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UNIT 1
Ancient Greece

I. Pronunciation

Check your understanding and pronunciation of the following words and word combinations:

Aegean Sea [i'dʒiːən] – Эге́йское море
Aeolia [i:'əulɪə] or Aeolis – Эолида
Asia Minor [,eɪʃə'maɪnə] – Малая Азия
Athenian [,æθiːnɪən] – афинский
Athens ['æθ(ə)nz] – Афины
Boeotia [bɪ'əuʃə] – Беотия
Bulgaria [bʌl'geərɪə] – Болгария
Carthage ['kɑːθɪʤ] – Карфаген
Cyclades ['saɪklədiːz] – Киклады
Cyprus ['saɪprəs] – Кипр
Euboea [ju:'bɪ:ə] or Euboia – Эвбея
Gulf of Corinth ['kɔrɪnth] – Коринфский залив
Hellenistic [hɛlɪ'nɪstɪk] – эллинистический, относящийся к эллинизму
Ionia [aɪ'ɒnɪə] – Иония
Libya ['lɪbɪə] – Ливия
Macedonian [mæsɪ'dɔnɪən] – македонянин; македонец; македонский
Mediterranean [medɪt(ə)rɪnɪən] – Средиземное море, Средиземноморье
Miletus [ma'liːtəs] – Милет
Minoan [mi'nəʊən] – минойский, относящийся к минойской культуре
Mycenaean [,maɪs'ni:ən] – микенский, относящийся к крито-микенской культуре
Peloponnesus [,pɛləpɒniːs] or Peloponnese – Пелопоннес
Persia ['pɜːʃə] – Персия
Phoenicia [fɪ'nɪʃə] – Финикия
Samos [ˈseɪməs] – Самос
Thebes [θiːbz] – Фивы
Thermopylae [θɜːˈmɔpɪliː] – Фермопилы
Thrace [θreɪs] – Фракия
Trojan [ˈtrɔudʒ(ə)n] – троянец, троянский
Troy [trɔɪ] – Троя

II. Reading

**Text 1: Locating Ancient Greece**

Ancient Greece was very spread out, which means that the people, ideas, and events came from and took place all around the Mediterranean and sometimes beyond. Eventually, there were people who considered themselves to be Greek in Spain, France, Italy, North Africa, Libya, and Asia Minor – and in Greece itself of course.

The most densely populated area was the land mass known as Greece today. It’s an area that is really dominated by two things – the sea and very large mountain ranges. For the ancient Greeks, the mountain ranges meant that sections of this big slab of land were sometimes very disconnected from each other. This is one of the reasons why people tended to think of themselves in local terms rather than national ones.

Greece isn’t a very large land mass, and wherever you stand in it you’re unlikely to be more than about 50 kilometres from the sea. The land is fertile but also very hilly, which means that it doesn’t have vast plains of workable farmland. These two factors are important when considering why so many Greeks decided to leave the land mass and create new towns on the nearby islands and elsewhere in the Mediterranean.

**Separating the region**

You can divide Greece in two at the Gulf of Corinth, the large body of water that runs through the middle of the region:
To the north: North of the Gulf was the larger part of mainland Greece, although the south was much more heavily populated. The biggest city in this part of Greece was Thebes and also located in the region was the sacred site of Delphi, which was home to the famous oracle.

To the south: Southern Greece was divided in two by the Peloponnese mountain range. Most of the famous cities of ancient Greece were here: Sparta, Olympia, Corinth, Argos, and, to the north-east, Athens.

Touring the islands and beyond

Although the Greek mainland is fairly small, bits of what historians consider to be ancient Greece were spread all over the eastern Mediterranean. All the places that people now go to on holiday – approximately 1,400 islands – were part of ancient Greece, as well other more distant lands. Here’s a brief guide to some of the most notable parts of ancient Greece:

Euboia: The big peninsula that’s just off the eastern coast of Greece. Its people considered themselves to be very different and separate from those on the mainland.

The Cyclades: The big group of islands in the south, including places like Naxos, Paros, and Delos. The ancient Greeks called this group ‘The Circle’.

Asia Minor: The western coast of modern-day Turkey. During the Dark Ages, loads of Greeks from the mainland moved there and created the new Greek areas of Aeolia and Ionia.

Thrake: The area is now southern Bulgaria. For the ancient Greeks, this area was wild, hilly country full of warlike tribes – definitely a place to avoid!

Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus: Big important islands to the south-east that developed their own civilisations independent of the Greek mainland. In fact, civilisation started on Crete.

The western islands: Important islands to the west of mainland Greece. Corcyra (modern-day Corfu), Cephallenia, Ithaca, and Zakynthos were all in this part of the Mediterranean.
Other islands: Of the 1,400 islands, only about 250 were inhabited and many of those by not more than about 100 people. Each of the islands has its own fascinating stories and episodes. Islands like Lemnos, Miletus, Samos, and Lesbos are important to the story of the ancient Greeks.

The list of words and word combinations under study:
densely/heavily populated – a lot of people live close together there
land mass – a large area of land that is in one piece and not broken up by seas
fertile ['fɜːtaɪl] – describes land that can produce a large number of good quality crops
hilly – having a lot of hills
plain – a large area of flat land
farmland – land that is used for or is suitable for farming
mainland – the main part of a country or continent, not including the islands around it
sacred site – a place considered to be holy and deserving respect, especially because of a connection with a god
peninsula – a long piece of land that sticks out from a larger area of land into the sea or into a lake
warlike tribe – a group of people often involved in and eager to start wars
to inhabit – to live in a place

Answer the following questions:
1. What role did the mountain ranges play in the life of the ancient Greeks?
2. What are advantages and disadvantages of the location of Ancient Greece?
3. Was the absence of workable farmland crucial for the ancient Greeks? Why/why not?

Discuss the following questions:
1. Is it good or bad if people think of themselves in local terms rather than national ones? Give your reasons.
2. How does the location of a country influence the people’s life of this country? Give your examples.

Describe in detail the location of Ancient Greece and give its assessment.

**Text 2: Establishing chronology**

The following is a brief chronology of the whole of ancient Greek history. Of course, the ancient Greeks themselves wouldn’t have thought about their history in these terms and their ideas of how the world was progressing were very different, but modern historians generally agree on the following sequence of periods.

The Bronze Age: 2700–1100 BC

This period is the earliest of Greek history. During these years the first European civilisation appeared on the island of Crete and became known as *Minoan*. This period was strange and wonderful and seems very *alien* to modern sensibilities.

Civilisation soon sprang up on mainland Greece, and historians refer to this culture as *Mycenaean*. Around 1300 BC something cataclysmic happened in Crete; the Minoan period came to an end, and the people *scattered*.

The Dark Ages: 1100–900 BC

The Dark Ages are so named because historians know very little about what was going on. Most scholars describe it as time of travelling, and that pretty much sums it up. All the people who left mainland Greece after the end of the Bronze Age travelled far and wide, setting up new towns all around the Mediterranean. As a result trade and diplomacy *began in earnest* too.

Early Greece: 900–490 BC

This period was when Greece started to grow up. The hundreds of communities and colonies that had been established during the Dark Ages grew into new societies and what became known as *city-states*. These city-states had different forms of government, but remarkably the market town of Athens decided upon the system of *democracy*. 
All the city-states soon faced a major challenge, however, when the immense Persian Empire launched a series of attacks against them.

The Classical period: 490–350 BC

After dealing with the Persians, the Athenians began *throwing their weight around* and soon possessed an empire. The money that the empire generated was responsible for some of the fabulous culture that ancient Greece is famous for.

Athens’s domination, of course, came to an end when the Peloponnesian War began with Sparta. After its defeat, Athens declined in influence and a whole series of *squabbles* between the city-states broke out with no clear winner. Until . . .

The Hellenistic period: 350–150 BC

. . . the Macedonians arrived on the scene. Under King Philip II, the Macedonians dominated the whole of Greece through both war and diplomacy. Philip’s son Alexander then took things further by *invading* Persia, *seizing control* of the Persian Empire, and journeying as far as India in a *quest* of discovery and *conquest*.

After Alexander died without a strong *heir*, his empire broke up into *warring territories* ruled by his former generals. Eventually, the Romans arrived in the middle of the second century BC, and what we call the Greek period came to an end.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*chronology* [krɔ'nɔləʤɪ] – the order in which a series of events happened

*sequence* – a series of related things or events, or the order in which they follow each other

*alien* ['eɪlɪən] – coming from a different country, race, or group; strange and not familiar

*to scatter* – to (cause to) move far apart in different directions

*to begin in earnest* – it has already started but is now being done in a serious and complete way
city-states – in the ancient world, a city and the area around it with an independent government

to throw one's weight around – to act as if you have a lot of power or authority

squabble ['skwɔbl] – an argument over something that is not important

to invade – to enter a place in large numbers, usually when unwanted and in order to take possession or do damage

to seize control [siːz] – to take control using sudden force

quest [kwest] – a long search for something that is difficult to find, or an attempt to achieve something difficult

conquest ['kɔŋkwest] – the act of conquering a country, area, or situation

heir [eə] – a person who will legally receive money, property, or a title from another person, especially an older member of the same family, when that other person dies

warring territories ['wɔːrɪŋ] – territories that are at war with each other

Answer the following questions:

1. How many periods were there?
2. What was each period called? Why?
3. What is a city-state?
4. What do BCE and BC stand for?

Discuss the following questions:

1. How could diplomacy be present during the Dark Ages? Give your examples.
2. What do you understand by the term “democracy”?
3. Does the present-day democracy differ from the democracy of Ancient Greece? In what way? Give your reasons.

Complete the sentences with the word from the texts:

1. This country had a population in 1905 of 2,070,052, being the fourth most __________ area in Europe.
2. He was planning to __________ the castle, seize control of it and destroy it.
3. He was a tyrant who _______________ when it came to punishing his subjects.
4. I’ve narrowed my _____________ to just three possible locations and I’m sure I’ll find what I’m looking for.
5. They were scared to stay in one place, so they ___________ all over the area.
6. He was ____________ in this country; he didn’t know the language and traditions.
7. He was the only __________ to an enormous amount of land and money.

Text 3: The Evolution of Democracy

A. Although opinions diverge over when exactly we should date and how we should explain the “origin” or “breakthrough” of democracy, the main phases of its evolution are reasonably clear. Democracy “Athenian style” resulted from a long development that was punctuated by three “rupture points” of rapid change and incisive reform. It originated in a core of basic egalitarianism and “people’s power” that, despite the predominance of evolving aristocracies, was essential for the fabric of the early Greek polis (city-state or, rather, citizen-state) and shared widely throughout Greece. In a period of severe economic crisis and social conflict, Solon was elected archon and mediator in 594. Besides mandating debt relief, abolishing debt bondage, and regulating by legislation areas that were likely to cause conflict, he increased the citizens’ civic responsibility and involvement in politics by permitting third party prosecution and appeals to a popular court and by correlating in a “timocratic system” (from time, honor, status) the citizens’ social, economic, military, and political capacity. Henceforth, office holding was tied to property rather than descent. Whether active citizenship (including speaking and voting in the assembly) was available to all citizens or limited, by tradition and prevailing values rather than law, to those who were qualified for the heavy infantry (hoplite) army is debated. Although Aristotle recognized in Solon’s system crucial elements typical of democracy, certain statements preserved in Solon’s own poetry seem to suggest that Solon’s goal was to establish justice for all rather than government by the demos. In fact, he was quite emphatic about the demos’ limitations: leadership
was to remain the elite’s prerogative, although all citizens needed to be protected from abuses of power.

B. Renewed factional strife eventually prompted the usurpation of sole power (tyranny) by Peisistratos. His regime, later remembered as a “Golden Age”, brought the Athenians domestic peace and increasing prosperity, while the aristocracy’s political power was curtailed; through cults, festivals, and buildings Peisistratos emphasized the role of Athens as the polis’ center, at the expense of local centers in Attika that were dominated by elite families. As a result, paradoxically, in weakening aristocratic control and fostering communal integration, tyranny contributed importantly to preparing the ground for democracy. After Peisistratos’ death, the regime of his sons, disrupted by the assassination of Hipparchos in 514, turned oppressive. Hippias was overthrown by Spartan intervention in 510. Tyranny henceforth had a bad press in Athens, especially since the community in subsequent years twice faced the threat of Hippias’ reinstatement by Spartan or Persian intervention. Such threats enhanced communal solidarity. Anachronistically, the tyrannicides of 514, soon honored by a monument in the Agora, became symbols of liberation and, eventually, democracy.

C. After the fall of tyranny, aristocratic families resumed their traditional rivalries for predominance. In 508/7 Kleisthenes turned defeat into victory by appealing to the Athenian demos with an apparently popular reform proposal. His opponent, Isagoras, in traditional aristocratic fashion summoned help from a powerful “guest-friend” (xenos), king Kleomenes of Sparta, who promptly arrived with a company of soldiers, expelled Kleisthenes and his supporters, and proceeded to place Isagoras and his faction in power. The existing council resisted and the Athenian demos rose in revolt, forcing Kleomenes to leave and eliminating Isagoras’ faction. Kleisthenes returned and implemented the promised reforms. These were remarkably comprehensive and sophisticated. At their core was a reorganization of the citizen body and territory of Attika (mentioned above) that served as basis for the hoplite army and the Council of 500, which came to
represent the entire citizen population of Attika. Now for the first time even the fringes of Attika were fully integrated into the polis.

D. According to Herodotos, Kleisthenes “established for the Athenians the tribes and the democracy”. Whether the latter is correct in a specific sense and whether the Athenian citizens who did not qualify for the hoplite army (the lowest property class called thetes) enjoyed full political equality in this new political system – all this remains debated. Even so, unquestionably the late-sixth-century reforms, apparently supported by the entire community, had a broadly integrative effect and enhanced civic equality and political participation among a large part of the citizen body. All this was a necessary condition for Athens’ ability to repel attacks by hostile neighbors and Sparta in 506 and by Persia at Marathon in 490, and to play a crucial role in Greek victories over Persian armies in 480/79. And it served as an indispensable platform for another breakthrough, fifty years later, that fully established democracy both in institutions and in public consciousness.

E. In the generation after the Persian Wars Athens underwent profound changes in all spheres of life. As the head of a new alliance (the “Delian League”) comprising a wide range of members, from Asia Minor, the Aegean islands, and the mainland, it continued the war against the Persians, eventually eliminating their control over the west coast of the Aegean and far beyond. Gradually it transformed this alliance into a tightly ruled and remarkably centralized empire. All these developments depended on Athens’ large fleet and on those who manned it: thousands of lower-class citizens (besides metics, mercenaries, and slaves). The Athenian thetes thus assumed a crucial and permanent importance for their community’s security, power, and prosperity. By the late 460s the Athenians accepted the obvious consequences. Led by Ephialtes and soon by Perikles, they passed another set of reforms that weakened the political influence of the traditional aristocratic Areopagos Council and strengthened the power of those institutions that represented the entire citizen body, introduced pay for certain offices and political or judicial functions, thereby making it possible for lower-class citizens to spend their time in service for the community, and redefined citizenship.
F. Henceforth, with very few exceptions, all political functions were accessible to and spread widely among all citizens. The whole demos, constituted as an exclusive political elite irrespective of wealth, descent, and education, now participated equally in making all decisions and controlling the entire political process. In Euripides’ words, the demos now was lord and monarch, power had been popularized. By the 440s, the citizens must have been accustomed to their political role, the impact of the reforms fully visible. Naval power continued to be crucial for Athens’ imperial success, especially during the Peloponnesian War. As long as it was successful, democracy essentially remained unchallenged and open opposition was impossible. All this explains why democracy became deeply entrenched in the citizen body and was, as contemporaries observed, so difficult to uproot.

G. Constitutional development continued, though much more slowly, until, because of the Athenian disaster in Sicily, other setbacks in the war, and increasing financial pressure on the elite, opponents of democracy found broader support and finally prevailed in imposing a narrow oligarchy in 411. Even so, they succeeded only in the context of an extraordinary set of political conditions and as the result of massive terror. Their “oligarchy of the 400” was overturned after a few months and its successor, a more moderate oligarchy based on 5,000 full citizens, even sooner. The restored democracy, although fortified by strict controls, proved vengeful, unstable, and incapable of capitalizing on military successes to end the war honorably. Defeated and humiliated, Athens in 404 lost its empire and suffered through the terror regime of an even narrower oligarchy (the “thirty tyrants”), civil war, and a split of the polis, before in 403 reunification and reconciliation were achieved.

H. Even earlier, in 410, the Athenians initiated an ambitious process of reviewing and revising their laws. The law code that was completed and passed in 399 and a new procedure for the creation of new laws limited demotic arbitrariness and objectivized the process of legislation. To what extent this changed the nature of democracy and enhanced the “sovereignty of the law” is much debated. By
contrast, the introduction of pay for attendance at the assembly cemented the principle of universal citizen participation in and control of politics. Aristotle thus considered the form democracy reached in the fourth century the completion of its long development. The centralization of financial administration under the elected directors of the Theoric Fund from the 350s, which bestowed great power on the holders of this office, did not change the working of democracy. As Ober concludes:

There were various constitutional adjustments made in the period between the Peloponnesian and Lamian Wars, but there were no major changes in the sociology of Athenian politics. There were no compromises made with the basic principles of the political equality and exclusivity of the citizen body, of the lottery, or of pay for state service… Compared with the fifth century, the fourth century is remarkable less for its constitutional evolution than for its social and political stability. (Ober 1989: 95–103, quotation from 103).

Choose the paragraph where the following information is mentioned and decide whether the statement is true or false:
1. According to Aristotle, the democracy completed its development in the fourth century.
2. One could become an office holder if he/she had a good descent.
3. A new set of reforms strengthened the political influence of the traditional aristocratic Council.
4. Isagorus came to power by appealing to the Athenian demos with a reform proposal.
5. The main stages of the evolution of democracy are vague.
6. According to Euripides, power had been popularized, the demos was lord and monarch.
7. The late-sixth-century reforms could not help the Athenians to repel attacks.
8. The Athenian lowest property class became important for their community’s security, power, and prosperity after the Persian Wars.
10. The “oligarchy of the 400” lasted for a long time.
11. Tyranny played a crucial role in preparing the ground for democracy.

   Explain the following word and word combinations in English:

   - egalitarianism
   - archon
   - abuses of power
   - usurpation of sole power
   - tyrannicide
   - citizen body
   - narrow oligarchy
   - demotic arbitrariness

**Text 4: The Persian Wars**

With mainland Greece free from foreign interference, Athens grew large enough to fend off attacks from Sparta, its primary rival, and continued its experiment with representative forms of government. This was at a time when other Greek city-states were losing their independence. The island of Sicily, home to several city-states, endured many attacks from the Phoenician city-state of Carthage, just across the Mediterranean in North Africa. To the east, Ionian Greek city-states came under the rule of the Lydians, until all of Anatolia fell to Persia’s King Darius I. Darius’s empire was centered in the Near East and stretched from Egypt to present-day Afghanistan.

Athens became his target early in the fifth century B.C.E. Ionian Greeks rebelled against the Persian Empire in 499 B.C.E., and Athens and Eretria sent military aid. Darius quickly regained control of Ionia, and now had a good excuse to invade mainland Greece and add it to his empire.

It appeared to be an easy task. The Greek world was a fraction of the size of the Persian Empire. Although Darius deployed only 20,000 to 30,000 soldiers – a relatively small force – it was still more than double the number of Greeks who eventually faced them. The Persian army arrived first at Eretria on the island of Euboea in 490 B.C.E., and burned it as punishment for aiding in the Ionian revolt. From there, Marathon offered a good landing spot on the Greek mainland, because
it was flat and was close to Athens. An Athenian army of 10,000 hoplites marched to the coast to meet the Persians, and was joined by 1,000 hoplites from the small city-state of Plataea. When the Persians appeared ready for battle, Athenian general Miltiades (c. 554 – c. 489 B.C.E.) encouraged the Greeks to make the first move. The hoplites marched in phalanxes into the Persians’s formation. Though greatly outnumbered, the Athenians maneuvered their troops to trap the Persians between a swamp and the sea. Their heavy armor protected them from Persian arrows, while the long spears did their work.

Expecting an attack on Athens to follow, the Greek army made a 20-plus-mile run from Marathon back to Athens. But the Persians turned for home. The Greek historian Herodotus (484 – 425 B.C.E.) reported that the Persians lost 6,400 men, while the Athenians counted 192 dead, and the Plataeans even fewer. Although those figures may be exaggerated, they demonstrate the effectiveness of hoplite warfare.

Darius planned another attack but died in 486 B.C.E., leaving his son Xerxes (c. 159 – 465 B.C.E.) to exact revenge. It took several more years for the Persian Empire to return, this time with 75,000 to 100,000 soldiers, but the Persians faced a more united Greece. The Greek infantry, led by Spartan king Leonidas (c. 480 B.C.E.), numbered about 70,000 hoplites and about as many light-armed troops. As Xerxes’ army made its way around the Aegean Sea in 480 B.C.E., the king correctly assumed that the smaller Greek city-states would surrender without a fight. The Greeks planned to meet the Persians in force in east-central Greece at a 50-foot-wide pass called Thermopylae, squeezed between cliffs and the sea.

The Greek hoplites delayed the huge Persian army at this bottleneck for two days, until a Greek traitor showed the Persians a little-known way around the pass and the Greeks were surprised from behind. Knowing they were now beaten, Leonidas and a contingent of slightly more than 300 hoplites remained at Thermopylae while the rest of the Greek army retreated to defend city-states to the south. The Greeks, including Leonidas, fought to the last man, and are
immortalized in military history for continuing to delay an army many times their number.

