN: C. R. Conder, *Syrian Stone Lore.*—É. Reclus, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: Asia,* v. 4, *ch.* 9 —See, also, DAMASCUS.

SYRIA, CŒLE-. See CŒLE-SYRIA.

SYRO-CHALDEAN LANGUAGE, The. See SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

SYRTIS MAJOR AND SYRTIS MINOR. —These were the names given by the Greeks to the two gulfs (or rather the two corners of the one great gulf) which deeply indent the coast of North Africa. Syrtis Major, or the Greater Syrtis, is now known as the Gulf of Sidra, Syrtis Minor as the Gulf of Khabs, or Cabes.

SYSSITIA, The. —"The most important feature in the Cretan mode of life is the usage of the Syssitia, or public meals, of which all the citizens partook, without distinction of rank or age The origin of this institution cannot be traced. we learn however from Aristotle that it was not peculiar to the Greeks, but existed still earlier in the south of Italy among the Œnotrians

At Sparta [which retained this institution, in common with Crete, to the latest times], the entertainment was provided at the expense, not of the state, but of those who shared it. The head of each family, as far as his means reached, contributed for all its members, but the citizen who was reduced to indigence lost his place at the public board The guests were divided into *companies, generally of fifteen persons, who* filled up vacancies by ballot, in which unanimous *consent was required for every election.* No member, not even the king, was permitted to stay away, *except on some extraordinary occa* sion, as of a sacrifice, or a lengthened chase, when he was expected to send a present to the table such contributions frequently varied the frugal repast."—C. Thirlwall, *History of Greece, ch* 7–8.

SZATHMAR, Treaty of (1711). See HUNGARY· A. D 1699–1718.

SZECHENYI, and the Hungarian wakening. See HUNGARY. A D., 1815–1844.

SZEGEDIN, Battle of (1849). See AUSTRIA· A. D 1848–1849

SZEGEDIN, The broken Treaty of. See TURKS (THE OTTOMANS): A D. 1402–1451

SZIGETH, Siege of (1566). See HUNGARY: A. D. 1526–1567.

T.

TABELLARIÆ, Leges. —"For a long period [at Rome] the votes in the Comitia were given vivâ voce . . . ; but voting by ballot ('per tabellas') was introduced at the beginning of the 7th century [2d century B. C.] by a succession of laws which, from their subject, were named Leges Tabellariæ. Cicero tells us that there were in all four, namely: 1. Lex Gabinia, passed B C. 139. . . . 2. Lex Cassia, carried in B. C. 137. . . . 3. Lex Papiria, passed B. C. 131. . . . 4. Lex Caelia, passed B. C. 107."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq., ch.* 4.

TABLES, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1688.

TABORITES, The. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1419–1434.

TABREEZ, Battle of. See PERSIA: A. D. 1499–1887.

TACHIES, The. See TEXAS: THE ABORIGINAL INHABITANTS.

TACITUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 275–276.

TACNA, Battle of (1880). See CHILE: A. D. 1883–1884.

TACULLIES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ATHAPASCAN FAMILY.

TADCASTER FIGHT (1642).—Lord Fairfax, commanding in Yorkshire for the Parliament, and having his headquarters at Tadcaster, where he had assembled a small force, was attacked by 8,000 royalists, under the Earl of Newcastle, December 7, 1642, and forced to retire, after obstinate resistance. This was one of the earliest encounters of the great English Civil War.—C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax, ch.* 8.

TADMOR. See PALMYRA

TAENSAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES. NATCHESAN FAMILY.

TAEXALI, The.—A tribe which held the northeastern coast of ancient Caledonia

TAGALS, The. See PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

TAGLIACOZZO, Capture of Conradin at. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250-1268.

TAGLIAMENTO, Battle of the (1797). See FRANCE: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

TAGOS, OR TAGUS, The Greek title. See DEMIURGI

TAHITI.—This is the central and principal island of the Society group. It is of considerable size, having an area of 600 square miles. Its mountainous scenery is impressive, its climate delightful and healthy, its tropical productions lavish, and it has the repute of being one of the most romantic and charming spots of the world. Ten smaller islands, contiguous to it, form the archipelago. The French have controlled it since 1842, although Queen Pomare IV. is nominally still the reigning sovereign. See POLYNESIA.

TAIFALÆ, The.—In the fourth century, "the Taifalæ inhabited that part of the province of Dacia which is now called Wallachia. They subsequently accompanied the Visigoths in their migrations westward, and settled on the south side of the Liger, in the country of the Pictavi, where they were in the time of Gregory of Tours who calls them Theiphali, and their district Theiphalia."—W. Smith, *Note to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch.* 26.

TAILLE AND GABELLE, The.—Under the old régime, before the Revolution, "the chief item in the French budget was the taille [analagous to the English word 'tally'] This was a direct tax imposed upon the property of those assessed, and in theory it was in proportion to the amount they possessed. But in the most of France it fell chiefly upon personal property. It was impossible that with the most exact and honest system it should be accurately apportioned, and the system that was in force was both loose and dishonest. The local assessors exempted some and overtaxed others, they released their friends or their villages, and imposed an increased burden upon others, and, to a very large extent, exemptions or reductions were obtained by those who had money with which to bribe or to litigate. The bulk of this tax fell upon the peasants. From it, indeed, a large part of the population, and the part possessing the most of the wealth of the country, was entirely exempt. The nobility were free from any personal tax, and under this head were probably included 400,000 people. The clergy were free, almost all of the officials of every kind, and the members of many professions and trades. Many of the cities had obtained exemption from the taille by the payment of a sum of money, which was either nominal or very moderate. Only laborers and peasants, it was said, still remained subject to it. Out of 11,000,000 people [in the 17th century] in those portions of France where the taille was a personal tax, probably 2,500,000 were exempt. . . . Next to the taille, the most important tax was the gabelle, and, though less onerous, it also produced a vast amount of misery. The gabelle was a duty on salt, and it was farmed by the government. The burden of an excessive tax was increased by the cupidity of those who bought the right to collect its proceeds. The French government retained a monopoly of salt, much like that which it now possesses of tobacco, but the price which it charged for this article of necessity was such, that the States of Normandy declared that salt cost the people more than all the rest of their food. In some provinces the price fixed imposed a duty of about 3,000 per cent., and salt sold for nearly ten sous a pound, thirty times its present price in France, though it is still subject to a considerable duty. From this tax there were no personal exemptions, but large portions of the country were not subject to the gabelle. Brittany was free, Guienne, Poitou, and several other provinces were wholly exempt or paid a trifling subsidy. About one third of the population were free from this duty, and the exemption was so valued that a rumor that the gabelle was to be imposed was sufficient to excite a local insurrection. Such a duty, on an article like salt, was also necessarily much more oppressive for the poor than the rich. As the exorbitant price would compel many to go without the commodity, the tax was often rendered a direct one. The amount of salt was fixed which a family should consume, and this they were forced to take at the price established by the government.

The gabelle was farmed for about 20,000,000 livres and to cover the expenses and profits of the farmers probably 27,000,000 in all was collected from the people. A family of six would, on an average, pay the equivalent of ninety francs, or about eighteen dollars a year, for this duty."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin, ch.* 18 (*v.* 2).—"Not only was the price of salt rendered exorbitant by the tax, but its consumption at this exorbitant price was compulsory. Every human being above seven years of age was bound to consume seven pounds of salt per annum, which salt, moreover, was to be exclusively used with food or in cooking. To use it for salting meat, butter, cheese, &c., was prohibited under severe penalties. The average price of salt [in the reign of Louis XIV.] over two thirds of the country, was a shilling a pound. To buy salt of any one but the authorised agents of the Government was punished by fines of 200, 300, and 500 livres (about £80 of our money), and smugglers were punished by imprisonment, the galleys, and death. . . The use of salt in agriculture was rendered impossible, and it was forbidden, under a penalty of 300 livres (about £50), to take a beast to a salt-marsh, and allow it to drink sea water. Salted hams and bacon were not allowed to enter the country. The salt used in the fisheries was supervised and guarded by such a number of vexatious regulations that one might suppose the object of the Government was to render that branch of commerce impossible. . . But even the Gabelle was less onerous than the Taille. The amount of the Taille was fixed in the secret councils of the Government, according to the exigencies of the financial situation every year. The thirty-two Intendants of the provinces were informed of the amount which their districts were expected to forward to the Treasury. Each Intendant then made known to the Elections (sub-districts) of his Généralité the sum which they had to find, and the officers called Elus apportioned to each parish its quota of contribution. Then, in the parishes, was set in motion a system of blind, stupid, and