Expecting an attack, the Athenians abandoned their city. The Persians then destroyed it – even the temples atop the Acropolis. Then another narrow pass, this time at sea, became the undoing of the Persians. Athens had the advantage because of its large fleet of triremes, or Athenian warships. (Just before the Persians’ second trip to Athens in 480 B.C.E., a rich lode of silver had been discovered at Laurium in southern Attica, which financed a fleet of several hundred triremes.) The trireme was developed about the same time the hoplite soldier became common, around 600 B.C.E., and was most likely based on ship designs of the Phoenicians, who were expert seafarers.

The boat’s designers chose a long, narrow shape that could move quickly and was easily maneuverable. The ships weighed up to 2,200 pounds, and were powered by three tiers of 170 oarsmen, which is how the ship got its name – tri is Greek for “three.” The oarsmen rowed in unison at a speed of up to 18 beats per minute. The beat of a gong or a drum was used to maintain this rhythm. The trireme was fitted with a ramming “beak” – a battering ram made of oak and reinforced with a bronze cap that protruded from the bow at water level. The rowers propelled the trireme against an enemy ship, piercing the hull.

Under the leadership of Themosticles (c. 524 – 459 B.C.E.), the Athenian fleet faced 400 to 500 Persian ships off the coast just north of Athens. The triremes prevailed and much of Xerxes’ fleet was destroyed. The Persian ships then turned around, leaving a still-large army behind in Boeotia. The Spartans led a successful defense effort there at Plataea, while Athens continued to chase the Persian fleet. The Persians were forced home, once again defeated by an enemy they greatly underestimated.

The key to this military victory was Greek unity. Faced with the prospect of foreign domination, 31 independent Greek city-states came together to fight a common foe – a first in their history. Even more remarkable was the cooperation between Athens and Sparta, each of which normally viewed the other as an enemy.
Athens and Sparta continued their alliance long enough to expel the remaining Persians from Ionia, Anatolia, and northern Greece. Athenian leaders were now convinced of the effectiveness of trireme warfare, and proposed forming and leading a league of city-states to build an even stronger navy, because everyone in Greece assumed the Persians would eventually return. Greek historian Thucydides (c. 401 B.C.E.) wrote in his *History of the Peloponnesian War* that the leaders of Sparta were glad to let the Athenians take on that responsibility.

The **naval alliance** organized and dominated by Athens consisted of the city-states most in danger of Persian attack: those in Ionia and on the islands in the Aegean. Larger city-states contributed triremes and their crews, while smaller ones pooled their resources to provide wealth or one ship. The alliance was called the Delian League, because the money was kept at the temple of Apollo on the island of Delos (city and other treasuries often were kept at a temple where, it was believed, the god would protect them).

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*to fend off* – to defend or protect yourself from something/somebody that is attacking you

*rival* – a person, group, etc. competing with others for the same thing or in the same area

*independence* – freedom from being governed or ruled by another country

*to endure* – to suffer something difficult, unpleasant, or painful

*to rebel* – to fight against the government

*military aid* – help relating to the armed forces

*to regain* – to get back

*fraction* – a small part or amount of something

*to deploy* – to move soldiers or weapons into a position where they are ready for military action

*punishment* – bad treatment
revolt – a protest against authority, especially that of a government, often involving violence; the action of protesting against authority

hoplite – citizen-soldiers of Ancient Greek city-states

phalanx [ˈfælæŋ(k)s] – a large group of people standing very close to each other, usually for the purposes of defence or attack

to outnumber – to be greater in number than somebody/something

to maneuver [məˈnuːvə] (manoeuvre – BrE) – to try to make someone act in a particular way

to trap – to lure and catch somebody/something

swamp – an area of ground that is very wet or covered with water and in which plants, trees, etc. are growing

armor (AmE) [ˈɑːmə] (armour – BrE) – special metal clothing that soldiers wore in the past to protect their bodies while fighting

arrow – a weapon that is like a long, thin stick with a sharp point at one end and often feathers at the other, shot from a bow (= a long, thin piece of wood bent into a curve by a piece of string)

spear [spɪə] – a weapon consisting of a pole with a sharp, usually metal, point at one end, that is either thrown or held in the hand

warfare [ˈwɔːfeə] – the activity of fighting a war, especially using particular weapons or methods

to exact revenge – to punish for harm that has been done to someone else

infantry [ˈɪnfəntri] – the part of an army that fights on foot

light-armed – bearing light weapons

to surrender – to admit that you have been defeated and want to stop fighting

pass – a path or road between or over mountains

to squeeze – to press something firmly, especially from all sides in order to change its shape, reduce its size, or remove liquid from it

bottleneck – a place where a road becomes narrow

traitor – a person who is not loyal or stops being loyal to their own country, social class, beliefs, etc.
contingent [kən'tɪnʤ(ə)nt] – a group of soldiers that are part of a larger force

to retreat – to go away from a place or person in order to escape from fighting or danger

to defend – to protect someone or something against attack or criticism

to abandon – to leave a place, thing, or person, usually for ever

undoing – the cause of someone’s failure, or of someone’s loss of power or money

fleet – a group of ships, or all of the ships in a country’s navy

warship – a ship supplied with guns, for use in war

seafarer [‘siːˌfeərə] – a person who travels by sea

oarsman [‘ɔːzmən] – a person who rows a boat, especially in competitions

to row [rəʊ] – the activity of making a boat move through water

to pierce – to go into or through something, making a hole

hull – the body or frame of a ship, most of which goes under the water

to prevail – to get control or influence

defense – protection or support against attack, criticism, or infection

to chase – to hurry after someone or something in order to catch him, her, or it

common – shared

foe [fəʊ] – an enemy

to expel – to force someone to leave a school, organization, or country

naval [‘nɜrv(ə)l] – belonging to a country’s navy, or relating to military ships

alliance [‘ɔləɪən(t)s] – a group of countries, political parties, or people who have agreed to work together because of shared interests or aims

Answer the following questions:
1. What do you understand by “representative forms of government”?
2. Why did Darius want to invade mainland Greece?
3. How did the Greek army manage to send the Persians home?
4. Why were the Greeks surprised from behind by the Persians?
5. What advantage did the Athenian warships have?
6. Why was the alliance called the Delian League?
Reproduce the events of the Persian Wars by using the following words and word combinations:

1. основной соперник
2. оказаться под властью
3. становиться целью
4. готовый к бою
5. повернуть к дому
6. сражаться до последнего (человека)
7. недооценивать врага
8. военно-морской флот
9. взять на себя ответственность
10. объединять ресурсы

**Text 5: Alexander the Great (356-323 BCE)**

The decisive battle of Philip’s conquest of Greece occurred in 338 BCE at Chaeronea in Boeotia, when Philip beat the Athenians and their allies. The military victory that won the day was a cavalry charge by Philip's eighteen-year-old son, Alexander. Alexander seems to have inherited much from his brilliant father: physical courage, arrogance, extreme intelligence, and, most importantly, unrestrained ambition. For when his father died in 336 BCE at an assassin’s hand, Alexander quickly consolidated his power and set out to conquer the world – at the age of twenty-one!

He had been a youth of infinite promise. Physically handsome, strong, brave, and nothing short of brilliant, he had been schooled by no less a person than Aristotle. With all these qualities, he took up his father's ambition and prosecuted it with a swiftness that is almost frightening.

In 334 BCE, Alexander crossed over into Asia Minor to begin his conquest of Persia. To conquer Persia was to conquer the world, for the Persian Empire sprawled over most of the known world: Asia Minor, the Middle East, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Iran. He didn't have much to go on: his army numbered thirty thousand infantry and only five thousand cavalry. He had no navy. He had no money.

His strategy was simple. He would move quickly and begin with a few sure victories, so he could gain money and supplies. He would focus on the coastal cities
so that he could gain control of the ports; in that way, the Persian navy would have no place to make landfall. Finally, he took the battle right to the center of the opposing forces, and he threw himself into the very worst of the battle. His enemies were stunned and his troops grew intensely loyal to this man who threw both them and himself right into the teeth of the wolf.

He quickly overran Asian Minor after defeating the Persian forces that controlled the territory, and after seizing all the coastal cities, he turned inland towards Syria in 333 BCE. There he engaged the main Persian army under the leadership of the Persian king, Darius, at a city called Issus. As he had done at Chaeronia, he led an astounding cavalry charge against a superior opponent and forced them to break ranks. Darius, and much of his army, ran inland towards Mesopotamia, leaving Alexander free to continue south. He seized the coastal towns along the Phoenician and Palestinian coasts. When he entered Jerusalem, he was hailed as their great liberator. He continued south and conquered Egypt with almost no resistance whatsoever; the Egyptians called him king and son of Re.

By this point, Darius understood that the situation was out of his control. As Alexander moved down the Phoenician coast, he managed to conquer the city of Tyre, which was absolutely central to Persian naval operations. Darius knew that he could never recover Asia Minor, Phoenicia, or Palestine, so he sent an offer to halt hostilities. If Alexander would cease, Darius would cede to him all of the Persian Empire west of the Euphrates River; Mesopotamia, Persia (modern day Iran), and the northern territories would remain Persian.

Alexander would have none of this. In 331 BCE, he crossed the Euphrates river into Mesopotamia. Darius met him near the ancient Assyrian city of Nineveh, the city that had been destroyed by the Chaldeans only three centuries earlier. This was the last battle between Darius and Alexander; the Macedonian king again put the numerically superior Persian army to flight, and Darius ran also. In January of 330 BCE, Alexander entered Babylon: he had conquered Mesopotamia and now controlled its greatest and wealthiest city. The Persians had amassed vast wealth from the tribute paid by the various states under them. Alexander, who had started
with no money at all, was now in control of the fattest treasury that had ever existed.

Darius, meanwhile, met his death at the hands of a conspiracy. The Persian nobles no longer felt that he could effectively lead them and, under the leadership of his brother Bessus, the nobles killed Darius and left his body for Alexander to find. Alexander, however, pushed on, found Bessus, and killed him and as many Persian nobles as he could. The Persian Empire had officially come to a close.

Having conquered what was then the known world, Alexander had pushed his army to the very limits of civilization as he knew it. But he wanted more; he saw that the world extended further and partly out of curiosity, and partly out of a desire to conquer the entire world within the boundaries of the river Ocean (the Greeks believed that a great river, called Ocean, encircled all the land of the world), Alexander and his army pushed east, through Scythia (northern Iran), and all the way to Pakistan and India. He had conquered Bactria at the foot of the western Himalayas, gained a huge Bactrian army, and married a Bactrian princess, Roxane. But when he tried to push on past Pakistan, his army grew tired, and he abandoned the eastward conquest in 327 BCE.

In 324 BCE, Alexander returned to Babylon. He was now, literally, king of the world, and began to lay down his strategies for consolidating his empire. He began to plan cities and building works, new conquests, and even considered deifying himself. But like so many human gods, his own death caught up with him. In 323 BCE, at the age of thirty-three, he fell into a fever and died.

It’s rare in history that human events become so focused on a single individual; rarely is that focus justified. Alexander, however, is one of the notable exceptions. The age of Alexander was the age created by Alexander, and he would permanently stamp world culture with a Greek character. He was in many ways a brilliant and selfless person, quite possibly the most brilliant military leader in human history. With a small army, little or no supplies, and no money, he conquered the greatest, wealthiest, and most powerful empire in the world. He never lost a battle, not once, and he flung himself into battle with intense physical
bravery. He was also a tyrant and a bully, given to fits of uncompromising violence. He was certainly a drunkard and at times unstable. We will never know if he could have ruled or unified this huge empire, for it may have crumbled into nothing within a few years. His death, however, guaranteed that the empire he had built would never last.

**Alexander the Great’s legacy:**

While there is much controversy among historians about the significance of Alexander in Greek history and culture, there is no question that the Alexandrian empire was built because of his military genius and his unbridled ambition. Whether or not Alexander could have kept this unimaginably large empire together is an unanswerable and ultimately useless question. It is clear, however, that his death, only a year after completing his Herculean conquest of the world, spelled the end of the empire he had acquired so quickly.

Alexander, who was only thirty-three years old when he died, had made no preparations for his succession. He had married a Bactrian princess, Roxane, when he had conquered Bactria; their son, however, was unborn when Alexander died. Alexander also had a brother, but he was both weak and unintelligent. So the generals which had aided him divided the empire among themselves in order to preserve the empire for the future, as yet unborn, king; this would guarantee that Alexander’s empire would remain in the royal line of Macedonian kings. Like all powerful and ambitious men, they soon fell into conflict with one another. In two decades of conflict, several of the original generals were killed, along with Alexander's son and brother. By 300 BC, all that was left of Alexander’s empire were four smaller empires, each controlled by military generals who declared themselves kings. Greece and Macedonia fell to Antigonus, who founded the Antigonid dynasty of Greek kings; this dynasty would eventually control Asia Minor. Asia Minor original came under the control of the Attalid dynasty, but was eventually subsumed under the Antigonids. Mesopotamia and the Middle East came under the control of Seleucus, who crowned himself Seleucus I and began the Seleucus dynasty (every king in this dynasty would be named Seleucus). Egypt
came under the control of Ptolemy, who crowned himself Ptolemy I and began the Ptolemid dynasty. The Ptolemids maintained Greek learning and culture, but adopted several Egyptian customs surrounding the kingship, such as inheritance through the maternal line.

These empires periodically fought with one another, for none of these kings ever fully accepted the fact that the empire had fractured into three parts. Each believed that they were the rightful heirs to the entire empire that Alexander had built. Countries, such as Judah, periodically shifted from one empire to another as the fortunes of war went now to the Ptolemids and now to the Seleucids.

Despite the constant conflict, the Hellenistic world was an incredibly prosperous one. Alexander and his successors had liberated an immense amount of wealth from the Persian empire, and with this new wealth in circulation the standard of living rose dramatically. Each of the empires embarked on building projects, on scholarship, on patronage of the arts, and on literature and philosophy. The Ptolemies built an enormous library in their capital city of Alexandria, and sponsored the translation of a host of religious and literary works into Greek.

This period really marked the first international culture in Western, Middle Eastern, and North African history. The Greeks imported their culture: political theory, philosophy, art, and literature all over the known civilized world. This culture would greatly alter the culture and religion of the Mediterranean. But the flow of culture worked in the opposite direction as well; non-Greek ideas and non-Greeks flowed into Greece (and Italy). They took with them their religions, their philosophies, science, and culture; in this environment, eastern religions in particular began to take hold in the Greek city-states both in the east and in Greece. Among these religions was Zoroastrianism and Mithraism; in later years, this international environment would provide the means for the spread of another eastern religion, Christianity.

This process of the “Hellenization” (“making Greek”) of the world took place largely in the urban centers the Greeks began to zealously build. While the Greeks had for a long time believed that monarchy was a sign of barbarity, they had to
come to terms with the reality of their new form of government. So they compromised. While they accepted the monarchy, the set about building somewhat independent *poleis* that had the structure of the polis without its political independence. The growth of these cities provoked massive migrations from the Greek mainland, as Greeks settled in these new, far-flung *poleis* to assume lucrative positions in the military and administration.

Spread from Italy to India, from Macedonia to Egypt, Greek culture was the most significant of its times. The mighty empires of the Greeks hung onto this vast amount of territory for almost three centuries. Slowly, however, a new power was rising in the west, steadily building its own, accidental empire. By the time of Christ, the great Greek empires of the Hellenistic world had been replaced and unified once more into a single empire under the control of an Italian people, the Romans.

**Answer the following questions:**

1. What advantages/disadvantages did Alexander the Great have as he began his career of conquests?
2. Why were his men so loyal to Alexander?
3. How did Alexander the Great defeat the Persians?
4. Why do you think that Alexander killed Bessus?
5. Why did Alexander abandon his eastward expansion in 326 BCE?
6. What immediately happened to Alexander the Great’s empire?
7. Why did Alexander’s empire ultimately collapse?
8. What is meant by the term “Hellenism?” Where was it most influential in the ancient world?
9. Identify some of the effect that Alexander’s conquests had on the Greek people?
10. Why can it be said that the Age of Alexander the Great marked the first truly international culture in history?
Historical Diary Assignment: research as much as you can about the life, times, experiences, and actions of Alexander the Great. Think about these questions as you do your research:

- What were Alexander’s fears, hopes, and dreams?
- What or who were the most significant influences on his life?
- What were the main goals and motives of Alexander the Great?
- Did Alexander deserve the title “Great”?
- What were the major merits and failings of Alexander as a general and a statesman?
- What were Alexander’s most important achievements and how lasting an impact did he have on the history and civilizations of the lands he conquered?
- To what extent did Alexander the Great represent the qualities of romantic optimist, military and administrative genius and oriental tyrant?

Investigate all you can about the life of Alexander the Great and put yourself in his shoes! Include actual historical data from his life. These diaries must express Alexander’s thoughts, feelings, and secrets. What would Alexander have written in his diary, had he kept one? Combine your research and your imagination to complete this assignment!

III. Listening

1. The Origins of the Ionian Revolt and the Beginning of the Persian Wars (Prof. Eric H. Cline’s lecture)

The list of words and word combinations under study:

- **rebellion** – an attempt by some of the people in a country to change their government, using violence
- **Herodotus** [haˈrɔdətɨs] – Геродот
- **enquiry** [ɪnˈkwaɪəri] – the process of asking questions or collecting information about somebody/something
barbarian – (in ancient times) a member of a people who did not belong to one of the great civilizations (Greek, Roman, Christian)

envoy [envɔɪ] – a person who represents a government or an organization and is sent as a representative to talk to other governments and organizations

trusty – that you have had a long time and have always been able to rely on

tyrant ['taɪərənt] – a person who has complete power in a country and uses it in a cruel and unfair way

tentative – said or done in a careful but uncertain way because you do not know if you are right

Answer the following questions:

1. Where was Ionia situated?
2. How was Herodotus called? Why?
3. Where was Herodotus born?
4. What does “historia” mean in Greek?
5. What was Herodotus interested in?
6. When and where did the Ionian Revolt begin?
7. What was one of the problems with the beginning of the rebellion?
8. What solution did Histiaeus find?
9. What did the slave have to say to Aristagorus?
10. Who did they ask for help? What were the answers?
11. When did the Persians start to recapture the rebellion cities?
12. What happened to Miletus?
13. When did the Ionian Revolt end?
14. Why did the Persians turn their attention to Greece?
15. What happened in 492 BC?
16. When did the real invasion take place?
17. Where did the first major battle of the Persian Wars take place?
18. Who was Hippias?
19. Why did Hippias join the Persians?
20. Why did the Spartans refuse to participate in the battle?
2. The Peloponnesian War (Prof. Donald Kagan’s lecture)

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*Thucydides* [θjuːˈsididəs] – Фукидид

*realm* [relm] – an area of interest or activity

*hostility* – unfriendly and not liking something

*frustration* – the feeling of being annoyed or less confident

*autonomy* [ɔːˈtɔnəmi] – the right of an organization, country, or region to be independent and govern itself

*brutality* [bruːˈtælɪtɪ] – behaviour that is very cruel or violent

*savagery* ['sævɪʤ(ə)rɪ] – (acts of) cruel and violent behaviour

*vengeance* ['venʤ(ə)n(t)s] – the punishing of someone for harming you

*atrocities* – an extremely cruel, violent, or shocking act

*bestial* ['bestɪəl] – cruel or like an animal

*mankind* – the whole of the human race, including both men and women

*obligation* – the fact that you are obliged to do something

*glorify* – to praise and honour a person

*withdraw* – to take or move out or back, or to remove

Answer the following questions:

1. Why is Thucydides believed to be the second great historian in History?
2. Why does the Peloponnesian War deserve to be thought of as a world war?
3. Why was the Peloponnesian War a critical point in Greek history?
4. Why is the Peloponnesian War so popular?
5. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Why or why not?
   “The longer a war persists, the more inevitable is the sinking below the civilized level of warfare to much more horrible ways of fighting” (taken from the lecture).
6. What was Thucydides’ first book about?
7. Why did this war happen? What was Thucydides’ truest explanation?
8. When did the war break out?
9. Why do nations go to war according to Thucydides?
10. What produced an explosion between Athens and Sparta?
11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Why/why not?
“The history of all civilized mankind is the history of warfare” (taken from the lecture).

IV. Quiz

Test 1:

Answer the following questions:
1. How does Greek culture still impact us today?
2. How did people in Ancient Greece become slaves? What couldn’t slaves do?
3. How was the purpose of Education different in Athens and Sparta?
4. What happened in Greek home when babies were born?
5. Describe the fact that although city-states rivaled each other, they also were bound by one another.
6. What happened in Athens and Sparta if graduates failed the fitness tests?
7. When graduates in Athens and Sparta took their final fitness and mental tests, what were their rewards for passing and penalties for failing?
8. List and describe the three most famous Greek philosophers and what each contributed to the world.
9. What did the Minoans help shape or create?
10. What did Mycenaeans pass on to later Greeks?
11. What did the geography of Greece prevent?
12. What were the Persians wars?
13. What was the outcome and impact of the wars?
15. Name the causes and effects of the Peloponnesian War.
16. Compare and contrast Athens and Sparta using lots of detail and examples.
17. Name one contribution each of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.
18. What was Alexander the Great’s first victory? What did he go on to conquer?
19. What legacy did Alexander the Great’s leave behind?
20. How was the purpose of education different in Athens and Sparta? (essay)

21. How did Alexander the Great encourage the blending of eastern and western cultures?

**Test 2:**

*Term identification: pick a word from the box that best completes the sentences below:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labyrinth</th>
<th>Phalanx</th>
<th>Homer</th>
<th>Cleisthenes</th>
<th>Crete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bard</td>
<td>Symposium</td>
<td>the Mycenaes</td>
<td>Mercenary</td>
<td>the Minoans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polis</td>
<td>Aristocrat</td>
<td>Tyrant</td>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. An island, southeast of the Greek mainland.
2. People who were ruled under King Minos.
3. A complex, confusing series of connected passages.
4. A person who seized power and established one-man rule.
5. Member of the nobility or the upper class.
6. In Ancient Athens, a gathering of men that featured eating, drinking, entertainment, and intellectual discussions.
7. The fourth tyrant to help reform Athens, who came to power in 508 B.C. and introduced a series of laws that established democracy for Athens.
8. A poet who tells stories by singing.
9. The art of effective public speaking.
10. Blind poet who composed the two most famous Greek epics.
11. A soldier who serves a foreign country for pay.
12. City-state of Ancient Greece.
14. A military formation in which foot soldiers stood so that their shields overlapped.
15. A group that originated among the Indo-European peoples of central Asia.