remorseless extortion, of which one cannot read even now without a flash of indignation. First of all, the most flagitious partiality and injustice presided over the distribution of the tax Parishes which had a friend at Court or in authority got exempt, and with them the tax was a mere form But these exemptions caused it to fall with more crushing weight on their less fortunate neighbours, as the appointed sum must be made up, whoever paid it The inequalities of taxation almost surpass belief. . . But this was far from being the worst feature. The chief inhabitants of the country villages were compelled to fill, in rotation, the odious office of collectors. They were responsible for the gross amount to be levied, which they might get as they could out of their parishioners . . Friends, or persons who had powerful patrons, were exempted; while enemies, or the unprotected, were drained of their last farthing . . The collectors went about, we are told, always keeping well together for fear of violence, making their visits and perquisitions, and met everywhere with a chorus of imprecations As the Taille was always in arrear, on one side of the street might be seen the collectors of the current year pursuing their exactions, while on the other side were those of the year previous engaged on the same business, and further on were the agents of the Gabelle and other taxes employed in a similar manner. From morning to evening, from year's beginning to year's ending, they tramped, escorted by volleys of oaths and curses, getting a penny here and a penny there; for prompt payment under this marvellous system was not to be thought of"—J C. Morison, *The Reign of Louis XIV.* (*Fortnightly Rev., April*, 1874, *v* 21) —Under Colbert (1661–1683), in the reign of Louis XIV., both the taille (or villein tax, as it was often called) and the gabelle were greatly reduced, and the iniquities of their distribution and collection were much lessened —H Martin, *Hist of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, *v.* 1, *ch.* 1. —For an intimation of the origin of the taille, see FRANCE: A. D. 1453–1461.

TAIPING REBELLION, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1850–1864.

TAJ MAHAL, The. See INDIA: A. D. 1605–1658.

TAKBIR, The.—The Mahometan war-cry—"God is Great."

TAKILMAN FAMILY, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TAKILMAN FAMILY.

TALAJOTS. See SARDINIA, THE ISLAND: NAME AND EARLY HISTORY.

TALAVERA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

TALCA, Battle of (1818). See CHILE: A. D. 1810–1818.

TALENT, Attic, Babylonian, &c.—"Not only in Attica, but in almost all the Hellenic States, even in those which were not in Greece but were of Hellenic origin, money was reckoned by talents of sixty minas, the mina at a hundred drachmas, the drachma at six oboli. At Athens the obolus was divided into eight chalci . . . the chalcûs into seven lepta. Down to the half obolus, the Athenian money was, in general, coined only in silver; the dichalchon, or quarter obolus, in silver or copper; the chalcûs and the smaller pieces only in copper. . . . The value of the more ancient Attic silver talent, silver value reckoned for silver value, will be 1,500 thlr. Prussian currency; of the mina, 25 thaler; of the drachma, 6 gute groschen; of the obolus 1 *g.* gr., —equivalent to $1.026, $17.10, 71.1 cts., 2.85 cts respectively. . . . Before the time of Solon, the Attic money was heavier; also the commercial weight was heavier than that by which money was weighed. One hundred new drachmas were equivalent to 72–73 ancient drachmas; but the ancient weight remained with very little alteration as commercial weight, to which, in later times, an increase was also added. Through the alterations of Solon, the Attic money, which before stood to the Æginetan in the relation of 5:6, had to the same the relation of 8:5. The new was related to the ancient Attic money as 18:25. Compared with the heavy Æginetan drachma . . , the Attic was called the light drachma. . . . The former was equivalent to ten Attic oboli, so that the Æginetan talent weighed more than 10,000 Attic drachmas. It was equal to the Babylonian talent Nevertheless the Æginetan money was soon coined so light that it was related to the Attic nearly as 3 2 . . . The Corinthian talent is to be estimated as originally equivalent to the Æginetan, but it was also in later times diminished. . . . The Egyptian talent . contained, according to Varro in Pliny, eighty Roman pounds, and cannot, therefore, have been essentially different from the Attic talent, since the Attic mina is related to the Roman pound as 4:3. . . . The Euboic talent is related . . . to the Æginetan as five to six, and is no other than the money-talent of the Athenians in use before the time of Solon, and which continued in use as commercial weight. According to the most accurate valuation, therefore, one hundred Euboic drachmas are equivalent to 138⅔ drachmas of Solon. . . . Appian has given the relation of the Alexandrian to the Euboic talent in round numbers as 6 to 7 = 120 to 140, but it was rather more accurately as 120 to 138⅔. . . . So much gold . . as was estimated to be equivalent to a talent of silver, was undoubtedly also called a talent of gold. And, finally, a weight of gold of 6,000 drachmas, the value of which, compared with silver, always depended upon the existing relation between them, was sometimes thus called."—A. Boeckh, *Public Economy of Athens* (*tr. by Lamb*), *bk.* 1, *ch.* 4–5.—See, also, SHEKEL.