**Test 3:**

*Multiple choice:*

1. When a child was born to a Greek family, the father would
a. pass out smoking pipes to all other males
b. register the child with the government
c. carry his wife around the house to honor her
d. carry his child, in a ritual dance, around the household

2. Slaves in Ancient Greece could not
   a. go to school
   b. enter politics
   c. use their own name
   d. all of the above

3. The Minoans helped to shape
   a. culture in Greece.
   b. city-states all over Greece.
   c. the first Greek civilization.
   d. youth programs in Greece.

4. Greek culture still impacts us today through
   a. Arts, philosophy, math, and politics.
   b. Arts, philosophy, and warfare
   c. wedding traditions
   d. male and female gender roles

5. Mycenaeans passed what on to later Greeks?
   a. A strong, centralized government.
   b. The idea that art and culture was more important than military strength.
   c. The belief that physical beauty was all that mattered.
   d. Mesopotamian and Egyptian influences.

6. The geography of Greece prevented Greeks from
   a. gaining additional territories.
   b. getting to know each other’s city-states.
   c. Creating a large, unified empire.
   d. expanding technologically.

7. The Persian Wars were a result of
a. certain Greek city-states attacking the Persian Empire.
b. Greek city-states uniting to fight the threat of the Persian Empire.
c. fighting among Athens and Sparta.
d. The Persian Empire attacking Greek islands.

8. The Persian Wars impacted Ancient Greece by
   a. Sparta emerging as the most powerful city-state.
   b. dividing the city-states further.
   c. destroying its economy.
   d. Athens emerging as the most powerful city-state.

9. After the Persian Wars, Athens enjoyed a golden age under Pericles because
   a. inflation was down.
   b. Athens became a direct democracy.
   c. jobs were provided for every citizen.
   d. the traditional Olympics began.

10. The Alexandrian author of The Elements of Geometry was
    a. Euclid
    b. Eratosthenes.
    c. Aristarchus.
    d. Zeno.

11. The code of conduct and ethical standards still practiced by modern doctors was developed by
    a. Thales
    b. Zeno
    c. Herodotus
    d. Hippocrates.

12. One of the causes of the Peloponnesian War:
    a. Sparta was against oligarchy while Athens encouraged it.
    b. Pericles provoked Spartan rulers into war
    c. Many Greeks outside of Athens resented Athenian domination
    d. Sparta destroyed the Acropolis in Athens
13. An effect (result) of the Peloponnesian Wars:
   a. Democratic government suffered.
   b. Athens became the cultural center of Greece.
   c. Athenian domination ended.
   d. All of the above.

Test 4:
Short answer:
1. Explain how people in Athens became slaves.
2. When graduates in Athens and Sparta took their final fitness and mental tests, what were their rewards for passing and penalties for failing?
3. What legacy did Alexander the Great leave behind?
4. Describe Alexander the Great’s first victory and what he went on to conquer.

V. Supplementary reading

The Colonial Expansion of Greece

Greek colonies of the Archaic period are found on or off the coasts of modern Spain, France, Italy, Sicily, Albania, Greece, Turkey in Europe, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia, Turkey in Asia, Egypt and Libya. Hence this is often regarded as the “age of colonization” or period of Greek colonization *par excellence*. In fact colonization was practised in all periods of Greek history. What distinguishes the colonization of the Archaic period is, firstly, its scale and extent, only rivalled by the very different colonization of Alexander and the Hellenistic period, and, secondly, its character, as a product of the world of the independent city-state, the *polis*. Later colonization of the Classical, and, even more clearly, of the Hellenistic, periods reveals in many ways that it emanated from a world dominated by larger political units. It is more difficult to distinguish Archaic colonization from its predecessor in the migratory period, when the Greeks settled the islands of the Aegean and west coast of Asia Minor. Indeed, the ancients themselves made no such distinction. However, it seems doubtful if the dominating political units of those days could properly be called *poleis*. In any case, a distinction is required by
the great difference in the quality of our knowledge of the colonization of the migratory period as compared with that of Archaic times. With some over-simplification one might say that the literary sources for the Archaic period present real historical evidence, even though they are partly contaminated by legendary elements, whereas those for the migratory period are all legend, even if a kernel of truth is concealed somewhere within them. As for archaeological evidence, even though the material is constantly being enriched for both periods, it remains incomparably more abundant for the Archaic colonizing movement.

This argument brings us to the sources for Greek colonization in the Archaic period, which we may divide for the purpose of discussion into literary and archaeological.

The extant literary sources are extremely widely spread, and information on Greek colonies comes from virtually the whole range of Greek and Latin authors. From Homer we have not only much indirectly informative material, on geography, for instance, or trade, or life in the polis, but also a clear description of an ideal colonial site. This occurs in the Cyclops episode, which is generally enlightening on many aspects of Greek colonization. The activities of a city-founder are also briefly described. Hesiod too, although he never mentions colonization directly, provides valuable information on contemporary economic, social and political conditions (e.g. his famous advice to have no more than one son), as well as his (possibly idiosyncratic) hostile attitude to seafaring. Of later poets Archilochus stands out, above all because of his connexion with Thasos. His value for facts is lessened by the fragmentary and allusive character of his extant poetry (and the later accounts of his life partly preserved in inscriptions on Paros are similarly incomplete and enigmatic), but, as a contemporary witness, he is uniquely valuable for his spirit and attitude to colonization.

Even though a very large number of extant Greek and Roman authors provide some piece of information directly or indirectly relevant to the history of Greek colonization, a few are of overriding importance. In any fully documented treatment of Greek colonization in the Archaic period (as, for instance, that of Jean
Berard, or, of the older ones, the very thorough chapters of Busolt) the names that occur most frequently in the footnotes are those of Herodotus, Thucydides, Strabo, Ps.-Scymnus and Eusebius; in other words, historians, geographers and a chronographer.

Neither Herodotus nor Thucydides was primarily concerned with writing a history of colonization. Their importance lies, firstly, in their relatively early date; although they belong to the period after the Archaic colonizing movement, they are nearer to it than our other substantial extant sources, and they both knew at firsthand about colonization in the Classical period. Secondly, they are both manifestly interested in colonies and colonizing activity. From Herodotus we have invaluable passages on the Phocaeans in the west, Greeks in Egypt, the Greek cities in the Black Sea, the history of Cyrene, and the attempts at colonization in Africa and Sicily by Dorieus – to mention only the most important. Thucydides is best known to historians of colonization for his fundamental, if very succinct, history of Greek colonization in Sicily, but there are many other vital pieces of information scattered about his work, and, in particular, he is richly revealing on institutions and relationships in the colonial field. Between them Herodotus and Thucydides determine our picture of Greek colonization.

However, it is the ancient geographers who provide the nearest thing we have to a systematic account of Greek colonization, because their methods and aims led them to list great numbers of Greek colonies, and often to furnish such further information as the mother city (or cities), the date of foundation, and the oikistes or oikistai. Strabo is the doyen of such sources. A contemporary of Augustus, he was familiar with the learned literature produced down to his day and has the virtue of frequently indicating his authorities.

Less great Greek geographers are also often helpful. Of these we may single out the author of a poem in iambic trimeters, long referred to as Ps.-Scymnus. The aim of his work was to describe briefly the whole accessible world and, in particular, the colonies and foundation of cities. His description of Europe is complete, but that of Asia is lost except for the Asiatic coast of the Pontus. This
skillful compression of much basic geographical and historical knowledge is frequently valuable to the modern historian, especially in areas for which earlier or better literary sources are not abundant, as, for instance, in the northern Aegean, Propontis and Pontus. The poem was written within the years 138 to 75/4 B.C. (to give the widest termini). The old attribution to Scymnus of Chios was entirely unjustifiable, for Scymnus of Chios wrote in prose and lived about a century earlier. Diller has therefore most reasonably suggested that we should give up the term Ps.-Scymnus and call the author (from his dedication) “Auctor ad Nicomedem regem”, abbreviated “Nic.”, but it is difficult to oust an appellation sanctified by long usage.

It is clear that by the time of Herodotus the foundations of colonies had become a theme for history - and for legend. His account of the colonization of Cyrene bears all the marks of the genre *ktisis*, with its forged Delphic oracles, folk-tale motifs and concentration on individuals. The ancestor of the genre can be seen in Homer's description of the settlement of Rhodes, and the colonization of Colophon was described by Mimnermus. The first lengthy treatment of an Archaic colonial foundation known to us was that of Elea by Xenophanes, and from the fifth century onwards *ktiseis* were written in large numbers. Polybius regarded the history of foundations as a separate branch of history, which appealed especially to the curious and the lover of the recondite, of whom he cites Ephorus as a characteristic example. So a great lost literature lies behind the meagre and skeletal information preserved for us in the extant historians and geographers.

One feature of this literature was undoubtedly the attempt to fix the foundations of colonies chronologically. The most abundant testimony to that chronographical work that we possess now is the *Chronica* of Eusebius, which is preserved in an Armenian version, in the slightly later chronological tables of St Jerome (Hieronymus), a work often called Eusebius Hieronymi, and in other subsequent chronographies. A relatively large number of exact colonial dates figure in these tables, dates which doubtless derive from the work of scholars of the Classical and Hellenistic periods. We can see from the careful indications of
chronology in Thucydides' account of the colonization of Sicily that foundation
dates were already present in the history of Greek colonies at the end of the fifth
century. It was at that same period that Greek historians were fashioning
chronological frameworks for the whole of Greek history. When they were dealing
with early periods for which no actual dates were available, their method (though
not clear in all details) was to take existing lists of names, such as kings,
magistrates, athletic victors or priestesses, and then compute generations. Many
scholars believe that this method was also used in order to achieve the precise
foundation dates of Greek colonies, and therefore consider these dates to be strictly
artificial, and liable to the inaccuracies inherent in the method of calculation, as, for
instance, an arbitrary number of years to a generation, such as thirty or thirty-five.

It is obviously of great importance to decide whether these foundation dates
are true dates or the product of calculation. Thucydides’ dates for the Sicilian
colonies, being the earliest attested and transmitted by a historian of such authority,
inevitably constitute the test case. In his most valuable and convenient analysis of
these dates Dunbabin argued strongly against the notion that they were calculated
by reckoning generations, but since he wrote there has been more than one attempt
to show that a definite genealogical schema can be recognized in the dates and
intervals of time given by Thucydides. Of these the most impressive and subtly
argued is that of van Compernolle, who maintained that the whole edifice of the
Sicilian colonial dates was a construction created out of genealogies, especially
those of the Deinomenids of Gela and the Enmenids of Acragas, on the basis of
thirty-five years to a generation. This result could only be achieved by his choosing
different base dates as starting points for the various calculations, and the choice of
those dates was inevitably arbitrary. No argument containing such a flaw could be
convincing, but it has, in any case, since also been shown that the ancestors of
Gelon, one of the major elements in van Compernolle’s scheme, cannot be listed
with the assurance he supposed. So the best attempt to show that Thucydides' Sicilian
dates are a product of calculation must be adjudged a failure, and we may
conclude that all such attempts must inevitably rest on arbitrary and unjustifiable assumptions.

In default of satisfactory proof that these dates are calculated, what case can be made for believing that the citizens of the Sicilian colonies in the fifth century actually knew when their cities had been founded? Since their foundation occurred two centuries and more before the Greeks began to write history, it is necessary to postulate some procedure by which the era of the colony was recorded or could be worked out. It has been pointed out that in a colonial city the annual ceremonies in honour of the oikistes might provide a specially favourable framework for an accurate count of years, but it must be admitted that, while the annual ceremonies are well attested, we have no evidence that they gave birth to chronological records. Another point concerns Thucydides. In view of his very demanding chronological principles, it could be argued that, if he knew that the Sicilian colonial dates were not true dates, but had been calculated in ways such as those suggested above, he would not have transmitted them. We can hardly believe that he would have been deceived. Whether he took his chronology of the Sicilian colonies from the Sikelika of Antiochus of Syracuse, or, as seems more likely, pursued his own researches and used a variety of sources, both literary and oral, the force of this argument is unaltered. As our knowledge stands, it seems better to make the assumption, bold though it may be, that the true foundation dates of the colonies had been recorded in some way, than to embrace the unattractive premises required by any other hypothesis.

Since we cannot be certain about the origin and authority of these dates, it is not surprising that some modern historians have treated them very cavalierly. In his stimulating chapter Beloch was characteristically willful in setting aside the traditional dates in favour of a priori ideas of his own, but he also had the insight to perceive that the chronology would be settled by thorough investigation of colonial cemeteries. And what the archaeological investigation of numerous colonial cemeteries since he wrote has shown is that he was entirely unjustified in his low opinion of the literary foundation dates.
Apart from the early poets, none of the literary evidence for Greek colonization in the Archaic period is contemporary. Ultimately we cannot make good this lacuna, because there is no substitute for the precise and detailed information of contemporary literary sources, but archaeological evidence has the great advantage that it is primary and contemporary, and not affected by later ideas or selection.

Archaeological evidence has been most valuable in establishing colonial chronology. Greek painted pottery is now well dated independently of the literary foundation dates for the colonies, and, as a result, when sufficient material is available to ensure a representative sample, the archaeological date for the foundation of a colony can be confidently determined. The nature of pottery evidence does not allow such dating to be closer than to the nearest quarter century, but, even so, the historian has for numerous Greek colonies an archaeological date, which can in many cases be set beside a literary date, much to the advantage of his interpretation. Archaeological evidence has thus to some extent compensated for the uncertainties which inevitably attach to the literary foundation dates. But it has also, by showing how reliable in general the literary tradition is, increased our confidence in the authority of the literary sources for Archaic Greek colonization.

There are many other fields in which the material evidence can either verify the literary evidence or add something totally new. One thinks of topography, town plans, sizes of cities, defenses, public and private buildings; of achievements in all the arts expressed in durable materials; of evidence for standards of material life, for exports and imports. For all these subjects archaeological evidence is entirely appropriate, so no great problems are presented by the fact that the great bulk of our evidence is due to the spade.

It is when we turn to the life and practices of the community, and to relationships between different groups, that the archaeological evidence may become very difficult to interpret. Take, for instance, the relations between the Greeks and the indigenous population. This is undoubtedly a subject in which archaeological evidence has – vastly extended the material available for discussion,
just as it is certainly the topic which is currently most enthusiastically pursued in
the whole field of Greek colonization. But, if we often cannot tell who the people
are whose remains have been discovered (whether Greeks, Hellenized natives,
natives who merely liked Greek objects, or a mixture), the first, fundamental,
question, on which all interpretation must depend, cannot be answered. On the
basis of archaeological evidence alone it will always be difficult to draw a clear
picture of Hellenization, intermarriage, mixed communities, exploitation of natives
by Greeks, and so forth. Yet these are the very topics on which archaeological
evidence is continually asked to throw light, and for which the great bulk of the
evidence – and all the new evidence likely to accrue – is archaeological. In such
circumstances the only safe procedure is to use first the literary sources, however
exiguous, simply because they are explicit, and to interpret the much more
abundant, but inarticulate, material evidence under their guidance.

In the arrangement of this chapter the order is imposed by the nature of the
subject: first, the history of the foundations by area; secondly, discussion of topics.
For much of the factual detail belonging to the first part the reader is referred to the
table at the end and to the maps. As a general principle, little attempt is made to
treat the history of colonies after their foundation. The chronological limits of this
chapter are 800 – 500 B.C. Within that period, apart from a few specially favoured
cities, such as Cyrene, there are few colonies of which anything approaching
history can be written. In the discussion of topics we cannot exclude all material
subsequent to 500. Contemporary literary or epigraphic evidence on many of the
most important questions about Greek colonization is virtually absent before the
fifth century. Furthermore, some of the ideas and practices described then are
expressly termed traditional. There is thus sufficient justification, so long as we do
it with our eyes open, for using this material to illuminate a picture of Greek
colonization in Archaic times, which would otherwise be obscure indeed.
UNIT 2
Ancient Rome

I. Pronunciation

*Check your understanding and pronunciation of the following words and word combinations:*

Alfred ['ælfrid] – Альфред
Aphrodisias [æfroˈdɪsɪəs] – Афродисиас
Cannae ['kæni] or ['kæneɪ] – Канны
Ebro River ['ɪbroʊ] – Эбро
Ephesus ['efəsəs] – Эфес
Etruscan ['ɪtrakən] – этруск
Gaul [ɡɔːl] – Галлия; галл
Julius Caesar ['dʒuːlɪəs 'siːzə] – Юлий Цезарь
Polybius [pəˈlɪbiəs] – Полибий
Pyrrhus ['pɪrəs] – Пирр
Samnites ['sæmnɪt] – самнит
Solon ['sɔlɒn] – Солон
Syracuse ['sərəkjuːz] – Сиракузы
Tunisia [tjuːˈnɪziə] – Тунис

II. Reading

*Text 1: Roman history, blow by blow*

Rome’s early life was more about internal social struggles, beginning with the kings. With the kings gone, the Republic was created, and Rome gradually accumulated local allies in her bid to ensure her own security. As Rome’s power grew, these allies came to want to share the same social privileges the Romans enjoyed. As she grew in power and prestige, Rome increasingly came into contact with international rivals like Carthage. A seemingly endless series of wars followed, which were far from conclusive, yet Rome prevailed simply because she
constantly came back for more and ultimately wore down her opponents. By the first century BC, Rome was the most powerful state in the Mediterranean.

Rome then started falling apart because immensely powerful generals used their armies to pursue their own political ambitions. Decades of political chaos followed until Octavian brought the wars to an end and took over supreme power. He ‘restored the Republic’, so he said, but he really created himself as emperor – a spin most accepted in return for peace. Ruling as Augustus, the stability he brought made Rome even more powerful. By the early second century AD, Rome under the emperors was at her zenith, controlling the whole Mediterranean area, north-west Europe, central Europe, North Africa, Egypt, and the Middle East.

In the third and fourth centuries AD, with barbarians battering down the frontiers, it became impossible for one emperor to control it all. So by the fourth century, it was usually the case that at least two, and sometimes more, emperors ruled different parts of the Roman Empire. The basis of the division was between the East and the West. The Eastern Empire managed to survive until 1453 but it was a mere shadow of its former self. The Western half had really ceased to exist by the mid-400s, a thousand years earlier.

After the end of the Roman Empire in the West, Europe fragmented into numerous little kingdoms, principalities, and duchies. Imagine the United States falling apart and the governor of each state becoming the head of a local dynastic monarchy. To make things worse, each king had to constantly fight for his kingdom against rivals. Borders were always changing, and the threat of invasion was never far away. In England, for example, King Alfred of the Saxons in Wessex (AD 871–899) had to fight back the Viking invaders. In medieval Italy, even cities fought one another.

Today, what was once the Roman Empire is now dozens of independent countries. It’s quite remarkable to think that an area once ruled by Roman emperors even to this day is broken up into so many parts. Only with the coming of the European Union have many European countries started co-operating again.
The list of words and word combinations under study:

*internal* – existing or happening inside a person, object, organization, place, or country

*struggle* – fight, especially with your hands

*to accumulate* – 1) to collect a large number of things over a long period of time; 2) to gradually increase in number or amount

*to ensure* – to make something certain to happen

*conclusive* – proving that something is true, or ending any doubt

*to wear down* – to make someone feel tired and less able to deal successfully with a situation

*to pursue* [pə'sjuː] – to follow someone or something, usually to try to catch him, her, or it

*to take over* – to begin to have control of something

*supreme* – having the highest rank, level, or importance

*zenith* – the best or most successful point or time

*to batter down* – hit smth so hard that it broke and fell down

*frontier* [frʌntiər] – a border between two countries

*former* – of or in an earlier time; before the present time or in the past

*to fragment into* – to break something into small parts or to be broken up in this way

*threat* [θret] – a suggestion that something unpleasant or violent will happen, especially if a particular action or order is not followed

*medieval* [,medɪˈiːv(ə)l] – related to the Middle Ages

*remarkable* – unusual or special and therefore surprising and worth mentioning

Explain the following words:

*kingdom* – королевство, царство, государство

*principality* – княжество

*duchy* ['dʌʃi] – герцогство

*monarchy* ['mənəkɪ] – монархия
Answer the following questions:
1. Why were there a lot of wars in Rome?
2. Why did Rome prevail in the wars?
3. Why was it usual that two or even more emperors ruled different parts of the Roman Empire?

Discuss the following questions:
1. How could Octavian “restore the Republic”? What did it mean?
2. Why is it remarkable to think that an area once ruled by Roman emperors even to this day is broken up into so many parts? Give your reasons.