TALLAGE, The.—"Under the general head of donum, auxilium, and the like, came a long series of imposts [in the period of the Norman kings], which were theoretically gifts of the nation to the king, and the amount of which was determined by the itinerant justices after separate negotiation with the payers. The most important of these, that which fell upon the towns and demesne lands of the Crown, is known as the tallage. This must have affected other property besides land, but the particular method in which it was to be collected was determined by the community on which it fell, or by special arrangement with the justices."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, *ch.* 13, *sect.* 161 (*v.* 1).

TALLEYRAND, Prince de: Alienation from Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1807–1808.

TALLIGEWI, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALLEGHANS.

TALMUD, The.—"The Talmud [from a Hebrew verb signifying 'to learn'] is a vast irregular repertory of Rabbinical reflections, discussions and animadversions on a myriad of

topics treated of or touched on in Holy Writ; a treasury, in chaotic arrangement, of Jewish lore, scientific, legal, and legendary, a great storehouse of extra-biblical, yet biblically referable, Jewish speculation, fancy, and faith The Talmud proper is throughout of a twofold character, and consists of two divisions, severally called the Mishna and the Gemara The Mishna, in this connection, may be regarded as the text of the Talmud itself, and the Gemara as a sort of commentary. . The Gemara regularly follows the Mishna, and annotates upon it sentence by sentence . There are two Talmuds, the Yerushalmi [Jerusalem], or, more correctly, the Palestinian, and the Babli, that is, the Babylonian The Mishna is pretty nearly the same in both these, but the Gemaras are different. The Talmud Yerushalmi gives the traditional sayings of the Palestinian Rabbis, the 'Gemara of the Children of the West,' as it is styled, whereas the Talmud Babli gives the traditional sayings of the Rabbis of Babylon This Talmud is about four times the size of the Jerusalem one, it is by far the more popular, and to it almost exclusively our remarks relate" —P. I Hershon, *Talmudic Miscellany, introd* — The date of the compilation of the Babylonian Talmud is fixed at about A D 500, that of Jerusalem was a century or more earlier See, also, MISCHNA.

TALUKDARS.—"A Taluka [in India] is a large estate, consisting of many villages, or, as they would be called in English, parishes These villages had originally separate proprietors, who paid their revenue direct to the Government treasury The Native Government in former times made over by patent, to a person called Talukdar, its right over these villages, holding him responsible for the whole revenue The wealth and influence thus acquired by the Talukdar often made him, in fact, independent . When the country came under British rule, engagements for payment of the Government Revenue were taken from these Talukdars, and they were called Zamindars"—Sir R Temple, *James Thomason, p* 158 —See INDIA A D 1785-1793.

TAMANES, Battle of. See SPAIN A. D 1809 (AUGUST—NOVEMBER)

TAMASP I., Shah of Persia, A. D 1523-1576 ...**Tamasp II., Shah of Persia,** 1730-1782

TAMERLANE, OR TIMOUR. See TIMOUR

TAMMANY RING, The. See NEW YORK A. D 1863-1871.

TAMMANY SOCIETY.—TAMMANY HALL.—"Shortly after the peace of 1783, a society was formed in the city of New York, known by the name of the Tammany Society It was probably originally instituted with a view of organizing an association antagonist to the Cincinnati Society. That society was said to be monarchical or rather aristocratical in its tendency, and, when first formed, and before its constitution was amended, on the suggestion of General Washington and other original members, it certainly did tend to the establishment of an hereditary order, something like an order of nobility. The Tammany Society originally seems to have had in view the preservation of our democratic institutions. . . . 'Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, was founded by William Mooney, an upholsterer residing in the city of New York, some time in the administration of President Washington. . William Mooney was one of those who, at that early day, regarded the powers of the general government as dangerous to the independence of the state governments, and to the common liberties of the people. His object was to fill the country with institutions designed, and men determined, to preserve the just balance of power His purpose was patriotic and purely republican. . Tammany was, at first, so popular, that most persons of merit became members; and so numerous were they that its anniversary [May 12] was regarded as a holiday At that time there was no party politics mixed up in its proceedings. But when President Washington, in the latter part of his administration, rebuked "self created societies," from an apprehension that their ultimate tendency would be hostile to the public tranquility, the members of Tammany supposed their institution to be included in the reproof; and they almost forsook it The founder, William Mooney, and a few others, continued steadfast. At one anniversary they were reduced so low that but three persons attended its festival From this time it became a political institution, and took ground with Thomas Jefferson'"—J. D. Hammond, *History of Political Parties in the State of New York, v* 1, *ch* 18 —"The ideal patrons of the society were Columbus and Tammany, the last a legendary Indian chief, once lord, it was said, of the island of Manhattan, and now adopted as the patron saint of America. The association was divided into thirteen tribes, each tribe typifying a state, presided over by a sachem There were also the honorary posts of warrior and hunter, and the council of sachems had at their head a grand sachem, a type evidently of the President of the United States."—R Hildreth, *Hist of the U S, v.* 4, *ch.* 3.—"Shortly after Washington's inauguration, May 12, 1789 the 'Tammany Society or Columbian Order' was founded. It was composed at first of the moderate men of both political parties, and seems not to have been recognized as a party institution until the time of Jefferson as President William Mooney was the first Grand Sachem, his successor in 1790 was William Pitt Smith, and in 1791 Josiah Ogden Hoffman received the honor John Pintard was the first Sagamore De Witt Clinton was scribe of the council in 1791. It was strictly a national society, based on the principles of patriotism, and had for its object the perpetuation of a true love for our own country. Aboriginal forms and ceremonies were adopted in its incorporation."—Mrs M J Lamb, *Hist. of the City of N. Y.*, v. 2, *p* 362, *foot-note* —"One must distinguish between the 'Tammany Society or Columbian Order' and the political organization called for shortness 'Tammany Hall.' . . The Tammany Society owns a large building on Fourteenth Street, near Third Avenue, and it leases rooms in this building to the 'Democratic Republican General Committee of the City of New York,' otherwise and more commonly known as 'Tammany Hall' or 'Tammany.' Tammany Hall means, therefore, first, the building on Fourteenth Street where the 'Democracy' have their headquarters; and secondly, the political body officially known as the Democratic Republican General Committee of the City of New York.