Text 2: From city to Empire

With the assassination of Julius Caesar in 44 BC the Roman aristocracy was thrown into a chaos from which it only emerged in 31 BC with the victory of Octavian, who, under the name Augustus, set the pattern for future government of the Roman world by a sole ruler. The struggle in which Augustus had been involved had nominally been over the right to honours and magistracies in the city of Rome, but the arena for the contest was the whole area that had been conquered by Rome over the preceding three centuries. Armies marched through Italy, and fought in most of the countries bordering the Mediterranean from Spain to Egypt. In an age of slow communications, the cause of their tribulations must have been quite obscure to many of the provincials whose taxes and forced labour enabled great Roman aristocrats to fight out the Roman revolution. Hence the approach by the people of Aphrodisias in Turkey to Octavian in c. 38 BC, even though their territory did not lie in the region controlled by him. According to an inscription preserved at Aphrodisias, Octavian wrote to the neighbouring city of Ephesus.

Solon son of Demetrius, envoy of Plarasa-Aphrodisias, has reported to me…how much property both public and private was looted, concerning all of which I have given a mandate to my colleague [Marcus] Antonius that, as far as possible, he should restore to them whatever he finds. (Reynolds, no. 12; LR 1, p. 327)
For such desperate provincials, Rome was a distant ruthless power and the machinations of her leaders belonged to a different world. Any help from any powerful individual was to be seized on.

By AD 180 much of this had changed. The Roman world was for the most part at peace, and it was many years since aspirants to power had upset the status quo (although civil war was to erupt again in AD 193 on the murder of Commodus). But in any case, for many provincials of the urban aristocracy Rome had ceased to appear alien and hostile. Partly this was as a result of the grant of Roman citizenship to increasing numbers: in AD 212 it was to become quasi-universal. Partly it was encouraged by the openness of the Roman upper class to rich provincials who wished to devote their lives to participation in the state’s bureaucracy. But above all it was a product of the main change which gives the period its name. What united the 50 to 60 million or so inhabitants of the empire, whether they were scions of old Roman noble families or the humblest Syrian peasant, was simply this: that all were ruled by one man, the supreme autocrat, the emperor.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

- assassination – the murder of someone famous or important
- aristocracy [ˌærɪstəˈkrəsɪ] – a class of people who hold high social rank
- to emerge – to appear by coming out of something or out from behind something
- pattern – a particular way in which something is done, is organized, or happens
- sole – being one only; single
- magistrate – a person who acts as a judge in a law court that deals with crimes that are less serious
- contest – a competition to do better than other people, usually in which prizes are given
- tribulation – a problem or difficulty
- obscure – not clear and difficult to understand or see
- to fight out – to argue until a decision is reached between two people or groups
to loot - (usually of large numbers of people during a violent event) to steal from shops and houses
ruthless – not thinking or worrying about any pain caused to others; cruel
to seize on – to use, accept, or take advantage of something quickly or enthusiastically
aspirant – someone who very much wants to achieve something
civil war – a war fought by different groups of people living in the same country
to erupt – to start suddenly and violently
citizenship [ˈsɪtɪznɪʃən] – the state of being a member of a particular country and having rights because of it
quasi [ˈkwɑːzi] – used to show that something is almost, but not completely, the thing described
scion [ˈsɑːn] – a young member of a rich and famous family
humble – not proud or not believing that you are important
peasant [ˈpezn] – a person who owns or rents a small piece of land and grows crops, keeps animals, etc. on it, especially one who has a low income, very little education, and a low social position. This is usually used of someone who lived in the past or of someone in a poor country
autocrat [ˈɔːtəkræt] – a ruler with unlimited power, or someone who demands that people completely obey them

Answer the following questions:
1. Why was the Roman aristocracy thrown into a chaos after the assassination of Julius Caesar?
2. Why had Rome ceased to appear alien and hostile for many provincials of the urban aristocracy?

Discuss the following questions:
1. What do you understand by the term “bureaucracy”? How could it be present then? Give your examples.
**Text 3: Life in Ancient Rome**

**A.** Roman cities were very modern places in which people lived, traded and worked. The center of these ancient cities was a forum, a large open space surrounded by markets, baths, arenas and other public buildings.

Wealthy Romans could afford living in large luxurious houses, which often lay on the outskirts of the city, far away from the noise and smell of the city center. They had servants and slaves to do everyday work for them. The poor population had to live in overcrowded, dirty buildings. They were always in danger of collapsing or being burned down.

Life in the countryside was more relaxed. The population was made up of farmers who raised animals and planted crops. During the summer they often fought in the army. A latifundium was the large farm of a rich landowner. He was able to make a higher profit by working with slaves.

Normal people lived in small houses or huts that were not as big and luxurious as those of the city. Many inhabitants of Rome had country houses, which they went to in order to escape the hectic city life.

**B.** Head of the Roman family was the paterfamilias, the oldest male. He controlled the whole household and had power over all the members of his family. In the upper classes slaves and servants also lived with a family. Romans often married for political reasons. Many rich Romans arranged marriages for their children so they could stay in the higher classes and keep their influence and power.

When Rome was still a republic, women had very few rights. They had to stay at home and care for the household, prepare meals and look after their children. They were not allowed to own land. This changed when ancient Rome became an empire. Women were allowed to have their own shops and businesses, and they were able to buy land. They could also get a better job.

**C.** While many Romans ate simple meals, wealthy inhabitants had the best food the empire could offer. They ate white bread, olives, fruit and cheese, as well as fish. Breakfast was usually a slice of bread or a pancake with dates and honey. Romans usually had a small lunch at about 11 in the morning. Dinner was the main
meal of the day. It was normally taken in the late afternoon or early evening. Fish, cooked meat and a variety of vegetables were served. Sometimes they had a small cake with honey for dessert.

D. Roman clothing was made out of wool, which women spun into cloth. Richer citizens could afford to buy clothes made out of silk, linen or cotton, which the Romans obtained from other parts of the empire.

Citizens of Rome wore a tunic, a piece of loose clothing that fell down to the knees. On special occasions they were allowed to wear a toga, an elegant piece of white clothing that was wrapped around their body.

Women wore tunics and later on stolas, which reached down to their feet. They liked jewelry and experimented in dyeing their hair.

Outdoors Romans often wore shoes that were closed around the toes, when in the house, they liked to wear sandals.

E. Bath houses were the centre of Roman leisure life. Men and women often got together in separate bath houses. There they could relax, get massages, exercise, take baths and gossip. People of all social classes got together in such public bath houses. Going to a bath was a symbol of cleanliness, of being purer and better than others.

Ancient Romans celebrated religious holidays very often. Almost every god and goddess had their own holiday. Festivals and entertainment were arranged in honor of them.

Amphitheaters were the ancestors of modern stadiums. The Coliseum in Rome was, by far, the biggest amphitheater. It could hold over 50 000 spectators. Gladiators entertained the audience by fighting against wild animals and often combating each other.

The Circus Maximus was the center of chariot races. Up to 250 000 people attended such a race. Chariot racing had been popular in ancient Greece and was one of the highlights of ancient Olympic Games. Each chariot was pulled by four horses.

Roman citizens went to the many theatres in the city that showed plays of
famous Roman playwrights. Most of the plays were comedies, in which actors wore masks that showed if they were happy or sad.

F. During the early centuries of ancient Rome children were mostly educated at home by their parents. Fathers taught their sons how to read and write, as well as the basics of law and religion. Mothers showed their daughters how to cook, weave and spin.

Later on, rich Romans started sending their children to school, which they had to pay for. There they learned to read, write and solve mathematical problems. One of the main tasks was to teach child to become a good speaker. Older pupils studied Greek language and literature and astronomy.

Match the parts (A-F) with the headings (1-6):
1. Clothes
2. The Roman family
3. Education
4. Food
5. Leisure Time
6. City and country life

Text 4: The Republic

The English word “republic”, derives from the Latin respublica – “the public concern”. Nowadays, when we apply the word to a modern country, we have a specific form of government in mind. Although the Romans continued to use the word to describe their state well into the imperial period, students of Roman history apply it to the state of Rome between the late sixth century BC, when the early monarchy was terminated, and the late first BC, when a new monarchy, which we know as the principate, was established by Augustus.

Romans of the principate tended to qualify respublica with the word vetus (“old”) when referring to the times before Augustus, and by it they signified a state which lacked the central direction of a monarchic figure, and in which the functions of government were, however nominally, split between three elements – the
magistrates (particularly the consuls), the senate (or “assembly” of the aristocracy), and the people (populus) and plebeians in their assemblies – the three comitia and the concilium plebis. In the eyes of at least one ancient historian, the Greek Polybius, writing in the middle of the second century BC, this “sharing” of power in a “mixed constitution” guaranteed stability by ensuring that none of the three elements of government had sufficient power to dominate, and that each depended upon the other two for the discharge of its functions.

In truth, Polybius’ analysis had more to do with classical political philosophy, as expounded by Plato and Aristotle, than it did with the political realities of Rome. For whilst sovereignty nominally belonged to the people in their assemblies, various factors – economic, political, military and religious – ensured that the people deferred to their ‘better’, the leaders of the nobility who, in fact, controlled all aspects of life and government through the senate and the magistracies. Because no salaries were paid for governmental duties, these tasks could in practice be exercised only by the wealthy. Further, because the Roman state made no distinction between civilian and military leadership, these same people held a monopoly of military command. Religion, too – a potent feature in the life of a superstitious people – was under the control of the wealthy who alone had the resources to defray the expenses involved in a complicated, and thus costly, area of Roman life.

As significant, however, was the institution of clientage in which the more fortunate members of society “protected” those less well-off in return for the latter’s political loyalty. Thus a state that had all the political institutions to allow a development into democracy remained unquestionably oligarchic in character.

Superficially, the stability and harmony assumed by Polybius to be Rome’s contribution to the development of classical city-states seemed real enough. In fact, it was the temporary product of the period when Rome was fighting first for her survival in Italy and then for supremacy over her Italian neighbours. However, security within Italy brought contacts with people further afield, such as Carthaginians and Greeks, wherein lay both opportunities and dangers.
Warfare imposed strains upon the Roman state by increasing demands upon Roman citizens, but also by bringing obligations and opportunities that individuals could use to their own advantage. Whilst it is commonly (and rightly) argued that the growth of the Roman empire from the third century BC was the general cause of the gradual disintegration and collapse of the republic, it is important to demonstrate the reasons for this, and to show how the old-fashioned “corporateness” of the Roman state retreated before the surging tide of factionalism and individualism. As a result, the last century of the republic (133–31 BC) was characterised by a series of struggles for military and political dominance fought out by major, often charismatic, figures such as Scipio Aemilianus, the Gracchus brothers, Gaius Marius, Cornelius Sulla, Pompey, Crassus and Caesar, and ultimately by Marcus Antonius and Caesar’s adopted son, Octavian, who, as the eventual victor, was to rule the republic and its empire as Augustus Caesar.

Answer the following questions:
1. What does *respublica* mean?
2. What is the difference in use of the word “republic” between the Romans and students of Roman history?
3. How did Romans of the *principate* qualify *respublica*?
4. How did Polybius see this “sharing” of power?
5. Why did the leaders of the nobility control all aspects of life?
6. Why did Rome remain oligarchic in character?
7. Why was the last century of the republic characterized by a series of struggles?

Explain the following word and word combinations in English:

- the public concern
- supremacy
- sovereignty
- warfare
- nobility
- factionalism
- clientage
- individualism
At the same time that Rome emerged as a world power, the city of Carthage (in Tunisia) had reached a similar status. Carthage was founded in the Iron Age by Phoenicians from the city of Tyre (in modern Lebanon). The Phoenicians were sea merchants with a long naval tradition. They spoke a Semitic language known as Phoenician, through which the alphabet was introduced into Greek (itself the basis of today’s alphabet). Phoenician language inscriptions that are written in Latin script are referred to as Punic.

Carthage and Rome had long been allies, seeing common enemies in the Etruscans, the Greeks, and King Pyrrhus. But after Rome had conquered the southernmost sections of Italy, the Mediterranean Sea became a contested arena. Sicily, which allowed easy access to both Italy and North Africa, became the first contested ground.

The First Punic War. From 264 B.C.E. to 241 B.C.E., Rome and Carthage fought on the island of Sicily. Initially, the war on Sicily had nothing to do with either of these great cities. The Sicilian city of Syracuse had hired Greek mercenaries (the Mammertines) to fight for them. But after a disagreement about pay, the Mammertines seized the city of Messana (modern Messina) on the northeastern tip of the island. Syracuse responded with force and the Mammertines responded by pleading for help, first from the Carthaginians and then from the Romans. Rome was divided as to whether it should assist. According to Polybius, the Senate did not vote to attack, but the assembly did. Rome did invade, however: Sicily was located too strategically to allow the Carthaginians to gain control of it.

The Romans’ arrival at Sicily was met with some successes. The early victories led to an alliance with Hiero of Syracuse, and soon Rome dominated most of Sicily. But the Romans did not control the seas, a vital area when battling for control of an island. In contrast, naval forces had been a Phoenician strength since at least the late Bronze Age (and probably earlier). Rome had never developed as a sea power. This was in great part because of its geographical location; it was an inland city without a seaport, and Rome’s growth throughout Italy had not required
extensive naval powers. Polybius claims that Rome rectified the situation by building a navy of ships modeled after a wrecked Carthaginian vessel that had been captured. After a rocky start, Rome eventually gained the upper hand at sea, possibly through an innovation on the ship design. Added to Roman ships was the corvus (the crow), which was a drawbridge with an iron spike at the end. A Roman ship would come alongside a Carthaginian ship and drop the drawbridge onto it. The iron spike would hold the Carthaginian ship to the side of the Roman ship and allow Roman soldiers to board the enemy ship and defeat them from inside. This grappling technique took away the Carthaginian naval advantage and allowed Rome to use its hand-to-hand fighting skills at sea.

In 241 B.C.E., Carthage was forced to withdraw from Sicily, make peace with Rome, and pay a large indemnity. Shortly thereafter, Rome altered the terms of the agreement by taking control of Sardinia as well. Both Sicily and Sardinia were treated as territories by Rome. These territories were taxed and ruled directly by Rome, a significant departure from the treaty-building model Rome had used to bring mainland Italy under its control.

The Second Punic War. In the aftermath of the Roman defeat of Carthage, rebellions broke out among Carthage’s Spanish territories. These rebellions brought Hamilcar Barca (a Carthaginian general) to Spain, along with his son, Hannibal. Carthage fought numerous wars in this region, losing Hamilcar along the way. In what modern scholars call the Treaty of Ebro, Hamilcar’s successor, Hasdrubal, promised Rome that Carthaginian forces would not cross the Ebro River, although it was probably a unilateral statement on Hasdrubal’s behalf and not a bilateral agreement per se. When Hasdrubal was assassinated in 221 B.C.E., the Carthaginian army declared Hannibal their leader. Hannibal, one of history’s most brilliant military tacticians, led the Carthaginian army against Rome in the Second Punic War, which lasted from 218 B.C.E. to 202 B.C.E. The conflict ignited over the town of Saguntum, south of the Ebro River. The Romans claimed Saguntum as a protectorate (although the exact nature of the relationship is debated), so when Hannibal attacked the city, on the grounds that Saguntum was a security threat to
Carthaginian holdings, it was tantamount to a declaration of war against Rome. No one is certain if Hannibal intended this act as an invitation for war with Rome, but when Saguntum fell to Carthage in 218 B.C.E., Rome and Carthage became enemies again.

Hannibal decided to attack Italy directly. The logical route would have been through the Mediterranean Sea, but because Rome had become the preeminent naval power, this would have meant devastation for the Carthaginian forces. So a land route was necessary and Hannibal’s legendary crossing of the Alps was the solution. The exact route Hannibal followed has been obscured by time, but it is most probable that he and his massive forces traveled along the Spanish coast, moved north along the Rhone River, and then went over the Alps and into Italy. Rome sent an army to cut off Hannibal’s forces at the Rhone River, but in a strategic misstep they arrived too late and missed the Carthaginian army.

When Hannibal came out of the Alps, he gained the support of the Gauls, whom the Romans had recently defeated. Indeed, the Po Valley was an area of weakness for Roman security, and Hannibal marshaled new allies there, rebuilding the army that had decreased through the arduous journey. In 218 B.C.E., Hannibal defeated Roman armies at the Ticino and Trebbia Rivers. While Rome recalled troops from around the empire, Hannibal moved his forces through an unguarded corridor toward central Italy. At Lake Trasimene in 217 B.C.E., Hannibal ambushed and defeated a Roman army. The Romans changed strategy with the election of Quintus Fabius as dictator. Now the Roman armies avoided head-to-head conflict with Hannibal’s army, preferring to keep Roman forces in upper areas to engage in small raids against Hannibal. Such tactics were known as “Fabian tactics,” which, in modern vocabulary, refers to tactics of delay and harassment. But this was unpopular with the Roman populace, and in 216 B.C.E., Rome engaged Hannibal head-on at the Battle of Cannae. This was a stunning defeat for Rome, in which possibly 70,000 Roman men lost their lives, severely diminishing the Roman military. The defeat also led to the abandonment of numerous Roman allies, including the Samnites, Syracuse, Philip V of Macedon, and numerous individual
cities throughout Italy.

The weakness in Hannibal’s strategy was that he was cut off from Carthage, unable to reinforce his army, and therefore unable to protect his holdings. After nine years, Hannibal’s brother’s army (in Spain) set out to help in Italy. But this Carthaginian force was destroyed by the Roman general Scipio. This victory led to Scipio’s election as consul and to his subsequent journey to Africa to attack Carthage directly. Now with Rome as the aggressor, Carthage was forced to recall Hannibal to Africa, where his forces were defeated by Scipio’s in 202 B.C.E. at the Battle of Zama. Henceforth, Scipio became known as Scipio Africanus, for his conquest of Africa.

The Roman terms of surrender were brought to Carthage by Hannibal, who accepted the harsh conditions. In addition to a yearly payment to Rome, Carthage lost all holdings outside of Africa and was forbidden to wage war outside of Africa. Rome took over Spanish holdings in Spain (although numerous rebellions made this a difficult region to administer). Within Africa itself, Carthage could go to war—with Rome’s permission. Hannibal gave up his military role to concentrate on domestic management and Carthage’s economic success grew again. Rome, uncomfortable with Hannibal’s continued presence, demanded he be handed over. Hannibal refused and fled eastward until 182 B.C.E., when he poisoned himself to avoid capture.

The Third Punic War: The third and last Punic War (151–146 B.C.E.) led to the complete destruction of Carthage. The North African city and its remaining holdings had continued to prosper economically. But considerable enmity was still felt toward Carthage in Rome. Politicians, most notably Cato the Elder, insisted that Rome’s safety could not be guaranteed until Carthage was razed. Public opinion favored a military end to Carthage. In 151 B.C.E., Rome had its ally, Numidia (in Africa), manufacture a crisis to force Carthage to attack, thereby breaking its treaty obligations. Rome, declaring this to be a breaking of the previous agreement, declared war on Carthage. In 146 B.C.E., Carthage was destroyed completely. All of the surviving citizens became slaves, and the North African lands became a
Roman province.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*Iron Age* ['aɪən] – an archaeological era, referring to a period of time in the prehistory and protohistory of the Old World (Afro-Eurasia) when the dominant toolmaking material was iron

*merchant* ['mɜːʧ(ə)nt] – a person whose job is to buy and sell products in large amounts, especially by trading with other countries

*southernmost* – furthest towards the south of an area

*to contest* – to compete for something

*mercenary* ['mɜːs(ə)n(ə)rɪ] – a soldier who fights for any country or group that pays them

*to plead for* – to make an urgent, emotional statement or request for something

*vital* – necessary for the success or continued existence of something; extremely important

*inland* – in the middle of a country, away from the sea

*to rectify* – to correct something or make something right

*wrecked* [rekt] – very badly damaged

*drawbridge* – a bridge that can be raised or brought down in order to protect a castle from attack or to allow big boats to go under it

*indemnity* [ɪn'demnətɪ] – protection against possible damage or loss, especially a promise of payment, or the money paid if there is such damage or loss

*alter* – изменять

*aftermath* – the period that follows an unpleasant event or accident, and the effects that it causes

*unilateral* – involving only one group or country

*on one’s behalf* – representing

*per se* [.pɜː'sei] – by or of itself

*tactician* – someone who is skilled in using tactics

*to ignite* – to cause a dangerous, excited, or angry situation to begin

*protectorate* – a country that is generally controlled and defended by a more
powerful country

on the ground – based on
tantamount ['tæntəmaunt] – being almost the same or having the same effect as something, usually something bad

preeminent – more important or powerful than all others
to marshal – to control or organize a large group of people
to ambush – the act of hiding and waiting for somebody and then making a surprise attack on them

raid – a short surprise attack on an enemy by soldiers, ships or aircraft

harassment ['hærəsmənt] – the act of annoying or worrying somebody by putting pressure on them or saying or doing unpleasant things to them

populace ['pɔpjələs] – all the ordinary people of a particular country or area

subsequent ['sʌbsɪkwənt] – happening or coming after something else

to surrender – to admit that you have been defeated and want to stop fighting
to wage war – to begin and continue a war

to prosper – to develop in a successful way; to be successful, especially in making money

enmity – feelings of hatred towards somebody

to raze – to completely destroy a building, town, etc. so that nothing is left

Complete the table about the Punic Wars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The First Punic War</th>
<th>The Second Punic War</th>
<th>The Third Punic War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When? (the dates of the war)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why? (the reason of its beginning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who started the war and how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(the main events)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who won?</th>
<th>Who lost?</th>
<th>What was the outcome of the war?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

By using the data from the table, reproduce the chronology of the Punic Wars.