. . . The city of New York is divided by law into thirty 'assembly districts;' that is, thirty districts, each of which elects an assemblyman to the state legislature. In each of these assembly districts there is held annually an election of members of the aforesaid Democratic Republican General Committee. This committee is a very large one, consisting of no less than five thousand men; and each assembly district is allotted a certain number of members, based on the number of Democratic votes which it cast in the last preceding presidential election. Thus the number of the General Committeemen elected in each assembly district varies from sixty to two hundred and seventy. There is intended to be one General Committeeman for every fifty Democratic electors in the district. In each assembly district there is also elected a district leader, the head of Tammany Hall for that district. He is always a member of the General Committee, and these thirty men, one leader from each assembly district, form the executive committee of Tammany Hall. 'By this committee,' says a Tammany official, 'all the internal affairs of the organization are directed, its candidates for offices are selected, and the plans for every campaign are matured.' The General Committee meets every month, five hundred members constituting a quorum; and in October of each year it sits as a county convention, to nominate candidates for the ensuing election. There is also a sub-committee on organization, containing one thousand members, which meets once a month. This committee takes charge of the conduct of elections. There is, besides, a finance committee, appointed by the chairman of the General Committee, and there are several minor committees, unnecessary to mention. The chairman of the finance committee is at present Mr. Richard Croker. Such are the general committees of Tammany Hall. . . . Each assembly district is divided by law into numerous election districts, or, as they are called in some cities, voting precincts,—each election district containing about four hundred voters. The election districts are looked after as follows: Every assembly district has a district committee, composed of the members of the General Committee elected from that district, and of certain additional members chosen for the purpose. The district committee appoints in each of the election districts included in that particular assembly district a captain. This man is the local boss. He has from ten to twenty-five aids, and he is responsible for the vote of his election district. There are about eleven hundred election districts in New York, and consequently there are about eleven hundred captains, or local bosses, each one being responsible to the (assembly) district committee by which he was appointed. Every captain is held to a strict account. If the Tammany vote in his election district falls off without due cause, he is forthwith removed, and another appointed in his place. Usually, the captain is an actual resident in his district; but occasionally, being selected from a distant part of the city, he acquires a fictitious residence in the district. Very frequently the captain is a liquor dealer, who has a clientele of customers, dependents, and hangers-on, whom he 'swings,' or controls. He is paid, of course, for his services; he has some money to distribute, and a little patronage, such as places in the street-cleaning department, or perhaps a minor clerkship. The captain of a district has a personal acquaintance with all its voters; and on the eve of an election he is able to tell how every man in his district is going to vote. He makes his report; and from the eleven hundred reports of the election district captains the Tammany leaders can predict with accuracy what will be the vote of the city."—H. C. Merwin, *Tammany Hall* (*Atlantic, Feb.*, 1894).

ALSO IN: R. Home, *The Story of Tammany* (*Harper's Monthly, v.* 44, *pp.* 685, 835).

TAMULS, The. See TURANIAN RACES.

TAMWORTH MANIFESTO, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1834–1837.

TANAGRA, Battle of (B. C. 457). See GREECE: B. C. 458–456.

TANAIM, The.—A name assumed by the Jewish Rabbins who especially devoted themselves to the interpretation of the Mischna.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of the Jews, bk.* 19.

TANAIS, The.—The name anciently given to the Russian river now called the Don,—which latter name signifies simply 'water.'

TANCRED, King of Naples and Sicily, A. D. 1189–1194.

TANCRED'S CRUSADE. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096–1099; and JERUSALEM: A. D. 1099, and 1099–1144.

TANEY, Roger B., and President Jackson's removal of the Deposits. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1833–1836. . . . . **The Dred Scott Decision.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1857.

TANFANA, Feast and massacre of. See GERMANY: A. D. 14–16.

TANIS. See ZOAN.

TANISTRY, Law of. See TUATH.

TANNENBURG, Battle of (1410). See POLAND: A. D. 1333–1572.

TANOAN FAMILY, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: TAÑOAN FAMILY.

TANTALIDÆ, The. See ARGOS.

TAORMINA.—TAUROMENION.—About 392 B. C. Dionysios, the tyrant of Syracuse, expelled the Sikels, or natives of Sicily, from one of their towns, Tauromenion (modern Taormina) on the height of Tauros, and it subsequently became a Greek city of great wealth, the remains of which are remarkably interesting at the present day. "There is the wall with the work of the Sikel and the Greek side by side. There is the temple of the Greek changed into the church of the Christian apostle of Sicily. There is the theatre, the work of the Greek enlarged and modified by the Roman, the theatre which, unlike those of Syracuse and Argos, still keeps so large a part of its scena, and where we hardly mourn the loss of the rest as we look out on the hills and the sea between its fragments."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Sicily, ch.* 11, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 4).

ALSO IN: *The Century, Sept.*, 1893.

TAOUISM. See CHINA: THE RELIGIONS.

TAPIO BISCKE, Battle of (1849). See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848–1849.

TAPPANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

TAPROBANE.—The name by which the island of Ceylon was known to the ancients. Hipparchus advanced the opinion that it was not merely a large island, but the beginning of another world.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog., ch.* 23, *sect.* 2 (*v.* 2).