**Text 6: Last Years of Julius Caesar**

When Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon in January 49 BC, he inaugurated the autocracy of the Caesars. With great candour, the opening chapters of his account of the civil war between his forces and those of Pompeius Magnus reveal stark personal motives alongside a more respectable concern for the Roman Republic. Typically writing of himself in the third person, he gives his motives for fighting in a speech made to his troops:

“As for myself,” he said, “I have always reckoned the dignity of the Republic of first importance and preferable to life. I was indignant that a benefit conferred on me by the Roman people was being insolently wrested from me by my enemies.” (Civil War 1.9)

Caesar plunged the Roman world into war to protect his own affronted dignitas (Civil War 1.7), but the outcome of three years of bloody fighting was far more than the appeasement of a hurt. It was nothing less than the establishment of the road to monarchy. It was no accident that Suetonius’ series of imperial biographies began with Julius Caesar – not the first member of the Caesar family to hold office, nor yet the first to rule as later emperors did, but the first Caesar to rule alone.

Caesar’s rhetoric in the seizure of power was naturally enough entirely in accordance with the Republican traditions within which he had made his mark. A
scion of a patrician family, whose father had reached the praetorship, he had experienced no difficulty in enjoying a successful if unspectacular career until 63 BC. Then his election as pontifex maximus, the leading priest of the Roman state cults, propelled him to prominence, not least because of the unashamed use of bribery on his behalf by his powerful friend M. Licinius Crassus, who had been consul in 70 BC. Still, his achievement of a consulship in 59 BC would have aroused no surprise if he had not traded on the opportunities provided by his occupation of high office for the year to do favours to the most influential ex-magistrates of the time, his benefactor Crassus and his future rival Pompeius. This political accommodation, known to modern scholars as the First Triumvirate, was of brief duration in the early months of 59 BC, but it was sufficient to gain Caesar a great command in the province of Gaul, which he interpreted as a remit to conquer the whole area of France north of the Alps as far as the Channel. Exceptional generalship in the field between 58 and 51 BC, and a good deal of luck which compensated for some rash strategic decisions, won for Rome unprecedented conquests and for Caesar both immense popularity in the city and the support of a great body of soldiers. These men were tied to him both by the affection of shared military experience and by an expectation that his political power would win them rewards, suitable pensions for the soldiers in the form of land grants, and political preferment for the officers. When Pompeius’ friends attempted to prevent Caesar reaping the political harvest that he expected from his campaigns by demanding that he demit his general’s post in Gaul and thus lay himself open to prosecution for alleged misdeeds in office before being allowed to stand for election to a second consulship, Caesar responded by marching on Rome.

A. Such use of legionaries to seize power was hardly new in Roman life. Sulla Felix had marched on Rome in 82 BC, defeated his enemies and killed many of them, and won thereby election to the post of dictator, in which guise he had reorganized the state. Both Pompeius and Crassus had threatened the city in 70 BC in order to achieve their consulships, although in their case no fighting had been necessary. But in the previous twenty years, in which violence of a different kind
had been rampant in gang warfare on the streets of Rome, no army commander had used his troops to impose his political will in such a way. And Caesar went much further than Sulla. Stopping only briefly in Rome to raid the treasury, he waged a rapid campaign against Pompeius and his supporters in Spain and Greece, where in Thessaly he won a decisive victory over Pompeius in 46 BC. Pompeius fled to Egypt, only to be murdered on his arrival by his erstwhile supporters there. Campaigns in Egypt and Syria established Caesar’s control over those areas, and a final campaign in Africa subdued a further group of his political opponents. In 46 BC he could return to Rome to claim, implausibly, a great triumph for the Roman people.

B. Original, limited, ends soon gave ways to grander designs with the reality of unchallenged power. As Cicero put it, bitterly, immediately after Caesar’s death: “Behold, here you have a man who was ambitious to be king of the Roman people and master of the whole world; and he achieved it!” After the death of Pompeius in Egypt, Caesar was sufficiently at ease to grant, and advertise, pardon (dementia) for his political opponents. Such contravention of the rules of inimicitia (enmity) was bound to irritate the beneficiaries little less than betrayal of amicitia (friendship) would do. In 48 BC Caesar was elected by the people as dictator, thereby following the lead of Sulla in declaring normal competitive politics in abeyance while he sorted out the ills of the state. Unlike Sulla, who resigned into private life once the legislation that he thought essential had been passed, Caesar accepted in 44 BC the title of dictator perpetuo (dictator for life). A great programme had been enacted in 46 and 45 BC, from the settlement of his veteran soldiers on confiscated land in Italy to reform of the debt laws and the calendar. According to later reports, not all of them reliable, much more was intended for 44 BC, but his adoption of quasi-monarchical powers and the rumour that he might accept a royal crown, as he had already welcomed the establishment of a priesthood for his worship, proved too much for some fellow senators, who saw the dashing of all hopes for their own rise to the top in Roman politics. On the Ides of March (15 March) a large group of senators led by Marcus Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus, two of the supporters
of Pompeius who had been granted clementia by Caesar, stabbed him to death at the foot of Pompeius’ statue in the senate’s meeting place in the theatre of Pompeius.

C. In proclaiming the restoration of libertas, as they did on their coins, the murderers of Caesar were not at the time naive. Only one man had died; the rest of Caesar’s friends remained untouched. In constitutional terms there was no particular problem in the continued running of the government. One consul for the year survived, Caesar’s general Marcus Antonius. Magistrates for the law courts and command of armies had been duly elected by the people, albeit at Caesar’s behest. Far from a plunge into chaos, the liberators might argue that their action could bring a return to normality. And, indeed, in the days after the Ides of March, they remained peacefully in Rome, until the threat of allegedly spontaneous violence by the urban mob drove them out, first from Rome and then from Italy. Not even that flight was necessarily seen as a prelude to civil war. After all, most of those still active in politics in 44 BC remained involved because in some sense they were part of Caesar’s faction – including his murderers, who had received magistracies themselves with Caesar’s electoral support. Of Caesar’s enemies, only Sextus Pompeius, son of Pompeius Magnus, who had held on to the independent command of six legions in Spain after his father’s defeat and death, had a natural inclination to take advantage of Caesar’s demise. For the rest of Caesar’s friends there was no reason – and given Caesar’s fate, little incentive – to seek promotion to the same pre-eminence that Caesar had achieved. Enough for them to accept the steady prestigious rise through the cursus honorum guaranteed by the presence of so many friends to canvass for them. There is no reason to suppose any greater ambition for Marcus Lepidus, who as Caesar’s lieutenant (magister equitum) in the latter’s role as dictator alone lost his job as a result of his friend’s decease. As for Marcus Antonius, who was the surviving consul, Cicero, who hated him, accused him of aiming at dictatorship, but it is now impossible to know how justified the accusation was.

D. That all this was so can be traced in some detail through the contemporary
letters of Cicero, who at the age of 62, and nineteen years after his glorious consulship, stood pre-eminent in front of the senate, at least in his own estimation. Cicero applauded Caesar’s murderers as liberators, praised their act to the people and hoped to counter any excessive ambitions by passionate speeches (the so-called Philippics) in denunciation of Marcus Antonius. But speeches were of no account against the one figure for whose single-minded and ruthless determination no-one could possibly have allowed in March 44 BC. That figure was the young Octavius, the future emperor Augustus, who was to be the founder of the Roman Empire.

How do you understand the following phrases?
1. When Julius Caesar crossed the Rubicon in January 49 BC, he inaugurated the autocracy of the Caesars.
2. Caesar plunged the Roman world into war to protect his own affronted dignitas.

Choose the paragraph (A-D) where the following information is mentioned:
1. Octavius was the future founder of the Roman Empire.
2. Caesar accepted the title of dictator for life.
3. Campaigns in Egypt, Syria and Africa.
4. After Caesar’s death most of those active in politics in 44 BC remained involved, including Caesar’s murderers.

III. Listening
1. Internal Conflict – the Patricians and Plebeian Orders, 510-287 BC (Prof. Frances Titchener’s lecture)

Part 1. Answer the following questions:
1. What will be discussed in this lecture?
2. What does SPQR mean?
3. What did this slogan mean in 510 BC?
4. What was the good news? What was the bad news?
5. Who were Patricians?
Part 2. Are these statements true (T) or false (F):
1. The king decided whom to attack and whom to support.
2. Any Roman citizen who was not a Patrician was a Plebeian.
3. Patricians and Plebeians had a conflict because Patricians were from rich families.
4. It was clear how the consuls were elected.
5. Plebeians wanted to formalize the rules for access to the offices.
6. Plebeians left the town and crossed the river.
7. Patricians did not care that Plebeians had left.

Part 3. Answer the following questions:
1. Why could Patricians adopt young men?
2. What question did Plebeians ask themselves?
3. What did Plebeians do with the law?

Part 4. Are these statements true (T) or false (F):
1. Plebeians wanted to get the access to the Senate.
2. The Plebeian Tribune played a very significant role in Senate.
3. Every Plebeian wanted to become a Tribune.
4. The Tribune was well protected.
5. Patricians were not happy about the right of intermarriage.
6. Everybody had the right to appeal.
7. According to the law of 287, any legislation passed by Plebeian assembly would apply to Patricians.

Part 5. Are these statements true (T) or false (F):
1. Lex Hortensia equalized the situation between Plebeians and Patricians.
2. A man could hold only one office during his life.
4. The Roman system is similar to the US system.
5. Aedile was responsible for putting on games.
6. After aedile a man could become a quaestor.
Part 6. Answer the following questions:
1. What did later offices include?
2. What was the most important and prestigious duty?
3. Where did a consul retire?
4. What was the highest office in Rome?
5. What is the true meaning of ‘censor’?

2. Transformation of the Roman Empire (Prof. Paul Freedman's lecture)
   Answer the following questions:
   Part 1. Introduction:
1. What does “transformation” mean in this lecture?
2. What were the intentions of the barbarian tribes?
3. When was the end of the Western Roman Empire? How did it happen?
4. What is the difference between kingdom and empire?
5. What three questions were asked?
6. What period is called the Dark Ages?
   Part 2. Catastrophe:
1. How does Roger Collins describe the collapse of the Western Roman Empire?
2. Could everything else continue in the absence of a state and of a political order? How do you think?
3. What does the destruction of a political order mean?
4. What is the point of view of catastrophists?
5. What is the point of view of continuers?
6. How did the Greeks define barbarians?
7. Why did the Western Empire collapse?
   Part 3. The Roman Army and the Visigoths:
1. What was the problem of the Roman Army? Why?
2. What was the tendency regarding the Roman Army? Why?
3. What happened in 370?
4. What does “federati” mean?
5. What happened in 378?
6. When were the Visigoths officially recognized?
7. What influence did it have on the Army?
8. Who engineered the sack of Rome?

Part 4. Another Kind of Barbarian: The Huns:
1. Why were the Huns interested in Rome?
2. Who was the leader of the Huns in 450?
3. Where did they show up first?
4. Where did they go after that?
5. Who was willing to deal with the Huns?
6. Why did the Huns disintegrate?
7. Who took over the Roman Imperial responsibilities?
8. What happened in 493?

Part 5. Accommodation:
1. What was impact of all this?

Part 6. Decline:
1. What does “the radical material simplification” mean?
2. What impact did the presence of the Vandals in Africa have on Rome?
3. What happened to the society?
4. What was the population of Rome in 5 BC and in 800 BC?
5. What were the heirs to the Roman Empire?

IV. Quiz

Test 1:

Multiple choice:
1. Rome was founded by
   a. Augustus
   b. Romulus
   c. Caesar
2. One of the reasons for the decline of the Roman Empire is that
   a. it became too big to rule
   b. consuls and governors struggled for power
   c. the eastern part of the empire became an enemy
3. After Caesar had become the only ruler of Rome
   a. he had a love affair
   b. he was assassinated
   c. he went back to Gaul
4. The first Roman emperor was
   a. Mark Anthony
   b. Romulus
   c. Augustus
5. During the Punic Wars Rome destroyed
   a. Carthage
   b. Gaul
   c. Greece
6. The Roman Empire came to an end
   a. when Caesar was assassinated
   b. when the emperors converted to Christianity
   c. when Germanic tribes invaded
7. During the first century before Christ
   a. Rome had more than one emperor
   b. Rome became a Republic
   c. Rome suffered from civil wars
8. During the first two centuries A.D. Rome
   a. was peaceful and wealthy
   b. Christians took over Rome
   c. led many wars against other tribes
9. Between the fifth and first century before Christ Rome
   a. was a kingdom
b. was an empire  
c. was a republic  
10. In the 5th century A.D.  
a. Rome was invaded by Germanic tribes  
b. Roman soldiers landed in Great Britain  
c. Rome conquered Constantinople  

**Test 2:**  
*Term identification:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crucify</td>
<td>a. change to another religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribune</td>
<td>b. person elected to defend the rights of citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>c. kill somebody by nailing them the cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortification</td>
<td>d. towers and walls built to defend a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invade</td>
<td>e. to hunt down people and discriminate against them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassinate</td>
<td>f. single fight of a war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert</td>
<td>g. to take control of a territory by fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persecute</td>
<td>h. enter a country with an army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle</td>
<td>i. group of people with the same language and tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquer</td>
<td>j. to kill a person for political reasons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test 3:**  
*Answer the following questions:*  

1. Who was a great translator of Greek into Latin?  
2. Who was born as Octavian?  
3. Who made ancient Byzantium the capital of Christian Rome?  
4. Who conquered Gaul and Britain?  
5. Who described the adventures of a Trojan hero?  
6. Who was assassinated in 44 B.C?  
7. Who was the ruler of Egypt during the Roman Empire?
8. Who founded Rome?
9. Who set fire to Rome?
10. Who built a wall across Great Britain?
11. Who was banned from Rome because of his opposing views?
12. Who was one of Rome's greatest poets?
13. Who helped assassinate Caesar?
14. Who ended the persecution of the Christians?
15. Who was the judge at Jesus Christ's trial?
16. Who was good-natured at first but then turned into a ruthless ruler?

V. Supplementary reading

Augustus (Gaius Octavian) (63 B.C.E.–14 C.E.)

First emperor of Rome and founder of the Roman imperial state

I found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble.

Augustus

Gaius Octavian was born on September 23, 63 B.C.E., to C. Octavius and Atia, a niece of Julius Caesar by his sister Julia. The family of Octavian was a good one, but its alliance to the Julians was far more important, and Octavian came under their direct influence when his father died in 59 B.C.E. Atia raised him and ensured his education by grammarians and philosophers, but it was Caesar who would have the most impact upon Octavian, and who presented him with the greatest opportunities.

In 53 B.C.E., at the age of 12, Octavian delivered the funeral oration (the laudatio) for his grandmother Julia, and several years later served in a priesthood. Caesar came to dominate his life’s direction. He saw his uncle’s triumph in Rome in 46 B.C.E. and in 45 journeyed to Spain to be with him on campaign.

Octavian was never strong physically, suffering from a variety of complaints that plagued him throughout his life. The trip to Spain was arduous, along dangerous roads. He also suffered a shipwreck and was in a sorry state when he
arrived at Caesar’s camp. But his uncle recognized something unique in him, rewarding his efforts with military training.

After a time Octavian was sent to Apollonia, in Epirus, to study philosophy and the arts of war. He took with him his two dearest friends, Marcus Agrippa and Marcus Rufus. His studies were cut short by the assassination of Caesar in Rome.

Octavian was only 18 years old, but the will of his uncle declared him his chief heir and adopted son. His position in Rome was now radically different and bound by the obligation to avenge Caesar’s death. Octavian travelled to Rome and found that cautious deliberation would be far more useful than rash action, a characteristic that would mark his later years.

Marc Antony was in Rome, and Octavian found him unwilling to relinquish control of Julius Caesar’s property or assets. Octavian immediately began a defensive action against Antony. Cicero, Antony’s bitter foe, was befriended, and Octavian presented the *ludi Victoriae Caesaris*, the Victory Games of Caesar, to the people. The Senate, anxious to snub the ambitious Antony and his claims, made Octavian a senator and asked his aid in the wars that had begun as a result of the assassination.

Octavian defeated Antony’s legions at Mutina in April of 43 B.C.E. As a result, Octavian’s troops demanded that he be given the rank and the powers of a consul. Reluctantly the Senate agreed, and, as Caesar’s adopted heir, he took the name Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus.

Realizing that he had to reach a truce with Antony to achieve wider aims, Octavian formed a second triumvirate with him and Marcus Lepidus on November 27, 43 B.C.E. Octavian thus ruled Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia. He also benefited from the fact that Caesar had been elevated to the status of a god. Antony was joined to him as well, in the common ambition of defeating Brutus, Cassius, and the party of the LIBERATORS, a task accomplished at the battle of Philippi in 42 B.C.E. Octavian was not present, however, being too ill.

Antony was given control of the East as a result, while Octavian worked to strengthen his hold on Italy, sensing that Rome was where the ultimate power
rested. Officially he still held Africa, but in Italy he fought with Antony’s brother Lucius and Fulvia in 41 B.C.E., in the Perusine War, and then began gaining the good will of the legions by distributing land to the veterans of campaigns.

Political maneuvering next involved him in a marriage with Scribonia, a relative of Sextus Pompey, the son of Pompey the Great, but he divorced her and married the formidable Livia Drusilla, who remained with him until his death. Antony still troubled him, and a certain relaxation of tension was accomplished by the treaty of Brundisium in 40 B.C.E.

The triumvirate was maintained and extended by the treaty of Tarentum in 37 B.C.E.: Octavian ruled the West, Antony the East, and Lepidus took Africa. Marc Antony married Octavia, Octavian’s sister, but found life in the East too compelling, falling in love with Cleopatra VII of Egypt and thus dooming the marriage. Octavian could not take action against his brother-in-law as Sextus Pompey, a pirate with a vast fleet and a reputation for cruelty, still plagued Rome. Marcus Agrippa, however, waged a brilliant campaign against Sextus Pompey, and in 36 B.C.E. Sextus was defeated at the battle of Naulochus.

Lepidus then attempted to revolt against his fellow triumvirs, but his legions were taken away from him by Octavian, who sent him into exile at Circeii. This left only Octavian and Antony, dividing the Roman world between them. Octavian took the title of Imperator as he waged campaigns in Illyricum and Dalmatia (35–33 B.C.E.), after which he proclaimed to the Romans that their frontiers were safe. With that proclamation came a beautification program for the city, under the direction of Agrippa. His popularity thus ensured, Octavian was prepared to meet Antony for the final confrontation.

In October of 32 B.C.E., the western provinces swore their allegiance to Octavian. War was inevitable, and on September 2, 31, the battle of Actium was fought off the west coast of Greece, with Octavian facing Antony and Cleopatra. Through Agrippa’s brilliant leadership, Octavian won the day and gained mastery over the Roman world. He conquered Egypt in 30 and generally pacified the East along the lines begun by Antony.
As the “foremost citizen” of the Republic, Octavian exercised power beyond that of his predecessors. Unlike his uncle, Julius Caesar, he had no intention of declaring himself the master of the people, the ruler of the state – the dictator. Octavian recognized that by maintaining the Republican institutions and ensuring the prosperity of all Roman traditions, he could help Rome achieve its destined greatness.

He served as consul from 31 to 23 B.C.E. In 30 he was granted tribunician power, and in 29 began his reforms of the army. The plunder of Egypt was used to pay off his troops, and many veterans were given lands to farm and colonize. The legions were thus reduced, but Roman influence in the provinces was ensured.

Soon the once ponderous 60 legions were reduced to 28, although they were supplemented by large formations of auxiliaries. None of these legions were allowed in Italy, and for his own protection Octavian created something new – the Praetorian Guard. Later a treasury department, the aerarium militare, was created for better organization of military finances.

Octavian then turned to the Senate and in 28 B.C.E., armed with the title of princeps senatus and with the help of Marcus Agrippa, conducted a census. Through this maneuver the Senate was reduced in number to 800. Certain of his auctoritas, or unquestioned position, Octavian prepared to return his power to the Senate and to the people of Rome, thus gaining for all time their obedience.

The Senate received back its powers to control the state on January 13, 27 B.C.E. In return, Octavian was granted for 10 years control of Spain, Gaul, and Syria, centers of frontier defense, and controlled the appointment of governors. These were thus imperial provinces, and the Senate controlled the rest. This system was seemingly Republican, with the added safeguard that no governor of any province would dare to go against Augustus’s wishes.

On the 16th of January in 27 B.C.E., he received the title Augustus, signifying his semi-divine, or more than human, nature. By 23 B.C.E., although no longer a consul, Augustus received the titles of Imperium Maius and Tribunicia Potestas, which gave him control over the provinces, the Senate, and the state. His response
was typical; Augustus concentrated on reviving Roman religion. He created great temples to Mars and Apollo and ordered the temple of Capitoline Jupiter. In 12 B.C.E., he succeeded Marcus Lepidus as pontifex maximus, the highest priesthood of Roman religion. The Arval Brethren were revived, and the ranks of the Vestal Virgins were filled.

He built the Forum and the temples and supported any wealthy citizen who followed his lead. Most notable were the ever-faithful Marcus Agrippa and Marcius Philippus. Organizationally the city was divided into 14 wards under his direction. Police duties were performed by the Urban Cohorts, and order was maintained over the often unruly mobs. Above the Urban Cohorts, however, and above the population, the Senate, and, eventually, the emperors themselves, stood the Praetorian Guards.

Administrative changes were made in finances and bureaucracy. The Equestrian Order and Freedmen were brought into the government, and the civil system was born, a unit that maintained the empire for the next 500 years. The provinces contributed to the tax system, and laws were reformed or created, extending from adultery, treason, and bribery to marriage.

Augustus was concerned with the preservation of the frontiers, their certification, and, where possible, expansion. Spain and Gaul were strengthened and urbanized. Egypt’s borders were organized, and in 20 B.C.E. a formal peace was signed with Parthia in the East. The treaty affirmed Roman dominion over Armenia and pointed to one of Augustus’s focal points of policy: the utilization of existing client countries in the East – Armenia, Commagene, Cappadocia, Galatia, and even Syria – as buffers toward Parthian expansion. Augustus did not realize all of his ambitions. Germany was occupied, and steps taken toward colonization and pacification, but in 9 C.E., the general Varus was annihilated by Arminius and Germans in the Teutoburg Forest. All hopes of achieving Roman supremacy there were abandoned.

As Pater Patriae, Augustus stressed the importance of the Roman family and institutions. In 18 B.C.E., he pushed for the acceptance of the lex Julia de
adulteriis, which punished adultery, and the *lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus*, which required marriage and also the remarriage of the widowed. Only one person, the Lady Antonia, was given dispensation. Augustus honored family life and was always devoted to Livia, but his domestic affairs, and especially his constant search for a successor, dominated and strained his later years.

A successor to Augustus was not necessarily expected as there were no imperial precedents. Although Augustus searched constantly for an heir, Suetonius commented that twice the ruler thought of stepping down (after Antony’s death and when he fell seriously ill, probably in 23 B.C.E.). But finding a suitable successor was not easy, for few men in the Roman world would have been able to maintain Augustus’s equilibrium between the republican traditions and imperial realities. As the years passed, family tragedies and disappointments reduced his options until only one figure remained.

In the early years there was a battle of wills between Marcus Agrippa and Augustus’s nephew, Marcellus (29–23 B.C.E.). Marcellus was the husband of Augustus’s daughter Julia, but he died in 23. As a result, Julia was married to Agrippa. Although not eligible for the throne himself because of his common origin, his children could become emperors. Julia bore Agrippa three sons: Gaius, Lucius, and Agrippa Posthumus. Agrippa and his two sons, Gaius and Lucius, were officially adopted in 17 B.C.E.

Augustus needed administrative help, but his three adopted grandsons were too young. He turned to his wife Livia’s sons by her former husband, Tiberius Claudius Nero: Tiberius and Nero Drusus. Nero Drusus died on the Elbe in 9 B.C.E.; in 6 B.C.E., Tiberius was elevated to imperial assistant, with a share in Augustus’s *tribunicia potestas*. Only one year later, Gaius was given the title of Princeps Juventutis, joined by Lucius in 5 B.C.E., thus marking them as the true heirs. Tiberius moved to Rhodes, where he remained until 4 C.E., when tragic events brought him to Rome again. Lucius had died in 2 C.E., followed by Gaius. And Agrippa Posthumus was exiled.
With the heirs of his choice gone, Augustus faced yet another blow. His daughter Julia had caused a terrible scandal in 2 B.C.E. and was exiled. This left Augustus with only Tiberius to aid him, something that Livia had alwaysdesired. In 3 C.E., Augustus accepted 10 more years of rule. The fact that Tiberius was destined to succeed him became evident in 13 C.E., when he was granted full *tribunicia potestas* and *imperium proconsulare*. Augustus placed his will with the Vestal Virgins and fell ill in 14, dying on August 29. Tiberius, who was on his way to Illyricum, was summoned back to assume the position of Princeps. On the 17th of September, Augustus was deified by the Senate of Rome.

Octavian, or Augustus, was a figure of immensely human proportions, despite his *auctoritas* and eventual divinity. Suetonius wrote that he was remarkably handsome, of graceful gait but often less than immaculate appearance. His teeth were decayed, and his messily tended hair was yellow. Although he was only five feet, seven inches tall (perhaps less), he was elegantly proportioned. His health was always a concern. There was a weakness in his left hip and right forefinger, and ringworm was probably present. More importantly, Augustus fought terrible bouts of illness: abscessed liver, influenza and seasonal complaints. The worst came in 23 B.C.E., when it was generally believed that he would die. His private physician, Antonius Musa, managed to heal him.

A practical man, no great luxuries were kept in the palace, and his furnishings, like his diet and dress, were simple. He mistrusted the mob, disliked large crowds, and once, during the Civil Wars, had to be rescued by Marc Antony from a group of rioters.

Augustus was educated in rhetoric and studied with Apollodorus of Pergamum, from whom he learned Greek. Areus, a philosopher, and his sons Dionysius and Nicanor also provided elements of Augustus’s education. Although he never mastered Greek, he was a patron of Greek poetry and intellectuals in general, especially writers and philosophers. He himself possessed literary aspirations.
Most of Augustus’s writings are not extant. Only the famous *Res Gestae*, which listed his achievements, was preserved, in inscriptions, from antiquity. Augustus also penned an attack on Brutus’s *Eulogy of Cato*, a philosophical treatise and an autobiography of 13 books. Attempts at poetry and tragedy were made in his short poem, *Sicily*, and in his *Epiphanus* and *Ajax*. He destroyed *Ajax* himself. His style was simple but idiomatic, with numerous peculiarities of grammar and spelling.
UNIT 3
The Middle Ages

I. Reading

Text 1: Why the Middle Ages are called the Middle Ages

The term Middle Ages comes from the Latin *medium aevum*, from which we derive the word medieval. The terms Middle Ages and medieval are virtually synonymous, historically speaking. Europeans who lived in the fifteenth century and after looked back at the years between the fall of the Roman Empire and the dawn of the Renaissance as the middle, hence the name Middle Ages.

For medieval Europeans, the times probably seemed more like the *end* of time than anything else. Between 476 C.E. when Rome fell to the barbarians and the 1400s when signs of the Renaissance began to appear in Italy, Europe experienced difficult times. For roughly 400 years after the fall of Rome, with no Romans and no stable governments to maintain order, barbarian tribes had their way with Europe. Conditions weren’t exactly ideal for human *advancement* in areas like technology, science, education—or anything else for that matter. In fact, things were so *dismal* that many modern historians have labeled those first centuries after the fall of Rome as the Dark Ages.

*Introducing the Middle Ages*

So when did Europe emerge from the dark? Some *credit* must go to Charlemagne, who *forged* a stable central government for the Franks and made them the greatest of the barbarian kingdoms. Charlemagne wasn’t finished, though. In 800 C.E., he became Holy Roman Emperor and *solidified* a relationship between church and state that would last for a very long time. The position of Holy Roman Emperor went hand in hand with that of the pope. The pope was the final authority on all spiritual matters in the Catholic world, and the Holy Roman Emperor had supreme political authority in the Catholic world.

Some credit must also be given to William, Duke of Normandy, better known as William the Conqueror. In 1066 C.E., William successfully invaded England,
taking control after a decisive victory at the Battle of Hastings. Once in control of England, William established the system of **feudalism.** He divided his kingdom among a number of **nobles.** These were his **vassals,** and the pieces of land he gave each of them were called **fiefs.** Each noble was then responsible for supplying soldiers for the royal army. To do this, the nobles divided their land among vassals of their own in exchange for military service and loyalty. This process continued until all **tracts** of land in the kingdom were of a manageable size and until the royal army was of a sufficient size. The feudal system would dominate most of Europe for centuries—as long as 900 years in some regions.

For those uncomfortable with the judgment implied in the term “Dark Ages,” the Middle Ages can be divided into the Lower Middle Ages, the centuries after the fall of Rome, and the High Middle Ages, the centuries just prior to the Renaissance. While life in the Lower Middle Ages held plenty of uncertainty for most of Europe, life during the High Middle Ages couldn’t have been much better, despite the presence of some stable governments. The High Middle Ages were never as they appear in romantic tales or Hollywood movies, with happy peasants, beautiful castles, brave **knights,** and lovely ladies—in fact, they were **fraught** with political and religious turmoil, disease, and war.

**The list of words and word combinations under study:**

- to derive – to get something from something else
- **dawn** [dɔːn] – the early morning when light first appears in the sky
- **Renaissance** [rə'neɪs(ə)n(t)s] – the period of new growth of interest and activity in the areas of art, literature, and ideas in Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries
- **advancement** – the development or improvement of something
- **dismal** ['dɪzməl] – very bad or unpleasant and making you feel sad
- **credit** – praise that is given to someone for something they have done
- to **forge** – invent, create
- to **solidify** [sə'lidɪfaɪ] – to become or make something become certain
- **feudalism** ['fjuːd(ə)lɪz(ə)m] – the social system that developed in western Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries in which people served a man of high rank by
working and fighting for him and in exchange were supported and given land and protection

*noble* ['nəubl] – a person of the highest social group in some countries

*vassal* ['væs(ə)l] - in medieval Europe, a man who agreed to fight for a king or lord (= rich and powerful land owner) when needed, in exchange for land to live on

*fief* [fiːf] – a person who rents an area of land and pays for it by work

*tract* – a large area of land

*knight* [nɑːt] – (in the past) a man of high social position trained to fight as a soldier on a horse

*fraught* [frɔːt] – full of

*turmoil* ['tɜːrmɔɪl] – a state of confusion, uncertainty, or disorder

Answer the following questions:

1. Where does the term Middle Ages come from?
2. Why were they called Middle Ages?
3. Why did the times seem more like the end of time for medieval Europeans?
4. Why were the first centuries after the fall of Rome labeled as the Dark Ages?
5. What role did Charlemagne play in helping Europe to emerge from the dark?
6. When did he become Holy Roman Emperor?
7. What did it mean?
8. Why was Duke of Normandy an important figure at that time?
9. What is the system of feudalism? Give your assessment of it.
10. How can the Middle Ages be divided? Describe these times.

**Text 2: Anglo-French Relations and the Hundred Years War**

The recognition of overlordship which English monarchs demanded of the Welsh, Scots, and Irish was denied to the French king in Gascony, where these same English kings, as dukes of Aquitaine, had been feudal vassals of the Crown of France since 1204. Gascony lay at the heart of Anglo-French relations both before and during the so-called Hundred Years War (1337–1453): it replaced Normandy and Anjou as the main bone of contention. At Edward I’s accession, this
prosperous, wine-producing province was England’s only remaining French territory, and the political link with England was reinforced by a flourishing export trade in non-sweet wine which was complemented by the transport of English cloth and corn by sea to Bordeaux and Bayonne: in 1306–7 the duchy’s revenue was about £17,000 and well worth fighting for. Friction with the French king over Gascony’s frontier and the rights of Gascons was gradually subsumed in the larger issues of nationhood and sovereignty posed by an assertive, self-conscious French state bent on tightening its control over its provinces and vassals (including the English duke of Aquitaine). For their part, Edward I and his successors were reluctant to see French royal rights emphasized or given any practical meaning in Gascony. The result was a series of incidents, peace conferences, and ‘brushfire’ wars in which French armies penetrated Gascony and the duchy was periodically confiscated, and English expeditions – even a visit by Edward I himself (1286–9).

Relations between England and France might have continued to fester in this fashion had it not been for two other factors. The English government resented the Franco-Scottish alliance (from 1295) and was angered by the refuge offered by the French (1334) to the Scottish King David II after Edward III had invaded Scotland. Even more contentious were the consequences of the approaching extinction of the senior male line of the French royal house of Capet. The deaths, in rapid succession, of four French kings between 1314 and 1328, requiring the swearing of homage for Gascony on each occasion, were irritating enough, but the demise of the last Capet in 1328 raised the question of the succession to the French throne itself. At that point, the new English king, Edward III (1327–77), was in no position to stake his own claim through his French mother, Isabella, but in 1337, when the Gascon situation had deteriorated further, he did so. His action may have been primarily tactical, to embarrass the new Valois monarch, Philip VI, though for an English king to become king of France would have the undeniable merit of resolving at a stroke the difficult Gascon issue: the political stability and economic prosperity of Gascony would be assured. Thus, when a French fleet was sighted off
the Norman coast en route (so the English believed) for Scotland in 1337, war began – and would last for more than a century.

England’s war aims were neither constant nor consistently pursued. Especially in the fourteenth century, its war diplomacy was primarily dictated by a series of immediate problems, notably, of how to maintain independent rule in Gascony and how to deter Scottish attacks across the northern border in support of the French. Even after Edward III claimed the French Crown in 1337, he was prepared to ransom John II, the French king captured at the battle of Poitiers (1356), and to abandon his claim in the treaty of Brétigny (1360) in return for practical concessions. Nevertheless, dynastic ties, commercial and strategic considerations, even differing attitudes to the Papacy, which was installed at Avignon from 1308 to 1378, combined to extend the Anglo-French conflict to the Low Countries, to Castile and Portugal, as well as to Scotland, Ireland, and even Wales. To begin with, the wars (for this was a disjointed series of conflicts rather than one war) were fought by sieges in northern France in 1338–40; then there was more intensive campaigning by pincer movements through the French provinces of Brittany, Gascony, and Normandy in 1341–7 (resulting in the English victory at Crécy and the capture of Calais). This was followed by bold marches or chevauchées by Edward III’s eldest son, Edward the Black Prince, from Gascony in 1355–6 (culminating in the great victory at Poitiers) and by the king himself in 1359 to Rheims, the traditional coronation seat of French kings. The renewal of war in Castile (1367) inaugurated a period of more modest and fitful campaigning in Portugal, Flanders, and France itself, with both sides gradually exhausting themselves.

The advantage in the war lay initially with England, the more united and better organized of the two kingdoms. Its prosperity, based especially on wool production, and its experience of warfare in Wales and Scotland, were invaluable foundations for larger-scale operations on mainland Europe. The existence of highly independent French provinces dictated English strategy. Edward III’s campaigns in the Low Countries in 1338–40 relied on the support of the cloth-manufacturing
towns of Flanders which, though subject to the French king, had vital commercial links with England. In the 1340s a succession dispute in Brittany enabled English forces to intervene there and even to garrison certain castles; while Gascony, though far to the south, afforded direct access to central France.

The wars within the British Isles gave the English government a unique opportunity to develop novel methods of raising substantial forces. Supplementing and gradually replacing the traditional feudal array, the newer paid, contracted armies, recruited by indentured captains, were smaller, better disciplined, and more dependable and flexible than the loosely organized and ponderous French forces. English men-at-arms and archers, proficient in the use of the longbow and employing defensive tactics in battle, had a decisive advantage which brought resounding victories against all the odds in the early decades of the war (most notably at Crécy and Poitiers). The war at sea was a more minor affair, with naval tactics showing little novelty or imagination. It was usually beyond the capability of fourteenth-century commanders to stage a naval engagement and the battle of Sluys (which the English won in 1340) was incidental to Edward III’s expedition to Flanders. The English never kept a fleet permanently in being, but the Valois, learning the expertise of their Castilian allies, later constructed dockyards at Rouen which in time gave them an edge at sea (witness their victory off La Rochelle in 1372).

English investment in the French war was immense and unprecedented. Expeditions were organized with impressive regularity and were occasionally very large (over 10,000 men in 1346–7, for instance). The financial outlay was prodigious and tolerated so long as the war was successful; but as the margin of England’s military advantage narrowed after 1369, so the government resorted to newer and more desperate expedients, including poll taxes. Shipping for defence and expeditions could not be supplied solely by the traditional obligation of the southern Cinque Ports, and hundreds of merchant vessels (735 for the siege of Calais in 1347, for example) were impressed and withdrawn from normal commercial operations. Coastal defence against French and Castilian raiders, who
grew bolder after 1369, was organized by the maritime shires of the south and east, supported by others inland – but even this could not prevent the sacking of Winchelsea (1360), Rye (1377), and other ports. The costs of war were indeed high. It is true that conquered French estates were enjoyed by many a fortunate soldier and ransoms were profitable during the victorious years (King John II’s ransom alone was fixed at £500,000). But the lives and occupations of thousands of Englishmen, Welshmen, and Irishmen were disrupted by war service; supplies of food, materials, and equipment were diverted to operations that were entirely destructive; and the wool and wine trades were severely hampered. What is remarkable is that England was able to engage in these enterprises overseas for decades without serious political or social strains at home, and at the same time to defend the Scottish border, keep the Welsh calm, and avoid Irish uprisings. This achievement owed much to the inspiration, example, and leadership of Edward III and the Black Prince, both of whom embodied the chivalric virtues vaunted by the nobility and admired by society at large. To Jean Froissart, the Hainaulter who knew them both and kept a record of the most inspiring chivalric deeds of his age, the king was ‘gallant and noble [whose] like had not been seen since the days of King Arthur’. His son appeared as ‘this most gallant man and chivalrous prince’ who, at his death in 1376, a year before Edward III himself died, ‘was deeply mourned for his noble qualities’. King Edward presided over a regime in England that was less harsh than Edward I’s and far more capable than Edward II’s.

Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.

Answer the following questions:
1. What was the situation between England and France before the war?
2. What factors changed the relations between England and France?
3. What war aims did England have?
4. Why did England have the advantage in the war?
5. How were armies of England and France described?
6. How did England invest in the French war?
Text 3: Middle Ages facts

A. The phrase “Middle Ages” tells us more about the Renaissance that followed it than it does about the era itself. Starting around the 14th century, European thinkers, writers and artists began to look back and celebrate the art and culture of ancient Greece and Rome. Accordingly, they dismissed the period after the fall of Rome as a “Middle” or even “Dark” age in which no scientific accomplishments had been made, no great art produced, no great leaders born. The people of the Middle Ages had squandered the advancements of their predecessors, this argument went, and mired themselves instead in what 18th-century English historian Edward Gibbon called “barbarism and religion.”

This way of thinking about the era in the “middle” of the fall of Rome and the rise of the Renaissance prevailed until relatively recently. However, today’s scholars note that the era was as complex and vibrant as any other.

B. After the fall of Rome, no single state or government united the people who lived on the European continent. Instead, the Catholic Church became the most powerful institution of the medieval period. Kings, queens and other leaders derived much of their power from their alliances with and protection of the Church.

(In 800 CE, for example, Pope Leo III named the Frankish king Charlemagne the “Emperor of the Romans”—the first since that empire’s fall more than 300 years before. Over time, Charlemagne’s realm became the Holy Roman Empire, one of several political entities in Europe whose interests tended to align with those of the Church.)

Ordinary people across Europe had to “tithe” 10 percent of their earnings each year to the Church; at the same time, the Church was mostly exempt from taxation. These policies helped it to amass a great deal of money and power.

C. Meanwhile, the Islamic world was growing larger and more powerful. After the prophet Muhammad’s death in 632 CE, Muslim armies conquered large parts of the Middle East, uniting them under the rule of a single caliph. At its height, the medieval Islamic world was more than three times bigger than all of Christendom.
Under the caliphs, great cities such as Cairo, Baghdad and Damascus fostered a vibrant intellectual and cultural life. Poets, scientists and philosophers wrote thousands of books (on paper, a Chinese invention that had made its way into the Islamic world by the 8th century). Scholars translated Greek, Iranian and Indian texts into Arabic. Inventors devised technologies like the pinhole camera, soap, windmills, surgical instruments, an early flying machine and the system of numerals that we use today. And religious scholars and mystics translated, interpreted and taught the Quran and other scriptural texts to people across the Middle East.

D. Toward the end of the 11th century, the Catholic Church began to authorize military expeditions, or Crusades, to expel Muslim “infidels” from the Holy Land. Crusaders, who wore red crosses on their coats to advertise their status, believed that their service would guarantee the remission of their sins and ensure that they could spend all eternity in Heaven. (They also received more worldly rewards, such as papal protection of their property and forgiveness of some kinds of loan payments.)

The Crusades began in 1095, when Pope Urban summoned a Christian army to fight its way to Jerusalem, and continued on and off until the end of the 15th century. No one “won” the Crusades; in fact, many thousands of people from both sides lost their lives. They did make ordinary Catholics across Christendom feel like they had a common purpose, and they inspired waves of religious enthusiasm among people who might otherwise have felt alienated from the official Church. They also exposed Crusaders to Islamic literature, science and technology – exposure that would have a lasting effect on European intellectual life.

E. Another way to show devotion to the Church was to build grand cathedrals and other ecclesiastical structures such as monasteries. Cathedrals were the largest buildings in medieval Europe, and they could be found at the center of towns and cities across the continent.

Between the 10th and 13th centuries, most European cathedrals were built in the Romanesque style. Romanesque cathedrals are solid and substantial: They have
rounded masonry arches and barrel vaults supporting the roof, thick stone walls and few windows. (Examples of Romanesque architecture include the Porto Cathedral in Portugal and the Speyer Cathedral in present-day Germany.)

Around 1200, church builders began to embrace a new architectural style, known as the Gothic. Gothic structures, such as the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis in France and the rebuilt Canterbury Cathedral in England, have huge stained-glass windows, pointed vaults and arches (a technology developed in the Islamic world), and spires and flying buttresses. In contrast to heavy Romanesque buildings, Gothic architecture seems to be almost weightless. Medieval religious art took other forms as well. Frescoes and mosaics decorated church interiors, and artists painted devotional images of the Virgin Mary, Jesus and the saints.

Also, before the invention of the printing press in the 15th century, even books were works of art. Craftsmen in monasteries (and later in universities) created illuminated manuscripts: handmade sacred and secular books with colored illustrations, gold and silver lettering and other adornments. In the 12th century, urban booksellers began to market smaller illuminated manuscripts, like books of hours, psalters and other prayer books, to wealthy individuals.

**F.** In medieval Europe, rural life was governed by a system scholars call “feudalism.” In a feudal society, the king granted large pieces of land called fiefs to noblemen and bishops. Landless peasants known as serfs did most of the work on the fiefs: They planted and harvested crops and gave most of the produce to the landowner. In exchange for their labor, they were allowed to live on the land. They were also promised protection in case of enemy invasion.

During the 11th century, however, feudal life began to change. Agricultural innovations such as the heavy plow and three-field crop rotation made farming more efficient and productive, so fewer farm workers were needed – but thanks to the expanded and improved food supply, the population grew. As a result, more and more people were drawn to towns and cities. Meanwhile, the Crusades had expanded trade routes to the East and given Europeans a taste for imported goods such as wine, olive oil and luxurious textiles. As the commercial economy
developed, port cities in particular thrived. By 1300, there were some 15 cities in Europe with a population of more than 50,000.

In these cities, a new era was born: the Renaissance. The Renaissance was a time of great intellectual and economic change, but it was not a complete “rebirth”: it had its roots in the world of the Middle Ages.

**Text 4: Top 10 Myths About the Middle Ages**

A. Despite what many people believe, the Middle Ages gave birth to the jury system and trials were in fact very fair. The death penalty was considered to be extremely severe and was used only in the worst cases of crimes like murder, treason, and arson. It was not until the Middle Ages began to draw to a close that people like Elizabeth I began to use the death penalty as a means to rid their nations of religious opponents. Public beheadings were not as we see in the movies – they were given only to the rich, and were usually not performed in public. The most common method of execution was hanging – and burning was extremely rare (and usually performed after the criminal had been hanged to death first).

B. During the Middle Ages (until Gutenberg came along) all books had to be written by hand. This was a painstaking task which took many months – particularly with a book as large as the Bible. The job of hand-printing books was left to monks tucked away in monasteries. These books were incredibly valuable and they were needed in every Church as the Bible was read aloud at Mass every day. In order to protect these valuable books, they would be locked away. There was no conspiracy to keep the Bible from the people – the locks meant that the
Church could guarantee that the people could hear the Bible (many wouldn’t have been able to read) every day. And just to show that it wasn’t just the Catholic Church that locked up the Bibles for safety, the most famous “chained bible” is the “Great Bible” which Henry VIII had created and ordered to be read in the protestant churches. You can read more about that here. The Catholic diocese of Lincoln makes a comment on the practice here.

C. Peasants (those who worked in manual work) would have had fresh porridge and bread daily – with beer to drink. In addition, each day would have an assortment of dried or cured meats, cheeses, and fruits and vegetables from their area. Poultry, chicken, ducks, pigeons, and geese were not uncommon on the peasants’ dinner table. Some peasants also liked to keep bees, to provide honey for their tables. Given the choice between McDonalds and Medieval peasant food, I suspect the peasant food would be more nutritious and tasty. The rich of the time had a great choice of meats – such as cattle, and sheep. They would eat more courses for each meal than the poor, and would probably have had a number of spiced dishes – something the poor could not afford.

D. First of all, the thatched roofs of Medieval dwellings were woven into a tight mat – they were not just bundles of straw and sticks thrown on top of the house. Animals would not easily have been able to get inside the roof – and considering how concerned the average Middle Ager was, if an animal did get inside, they would be promptly removed – just as we remove birds or other small creatures that enter our homes today. And for the record, thatched roofs were not just for the poor – many castles and grander homes had them as well – because they worked so well. There are many homes in English villages today that still have thatched roofs.

E. Not only is this a total myth, it is so widely believed that it has given rise to a whole other series of myths, such as the false belief that Church incense was designed to hide the stink of so many people in one place. In fact, the incense was part of the Church’s rituals due to its history coming from the Jewish religion which also used incense in its sacrifices. This myth has also lead to the strange idea
that people usually married in May or June because they didn’t stink so badly – having had their yearly bath. It is, of course, utter rubbish. People married in those months because marriage was not allowed during Lent (the season of penance). So, back to smelly people. In the Middle Ages, most towns had bathhouses – in fact, cleanliness and hygiene was very highly regarded – so much so that bathing was incorporated into various ceremonies such as those surrounding knighthood. Some people bathed daily, others less regularly – but most people bathed. Furthermore, they used hot water – they just had to heat it up themselves, unlike us with our modern plumbed hot water.

F. In fact, while peasants in the Middle Ages did work hard (tilling the fields was the only way to ensure you could eat), they had regular festivals (religious and secular) which involved dancing, drinking, games, and tournaments. Many of the games from the time are still played today: chess, checkers, dice, blind man’s bluff, and many more. It may not seem as fun as the latest game for the Wii, but it was a great opportunity to enjoy the especially warm weather that was caused by the Medieval Warming Period.

G. While there was violence in the Middle Ages (just as there had always been), there were no equals to our modern Stalin, Hitler, and Mao. Most people lived their lives without experiencing violence. The Inquisition was not the violent bloodlust that many movies and books have claimed it to be, and most modern historians now admit this readily. Modern times have seen genocide, mass murder, and serial killing – something virtually unheard of before the “enlightenment”. In fact, there are really only two serial killers of note from the Middle Ages: Elizabeth Bathory, and Gilles de Rais. For those who dispute the fact that the Inquisition resulted in very few deaths, Wikipedia has the statistics here showing that there were (at most) 826 recorded executions over a 160-year period – from 45,000 trials!

H. In the 1960s and 1970s, the idea that women were oppressed in the Middle Ages flourished. In fact, all we need to do is think of a few significant women from the period to see that that is not true at all: St Joan of Arc was a young woman who
was given full control of the French army! Her downfall was political and would have occurred whether she were male or female. Hildegard von Bingen was a polymath in the Middle Ages who was held in such high esteem that Kings, Popes, and Lords all sought her advice. Her music and writing exists to this day. Elizabeth I ruled as a powerful queen in her own right, and many other nations had women leaders. Granted women did not work on Cathedrals but they certainly pulled their weight in the fields and villages. Furthermore, the rules of chivalry meant that women had to be treated with the greatest of dignity. The biggest difference between the concept of feminism in the Middle Ages and now is that in the Middle Ages it was believed that women were “equal in dignity, different in function” — now the concept has been modified to “equal in dignity and function”.

I. Furthermore, people did not believe the Earth was the center of the universe — the famous monk Copernicus dealt a death blow to that idea (without being punished) well before Galileo was tried for heresy for claiming that it proved the Bible was wrong. Two modern historians recently published a book in which they say: “there was scarcely a Christian scholar of the Middle Ages who did not acknowledge [Earth’s] sphericity and even know its approximate circumference.”

J. Thanks largely to Hollywood movies, many people believe that the Middle Ages were full of religious superstition and ignorance. But in fact, leading historians deny that there is any evidence of this. Science and philosophy blossomed at the time — partly due to the introduction of Universities all over Europe. The Middle ages produced some of the greatest art, music, and literature in all history. Boethius, Boccaccio, Dante, Petrarch, and Machiavelli are still revered today for their brilliant minds. The cathedrals and castles of Europe are still standing and contain some of the most beautiful artwork and stonework man has been able to create with his bare hands. Medicine at the time was primitive, but it was structured and willing to embrace new ideas when they arose (which is how we have modern medicine).
Match the parts (A-J) with the headings (1-10):

1. Smelly People
2. Flat Earth
3. Thatched Roofs
4. Oppressed Women
5. Death Penalty
6. Crude and Ignorant
7. Starving Poor
8. Violence Everywhere
9. Peasant Life
10. Locked Bibles

**Text 5: Black Death Facts**

The Black Death was a pandemic plague that spread throughout Europe in the 14th century. It’s thought that the plague wiped out around half of the population of Europe with some estimates saying that up to 200 million people lost their lives.

- The Black Death was most prominent in the years 1346 to 1353.
- The Black Death is also referred to as the ‘Great Plague’ and the ‘Great Mortality’. In London, England, it was named the ‘Bubonic Plague’.
- It was called the ‘Black Death’ because of the swollen buboes that appeared on people’s bodies that turned the skin black.
- It’s believed that the Black Death originated in Central Asia and was caused by harmful bacteria that were brought to Europe via the fleas living on black rats.
- The black rats entered Europe on trade ships that travelled between Europe and Asia.
- At the time, people did not understand where the Black Death came from or how it spread. Many people blamed God or certain communities, such as Jewish people, beggars and lepers.
- The first European country to be infected with the Black Death plague was Italy when trade ships carrying the disease landed in Sicily in 1347.
- It’s estimated that anywhere from 30-60% of people living in Europe died because of the plague, which amounts to up to 200 million people.
- The Black Death killed 50% of the people living in Paris, 40% of the people in Egypt and 60% of the people in London.
- Most people who caught the plague died within 12 hours of being bitten by an infected flea, carried by the rats.

- When people died, many were buried in wooden caskets that were marked with a red cross to show they had died from the plague. However, people were dying in large numbers and quicker than the coffins could be made, so many bodies were simply thrown into mass burial pits.

- The Black Death spread from Italy and infected most countries in Europe, including France, Spain, Portugal, England, Germany, Norway, Russia and even as far north as Iceland.

- The plague spread so quickly throughout Europe because many of the towns and cities were cramped and dirty, which gave an ideal home to the infected rats.

- The most common symptom of the Black Death was the appearance of buboes (infected swellings) on the body, in particular on the neck, armpits and groin.

- Alongside buboes, people suffering from the Black Death also showed symptoms of fever, rashes, vomiting and blackened skin.

- Outbreaks of plague happened on a regular basis during the 14th to 17th centuries because people understood little about infection and how diseases could spread.

- The Great Plague of London in 1665 was the last of the widespread plagues in England. It killed around a quarter of London’s population.

Identify the statements below if they are true or false:

1. The Black Death was most prominent in the years 1914 to 1918.
2. The Black Death is also referred to as the ‘Great Plague’ and the ‘Great Immortality’.
3. It’s believed that the Black Death originated in Central Europe and was caused by harmful bacteria that were brought to Europe via the fleas living on black rats.
4. The most common symptom of the Black Death was the appearance of buboes (infected swellings) on the body, in particular on the neck, armpits and groin.
5. Alongside buboes, people suffering from the Black Death also showed symptoms of fever, rashes, vomiting and blackened skin.

**Text 6: The Implications of Monastic Landholding**

There are few other historical societies in which between a quarter and a half of the basic socio-economic resource changed hands in so short a period as a hundred years. The quantity of land they were given made monasteries the ‘multinationals’ of the ninth century. This was a transfer of control, which was relocated beyond the reach of those immediately implicated in the exploitation of land. It was thus ultimately a redistribution of political as well as economic and social power, particularly as it was the secular elite who gained control, thanks to their thorough integration into relationships of reciprocal patronage with the church. Members of the elite, whether laymen acting as advocates or tenants, or monks acting as abbots or provosts, controlled, and profited from, the vastly extended scope of monastic landholding.

This was not a revolution which occurred silently or invisibly. From the last decades of the eighth century the duty of rulers to protect the powerless but free, the paupers, was again and again emphasised in moral instruction and royal edict. Of particular concern were the social pressures which might lead to the decline of the small freeholder, and encroachment on peasant landholding. The normative sources supply lurid stories of impoverished peasant smallholders losing their property, through trickery, threat, and desperation brought on by famine or hardship. Such stories reflected real worries: loss of property is a perennial concern of any peasant society, and expropriation through trick or threat a similarly widespread phenomenon which we must expect to meet in the Carolingian period.

But normative sources need careful handling: moral panics focus on cases which are rich in contemporary resonance, encapsulating the stresses engendered by social change, without necessarily being an objective representation of the actual process of change. It is no accident that the normative sources focus upon particular outrages which hit at the self-image of this society as consisting of property-owning
free peasants, a community in which social relations were conducted according to Christian norms. This self-image was at once stressed by the increasingly coherent ideological statements of the church, and put under stress by the shift in power in the localities. Peasants tricked out of their patrimonies may have been the exception, rather than the rule, but this was a period of mounting social differentiation and increasing pressure on the bottom strata of the peasantry. The shrill voices of the articulate were thus responses to the reality of change, albeit responses which did not identify the underlying pressure for change. The moral panic they created was not ignored: royal edicts from the 810s and 820s stressed the dangers of the erosion of the landed basis of the free peasantry, permitting gifts of land to the church but showing concern for the fate of heirs. The extent to which such edicts were enforced as law is a complex and separate issue; the current point is that they were reactions to real worries. These worries, indeed, lay behind the ebbing of the tide of gifts of land to the church as members of rural communities increasingly chose to relate to the church in ways which did not involve handing over land.

It would probably be a mistake to believe that famine or coercion lay behind more than a handful of the thousands of charters recording pious gifts to the church in this region. The patterning of gift-giving cannot be related to documented instances of famine or disorder. Less than a dozen surviving documents involve loss of personal freedom on the part of the donor. Donations of entire patrimonies were uncommon. Many gifts may have led to the establishment of formal relationships of dependence between donor and church, particularly when, as often happened, the donor received a life-interest in the land he had given; such formal relationships did not, however, abstract the donor from the local community or give the church exclusive jurisdiction over him or control of his labour. In that there was a dramatic increase in the quantity of land ultimately owned by the church, the proportion of land owned by the peasantry must have declined, a substantial, if not overwhelming, number of peasants ending their days as free tenants rather than owner-cultivators. The evidence from Dienheim confirms that those who did
decline were, in all probability, those whose holdings had been limited: here the top strata of the peasantry, who dominated witness-lists, were more reluctant to give land to the church, and, in any case, could probably afford to give the odd parcel of land without jeopardising the lot of future generations. We should not, therefore, exaggerate the scale of the change: the peasantry as a group did not disappear, but internal divisions within the peasantry between the landless and those who owned land became increasingly important. In the immediate post-Carolingian period this remained a society in which between a half and a third of the human population were legally free, and a critical mass of this group enjoyed full rights of ownership. Although more free peasants were dependent on landlords as tenants, and those who hung on to their property were likely to be more fully integrated in networks of patronage centred on churches and aristocrats, the peasantry was not subject to lordly jurisdiction or restrictive control or command. In the tenth century, local business continued to take place in neighbourhood meetings attended by substantial numbers of medium-sized proprietors; disputes were settled by the collective testimony of a community of free owner-cultivators. The creation of rights of territorial control and jurisdiction over free men was a separate process from the acquisition of land by the church, a process which is not apparent in the evidence until the eleventh century.

Nonetheless, the flow of land to the church had significantly altered the balance of power in the localities. In the eighth and ninth centuries, gifts of land to the church had built up bonds between churches and lay groupings, allowing the church to become an important patron and social actor from the level of the elite to that of the village. Land given to the church was not wholly or immediately abstracted from the world of kin, but the rules governing its redistribution were different from those pertaining to land owned by kin. Ultimate rights over church land remained in the hands of the saints; they could not be redistributed as kinship groups fissured and coalesced. The church was thus integrated into kinship structures and inheritance strategies. This changed the practical workings of kinship, inheritance and thus social reproduction: as families shared property rights
with, and defined themselves with reference to, local churches which they did not wholly control, so kinship ties became necessarily extensive, outward looking and in need of constant renegotiation. That is, the landholdings of the Carolingian church ensured the prevalence of a kinship system which was comparatively fluid and malleable.

Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.

Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.

Answer the following questions:

1. Why did monasteries become ‘multinationals’? How do you understand it?
2. What problems were there?
3. Is it OK to trust normative sources? What are they?
4. What was special about that period?
5. Why were edicts enforced?
6. What happened to the top strata?
7. What happened to peasantry?
8. What implications did monastic landholding have?

**Text 7: Joan of Arc – French military leader and martyr**

(born c. 1412 – died 1431)

Few people ever make history, and a person who does so in his or her teens is extremely rare. Joan of Arc, who came to prominence at the age of seventeen, never lived to see twenty. In less than three years, however, she turned the tide of a century-long conflict, and proved that a girl could lead men to victory.

Joan claimed to hear voices, which she said came from the saints, giving her wisdom from God. Whatever the source of her knowledge, she was uncannily wise beyond her years, and she might have led France to greater and greater victories if she had not been captured by her nation’s enemies. Under trial as a heretic, her prophetic gift was turned against her as evidence that she was doing the Devil’s work, not God’s, and she was burned at the stake. The verdict of history, however, rests on the side of Joan.
A. When Joan was born in about 1412, France had been locked in a war with England for more than seventy-five years. The conflict would drag on throughout her lifetime and beyond, becoming known as the Hundred Years’ War (1337 – 1453), even though it actually lasted for 116 years.

Most of the war was fought in France, which was devastated not so much by the fighting itself – there were few actual battles during the Hundred Years’ War – but by English raids on French towns. Then, in 1415, when Joan was about three years old, the English under King Henry V scored a major victory at Agincourt.

After Henry died in 1422, regents who ruled England in the name of his infant son Henry VI continued the attacks. In 1428 they began a siege, or sustained assault, on the city of Orléans.

B. Joan was born in about 1412 in Domremy, a village in the prosperous region of Champagne. Her family, despite later legends maintaining that she grew up in poverty as a shepherd girl, were in fact successful farmers.

So many tales would surround Joan’s life that it was sometimes difficult to separate out the facts. For instance, artists often depicted her as possessing a physical beauty that matched her purity of spirit, but this was probably not the case. Contemporary records make no mention of her appearance (had she been a great beauty, presumably these records would have mentioned it) except to note that she was strongly and solidly built.

One thing that is known, because Joan reported it herself, was that when she was about thirteen, she began hearing voices and seeing visions. The priests at her trial would later accuse her of receiving messages from demons, and some modern scholars dismiss the voices and visions as the product of mental illness. Joan, however, claimed that she was hearing from God through the voices of long-deceased saints.

C. As the siege of Orléans wore on, Joan came to believe that the voices had a special message for her. It was her destiny to save France from the English, and to do that, she needed to get the king’s approval to lead an army into battle. At some
point, her father tried to arrange her marriage to a local youth, but Joan had made a vow to remain a virgin, committed to Christ, and she refused.

Knowing that her father would not permit her to seek out the king, she convinced her uncle to help her get an audience with one of the local authorities. It is hard to imagine how Joan, a seventeen-year-old girl in a world where even grown women were expected to stay away from men’s affairs, got anyone to take her seriously.

Finally, however, she had an opportunity to meet with Sir Robert de Baudricourt, who was at first amused and then impressed by her determination. In early 1429, he arranged for her to meet with the king.

D. In fact the king, Charles VII, had yet to be crowned. By the standards of what was required to be a king in medieval times, he was a timid figure, and later his unwillingness to make a stand would cost Joan dearly. On meeting him, Joan announced boldly that she had come to raise, or end, the siege and lead him safely to the town of Reims, the traditional place where French kings were crowned or consecrated.

Given his lack of resolve, Charles was particularly hesitant to take her claims seriously, and he forced her to undergo a series of tests concerning her faith. These tests included lengthy questioning by priests, who wanted to make sure that she was hearing from God. She passed all the tests, as she would later point out when she was brought up on charges of witchcraft.

In time Charles agreed to send her into battle, and she acquired a distinctive suit of white armor, probably made to fit a boy. As for a sword, legend holds that she told one of the king’s men that he would find a specially engraved sword buried beneath the altar in a certain church — and he did. Whatever the truth of this story, it was yet another item brought up against her later as “proof” that Satan had given her special insight.

E. To the English troops at Orléans, the sight of Joan in her white armor leading a tiny French force must have looked the way David did to Goliath in the biblical story. But just as the future king of Israel killed the giant, Joan was to lead
her force to victory over a much stronger opponent. First she led the capture of the English fort at Saint Loup outside Orléans, and in a series of skirmishes, she forced the English to lift the siege. She was wounded both on the foot and above the breast, but she stayed in the battle until they had victory.

Two weeks later, Joan, claiming she had been healed by the saints, was ready to go back into action. By now she was the most popular person in France, and soldiers who had previously scorned the idea of a woman leading them into battle became zealous followers. They took the village of Patay on June 18, 1429, and their victory led a number of towns to switch their allegiance from England to France.

Joan informed Charles that he should next march on Reims, but he did not immediately heed her advice. After he relented and they began moving toward the city, they were stopped at Troyes, an English stronghold that they seemingly could not conquer. With supplies running out, the men were starting to grow hungry, but Joan urged them not to give up the siege, telling the troops that they would have victory in just two more days. Once again she was proven right, and on July 17, 1429, Charles was crowned in Reims with Joan standing nearby.

Charles and the leaders of the French army never fully accepted Joan into their confidence and often excluded her from strategy meetings. In many cases they would seek her advice after having met amongst themselves, only to discover that they should have asked her in the first place.

Joan’s extremely unorthodox ways were bound to make her enemies, and not just on the English side. Many of the French remained uncomfortable with the idea of a female leader, and civilians as well as soldiers remarked scornfully about her habit of always wearing men’s clothes. Nonetheless, she had far more admirers than opponents among the French, and everywhere she went, crowds tried to touch her in the hopes that she could heal sicknesses – a gift she never claimed.

Then in September 1429, she failed to take Paris, and was wounded again, this time in the leg. Two months later, she failed to take another town. Meanwhile, she was growing restless with Charles’s indecisiveness; therefore, she set out to assist
the fortress at Compiegne in the northeast, which was under attack. It was to be her last military campaign.

G. During a battle in May 1430, Joan was captured by John of Luxembourg, who was loyal to the Duchy of Burgundy. Burgundy, a large state to the north of France, was in turn allied with the English, to whom they gave her after receiving a handsome payment. The English were thrilled, and immediately handed her over to Peter Cauchon, bishop of Beauvais, for trial. Neither Charles nor any of the other French leaders made any significant effort to rescue her.

The legal proceedings that followed represented a ghastly miscarriage of justice, even by medieval standards. Because she was charged with heresy, or defying church teachings, she should have been confined in a jail controlled by the church, where she would have had female guards. Instead, she was thrown into a dungeon controlled by the civil authorities in the town of Rouen, and there she was guarded by five of the most brutish soldiers the English could muster.

Her trial wore on for months and months, and Cauchon’s tactics failed to wrangle a confession from Joan. He and the other interrogators could never successfully tie her to witchcraft, and eventually the charges were whittled down to a claim that she was not cooperating with the trial. Scrambling to find a case, Cauchon emphasized her wearing of men’s clothing as evidence of her disloyalty to the church. Finally, on May 24, 1431, he managed to bully the exhausted Joan into signing a statement that she was guilty of a wide range of crimes. She even agreed to wear women’s clothing.

H. Cauchon had led Joan to believe that after signing the statement, she would be moved to a church prison. Instead, he had her thrown back into the dungeon. Realizing that she would never get out alive, she made a final act of protest by putting on men’s clothing again. Now Cauchon had her where he wanted her: not only was she a heretic, but she had gone back to her heresy after recanting, or disavowing, it.

On May 30, Joan’s death sentence was read aloud in the town square of Rouen. Her captors were so eager to see her killed that, in another breach of law –
the church had no power to pass a death sentence in France – they immediately hauled her off to her execution. She was tied to a pole, and branches were heaped around her; then the fire was lit, and Joan was burned at the stake.

The English and their French allies – most of those involved in the trial were her countrymen – were so afraid of Joan and her alleged witchcraft that they arranged to have her ashes thrown in the River Seine nearby. And indeed Joan did exert a force after her death: her efforts contributed significantly to France’s final victory in 1453.

By that time there was a massive movement to reverse the sentence against Joan. In 1456, a commission directed by Pope Calixtus III declared that the verdict against her had been wrongfully obtained. Joan soon became one of the most widely loved and admired figures in Europe, and in 1920, she was declared a saint.

**Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.**

**Match the parts (A-H) with the headings (1-8):**

1. Trouble on the horizon
2. Capture and trial
3. The Hundred Years’ War
4. The martyrdom of Joan
5. Gaining Charles’s trust
6. Voices and visions
7. Victory after victory
8. On her way to meet the king

**II. Listening**

**1. The Crusades** (Prof. Thomas F. Madden’s lecture)

**Part 1. The list of words and word combinations under study:**

*Monastery* – a building in which monks live and worship

*combatant* – a person who fights in a war

*bloodshed* – killing and violence

*chivalry* – the system of behaviour followed by knights in the medieval period of history, that put a high value on honour, kindness, and courage

*piety* – strong belief in a religion that is shown in the way someone lives

*papacy* – the position or authority of the Pope
Answer the following questions:
1. What were the steps of reformation?
2. What was the percentage of Christian population in Europe?
3. What needed to be reformed?
4. How did they try to make aristocracy act in a more Christian manner?
5. Why were these measures undertaken?
6. Why was it difficult?
7. How did the Crusades come out of Europe?
8. Who played an important role in the Crusades? Why?

Part 2. The list of words and word combinations under study:

Christendom [ˈkrɪs(ə)ndəm] – Christian people or countries as a whole

siege – the surrounding of a place by an armed force in order to defeat those defending it

patriarchy – a society in which the oldest male is the leader of the family, or a society controlled by men in which they use their power to their own advantage

remnant – a small piece or amount of something that is left from a larger original piece or amount

Answer the following questions:
1. What were the external factors of Crusades?
2. What was the superpower of Medieval world?
3. When did the Muslim evasions start?
4. What was the religious situation in Europe by 1000?
5. How many patriarchies were there? Name them.
6. Which of them remained in Christian hands?
7. What happened in 1071?
8. Describe the Turks.
9. When did the Turks crash the Byzantine army?
10. What was Sultanate of Rum? What did it mean?
**Part 3.** The list of words and word combinations under study:

*plea* – an urgent and emotional request

*aid* – help or support

*pilgrimage* [ˈpɪlɡrɪmɪdʒ] – a visit to a place that is considered special, where you go to show your

Answer the following questions:

1. Who was the new Emperor of Constantinople?
2. Why was he in a difficult position?
3. What did he do?
4. What was illuminating about his plea?
5. What did he ask for?
6. Who was the Pope at that time? What was his response?
7. When did Alexius again send the plea to the West?
8. Who was the Pope in 1095?
9. How did the Pope respond?
10. What was his speech about?
11. Why did he call it ‘pilgrimage’?
12. What was the difference between Arabs and Turks in ruling Jerusalem?

**Part 4.** The list of words and word combinations under study:

*penitential* [,pɛnɪˈtɛnl] – showing that you are sorry for something you have done because you feel it was wrong

*remission* – the fact of being forgiven for breaking religious laws or rules

*vow* – a serious promise or decision

*booty* – any valuable things or money stolen by an army at war or by thieves

*to impoverish* [ɪmˈpɜːvərɪʃ] – to make somebody poor

*scarce* [skɛəs] – not easy to find or get

Answer the following questions:

1. How were the Crusades defined?
2. What did ‘penitential act’ mean?
3. What was the Church offering to knights?
4. What was said about the backgrounds of the first Crusade?
5. What groups participated in the Crusade?
6. When was the main body of the Crusade put together?
7. Why was it unique in History?
8. What was the death rate?

**Part 5.** The list of words and word combinations under study:

- **colonialism** – the belief in and support for the system of one country controlling another
- **carvesth out (for yourself)** – to successfully create or get something, especially a work position, by working for it
- **pagan** – belonging to a religion that worships many gods, especially one which existed before the main world religions

**Answer the following questions:**

1. What did historians use to think about the reasons for the Crusades?
2. Does it make any sense? Why not?
3. What was the true reason?
4. What did they expect to get from it?
5. Describe the first Crusade.
6. What happened after Jerusalem was conquered?
7. Why were Crusades able to conquer Jerusalem?
8. What happened in 1187?

**Part 6.** Answer the following questions:

1. What happened after it?
2. Who led the Crusade?
3. What did they fail to reconquer? Why?
4. How did they see the fact that Jerusalem remained under Muslims?
5. What did it initiate?
6. What idea did Richard I have?
7. Who and when called the fourth crusade?
8. What was the battle plan?
9. What happened during the fourth crusade?
10. What was said about the fifth crusade?
12. What happened in 1291?
13. What happened after 1291?
14. What happened in the 14th century?
15. How do we see the Crusades and how did they see violence?

2. *The Early Middle Ages, 284-1000 – The Splendour of Byzantium* (Prof. Paul Freedman’s lecture)

   **Chapter 1. Introduction (00:00-07:31)**

   The list of words and word combinations under study:

   - overreach – to fail by trying to achieve, spend, or do more than you can manage
   - unravel – to start to fail or no longer stay together as a whole
   - wrest – to get something with effort or difficulty
   - contraction – reduction
   - efflorescence – the production of a lot of art, especially of a high quality

   Answer the following questions:

   1. What is imperial overreach?
   2. When did Justinian die?
   3. What happened after Justinian’s death?
   4. How is ‘contraction’ understood?

   **Chapter 2. The Contraction of the Byzantine Empire (07:31-21:52)**

   The list of words and word combinations under study:

   - desertion – the act of leaving the armed forces without permission
   - to overthrow – to defeat or remove someone from power, using force
   - to besiege – to surround a place, especially with an army, to prevent people or supplies getting in or out
   - iconoclasm – strong opposition to generally accepted beliefs and traditions
   - to foil – to prevent someone or something from being successful
intermarry – marriage between people who are from different social groups, races, or religions, or who are from the same family

mutilation – severe damage to something, especially by violently removing a part

Answer the following questions:
1. What kind of story is it?
2. What is the difference in crises between the West and East?
3. What became of Europe in the 5 century?
4. What happened to the Byzantine Empire in the seventh and eighth centuries?
5. Who was the most dramatic enemy of Byzantium in this period?
6. When were the sieges of Constantinople?
7. What was said about Justinian?
8. When was the plague?
9. When did the Lombards invade Italy?
10. What was said about the tribes?
11. What happened after the death of the emperor Maurice?
12. When was Constantinople besieged?
13. What was said about the Bulgars?

Chapter 3. Reconstruction of the Empire (21:52-30:30)

The list of words and word combinations under study:

controversy – a lot of disagreement or argument about something, usually because it affects or is important to many people

portable – light and small enough to be easily carried or moved

depiction – the way that something is represented or shown

Annunciation – Lady Day

iconoclast – a person who strongly opposes generally accepted beliefs and traditions

idolatry – the act of praying to a picture or object as part of a religion

to worship – to have or show a strong feeling of respect and admiration for God or a god
to intimidate – to frighten or threaten someone, usually in order to persuade them to do something that you want them to do

iconodule – person who loves icons

Answer the following questions:
1. How was this empire rebuilt?
2. What is “Greek fire”?
3. What was the big controversy in the seventh century?
4. What was iconoclasm?
5. What was the role of the emperor in religion?

Chapter 4. Survival of the Byzantine Empire (30:30-39:36)

The list of words and word combinations under study:

come to naught – come to nothing
to dismantle – to get rid of a system or organization, usually over a period of time
stakeholder – a person or citizen who is involved with an organization, society, etc. and therefore has responsibilities towards it and an interest in its success
feasible – able to be made, done, or achieved
viable – able to work as intended or able to succeed

Answer the following questions:
1. What were a few plans of the emperors?
2. Why was Constans important?
3. How was it described?
4. What was said about army and the Empire?
5. What is the militarization of society?
6. What did the Empire represent itself from 717 to 843?

Chapter 5. Expansion of the Byzantine Empire (39:36)

The list of words and word combinations under study:

to excommunicate – to punish somebody by officially stating that they can no longer be a member of a Christian Church, especially the Roman Catholic Church
vernacular – spoken in a particular area or by a particular group, especially when it is not the official or written language
Answer the following questions:
1. What happened to the Empire from 843 to 1000?
2. What is ‘filioque’ controversy?
3. When was the official split between the Orthodox world and the Catholic world?
4. What are the differences between them?

III. Supplementary Reading

*The Papal Revolution*

Leo IX’s pontificate marked a turning point for the Church. He was not around long enough to finish rooting out corruption, but he certainly brought the reform into its final phase. He drove simoniacs from office, helped to end the practice of clerical marriage, and improved priestly training and education. His last significant achievement was the creation of the College of Cardinals. Recognizing that the Church was intellectually ill-equipped to deal with all the issues confronting it, Leo decided to create a special body of advisors to the papacy – theologians, lawyers, philosophers, historians, scientists, and diplomats who could lend expert counsel. These figures, handpicked by the pope (as they still are today), became the College of Cardinals. They figured prominently in the effort to resolve many of the long-pressing doctrinal issues that had never been wholly settled within the Church. For example, whereas everyone agreed that simony was evil, did that necessarily mean that the sacraments performed by clergy tainted with simony were invalid? The cardinals produced “position papers” on a variety of responses to the problem, laying out all the arguments they could muster; the Holy See then used these in order to come to its ultimate conclusion.

Another issue was the celibacy of the clergy. Was lifelong chastity a fundamental requirement or merely an ideal encouraged for all those who were interested in it? Ever since its inception, the Catholic Church had been filled with well-meaning male and female clerics who believed that celibacy was not a specific requirement; at various times in the past married clergy – that is, clergy who were either legally and fully married or who lived in common-law marriages with
concubines – may have been in the majority. But others argued from the start that only those willing to vow themselves to the celibate life were fully qualified for the priesthood. As the reform movement reached its culmination, this issue too had to be resolved. Surrounded by the cardinals, the papacy began establishing itself as the decision-making center of the Church on all doctrinal issues.

In 1059 a synod at Rome made two decisions that started to turn the reform movement into a revolution. The pope at the time was Nicholas II (1059–1061). Under his leadership the council condemned the practice of lay investiture – that is, the tradition by which secular rulers installed all clergy in their offices. The ritual by which a lay prince “invested” a priest or bishop with the insignia of his office suggested that the ecclesiastical authority was subordinate to the secular, and therefore the practice now stood condemned. The synod next promulgated the Papal Election Decree (1059), which asserted that henceforth and for all eternity the only way for any individual to become the legitimate pontiff of the Holy Catholic Church was to be freely elected to the position by the College of Cardinals. This decree removed the Holy See from the clutches of the Roman magnates, but it also declared the papacy’s independence from the imperial power. Emperors had dominated the Church ever since Constantine, the synod declared, and in so doing planted the seed of corruption that took seven centuries to root out. Only by assuring the Church’s full liberty from state-manipulation could the purity of the great reform be maintained.

These actions directly challenged state authority, especially that of the Germans who held the imperial title. Each side prepared for the inevitable clash by courting intellectual, diplomatic, and military support. The reformist emperor Henry III had died in 1056; his infant son Henry IV (1056-1106) inherited the imperial title but could do no more than watch his authority be undermined until he reached adulthood. The Church swung into action by allying itself with Robert Guiscard, the leader of the Normans in southern Italy, and trying to win support among the secular German princes who were always interested in policies that would weaken the emperor. The papal alliance strengthened the position of the
Norman rulers who were in the process of subduing the southern regions, and by this alliance the Holy See hoped to reign in these rowdy upstarts, but relations only worsened between Rome and the Byzantine Empire whose forces the Normans were removing.

Matters came to a head during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085), which coincided with Henry IV’s reaching adulthood and taking over control of the government. Both were headstrong men to whom the notion of compromise was anathema. Henry was kept busy for two years putting down rebellions by various princes, during which time he and Gregory maintained cordial though tenuous relations. But Henry deeply resented the papacy’s actions during his minority of pressing for more radical reform of the churches and encouraging the princes to undermine imperial power, while Gregory feared that it was only a matter of time before Henry would attempt to attack the crowning achievements of the reform by contesting papal independence from the emperor. In 1075 Henry finished dealing with his rebels and prepared to confront Rome, and Gregory responded with a preemptive strike that surprised everyone, including the most ardent pro-reform enthusiasts. Gregory penned a declaration called the Dictatus Papae ("Dictates of the Pope") in that year. This was a list of twenty-seven single sentence statements about papal power. For example:

The pope alone has the power to instate and depose bishops.
The pope alone may use the imperial insignia.
All secular princes are to kiss the pope’s foot alone.
The pope’s name alone shall be spoken in all churches.
The pope has the power to depose emperors.
The pope himself may be judged by no man.
The pope may release subjects from their vows of fealty to men who are unjust.

No one knows for certain what Gregory intended by the Dictates: Were they a dogmatic assertion, or a sort of ecclesiastical “wish list”? Were they an outline for a book that he planned to write? Were they a collection of random thoughts? All that
we know is that the Dictates triggered an angry reaction from Henry, who viewed them as an unprecedented open attack on imperial rights. (The other monarchs in Europe did not like the Dictates either, but they were generally willing to stand by and let Henry lead the fight against them.) Letters passed back and forth between emperor and pope, and the vitriol of their language increased with every exchange. Finally, by the end of 1076 both the emperor and the pope had declared each other excommunicated and deposed from office. Rejoicing in Henry’s apparent deposition, the German nobles rose up against him once again and this time they were joined by a number of the empire’s important ecclesiastical vassals as well. Henry temporarily defused the situation in 1077 by making a pilgrimage to Canossa, in northern Italy, where Gregory was staying. Dressed in penitential rags, Henry stood barefooted for three days outside Gregory’s palace window begging forgiveness for his sins and pleading to be restored to the Church. It was a personal humiliation – people came from miles around to watch – but it was politically quite clever. Gregory, as a priest, could not refuse to forgive a penitent sinner, and Henry knew that Gregory’s forgiveness of him would of necessity put an end to the rebellions against him, since rebels against a good son of the Church would themselves become the Church’s enemies. Gregory was furious at having been caught unawares, but all he could do about it, since there were so many witnesses to Henry’s abasement, was to enjoy the spectacle for a few days before granting absolution.

The war of words continued for several more years, and finally in 1081 Henry decided to put an end to the struggle by invading Italy. As the German army entered Rome, Gregory took refuge in his fortress at Castel Sant’Angelo, which Henry soon surrounded. The pope was effectively imprisoned. But Gregory had sent word to his Norman ally Robert Guiscard of Henry’s approach, and Robert came hurrying to the rescue. Henry’s forces wanted nothing to do with the Normans and fled north to Tuscany. For two years an unsteady peace existed, as the German imperials cut down pro-papal communes in the north of Italy and the Normans routed rebels in the south and prepared to resume their march on
Constantinople, while Gregory stayed cowering in Castel Sant’Angelo. But in 1084 Henry pounced on Rome again. Robert rode northward in a fury, only to find that Henry had once again vanished. Guiscard then indulged himself by letting his soldiers sack the Eternal City. They pillaged Rome as it had never been pillaged before, and when the smoke finally cleared and the Normans marched southward, a chastened Gregory VII had to go with them under protective custody from the Roman mobs who demanded the pope’s head. He soon caught sick and died at Salerno in 1085.

This was the dramatic climax of the investiture struggle but not its end. So long as Henry IV lived, there were no signs of compromise coming from Germany, although the first popes after Gregory VII were careful not to aggravate relations by pressing too hard on papal claims. The Holy See shifted its focus from debates with secular authorities to efforts to secure papal supremacy over the Church itself. The key issue here was to assert papal jurisdiction over the episcopacies, since the Church was now one in which the bishops were the leading figures. Monastic life continued to thrive and attracted thousands of new recruits, but it was clear by the end of the eleventh century that the true centers of Christian life had shifted to the cities and that bishops had replaced abbots as the dominant figures in shaping Christian devotional and institutional life. In fact, it is worth noting that there were more assertions in the Dictatus Papae about papal authority vis-à-vis bishops than there were assertions about the pope’s power over the emperor. Urban II (1088-1099) devoted himself to completing the work of reform by traveling widely, holding councils and public ceremonies à la Leo IX, championing – and gaining popular support for – the notion of the Holy See’s supremacy as foremost of the bishops. Urban was less charismatic than Leo, but he helped finalize the reform movement and establish beyond a doubt that after nearly eleven hundred years the Roman pontiff finally stood at the head of a united Church.
UNIT 4
Renaissance and Reformation

I. Reading

Text 1: Where and when was the Renaissance?

The Renaissance is usually associated with the Italian city states like Florence, but Italy’s undoubted importance has too often overshadowed the development of new ideas in northern Europe, the Iberian Peninsula, the Islamic world, south-east Asia, and Africa. In offering a more global perspective on the nature of the Renaissance, it would be more accurate to refer to a series of ‘Renaissances’ throughout these regions, each with their own highly specific and separate characteristics. These other Renaissances often overlapped and exchanged influences with the more classical and traditionally understood Renaissance centred on Italy. The Renaissance was a remarkably international, fluid, and mobile phenomenon.

Today, there is a popular consensus that the term ‘Renaissance’ refers to a profound and enduring upheaval and transformation in culture, politics, art, and society in Europe between the years 1400 and 1600. The word describes both a period in history and a more general ideal of cultural renewal. The term comes from the French for ‘rebirth’. Since the 19th century it has been used to describe the period in European history when the rebirth of intellectual and artistic appreciation of Greco-Roman culture gave rise to the modern individual as well as the social and cultural institutions that define so many people in the western world today.

Art historians often view the Renaissance as beginning as early as the 13th century, with the art of Giotto and Cimabue, and ending in the late 16th century with the work of Michelangelo and Venetian painters like Titian. Literary scholars in the Anglo-American world take a very different perspective, focusing on the rise of vernacular English literature in the 16th and 17th centuries in the poetry and drama of Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton. Historians take a different approach again, labelling the period c.1500–1700 as ‘early modern’, rather than
‘Renaissance’. These differences in dating and even naming the Renaissance have become so intense that the validity of the term is now in doubt. Does it have any meaning anymore? Is it possible to separate the Renaissance from the Middle Ages that preceded it, and the modern world that came after it? Does it underpin a belief in European cultural superiority? To answer these questions, we need to understand how the term ‘Renaissance’ itself came into being.

No 16th-century audience would have recognized the term ‘Renaissance’. The Italian word rinascita (‘rebirth’) was used in the 16th century to refer to the revival of classical culture. But the specific French word ‘Renaissance’ was not used as a descriptive historical phrase until the middle of the 19th century. The first person to use the term was the French historian Jules Michelet, a French nationalist deeply committed to the egalitarian principles of the French Revolution. Between 1833 and 1862 Michelet worked on his greatest project, the multi-volume History of France. He was a progressive republican, vociferous in his condemnation of both the aristocracy and the church. In 1855 he published his seventh volume of the History, entitled La Renaissance. For him the Renaissance meant:

... the discovery of the world and the discovery of man. The sixteenth century... went from Columbus to Copernicus, from Copernicus to Galileo, from the discovery of the earth to that of the heavens. Man refound himself.

The scientific discoveries of explorers and thinkers like Columbus, Copernicus, and Galileo went hand in hand with more philosophical definitions of individuality that Michelet identified in the writings of Rabelais, Montaigne, and Shakespeare. This new spirit was contrasted with what Michelet viewed as the ‘bizarre and monstrous’ quality of the Middle Ages. To him the Renaissance represented a progressive, democratic condition that celebrated the great virtues he valued – Reason, Truth, Art, and Beauty. According to Michelet, the Renaissance ‘recognized itself as identical at heart with the modern age’.

Michelet was the first thinker to define the Renaissance as a decisive historical period in European culture that represented a crucial break with the Middle Ages, and which created a modern understanding of humanity and its place in the world.
He also promoted the Renaissance as representing a certain spirit or attitude, as much as referring to a specific historical period. Michelet’s Renaissance does not happen in Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, as we have come to expect. Instead, his Renaissance takes place in the 16th century. As a French nationalist, Michelet was eager to claim the Renaissance as a French phenomenon. As a republican he also rejected what he saw as 14th-century Italy’s admiration for church and political tyranny as deeply undemocratic, and hence not part of the spirit of the Renaissance.

Michelet’s story of the Renaissance was shaped decisively by his own 19th-century circumstances. In fact, the values of Michelet’s Renaissance sound strikingly close to those of his cherished French Revolution: espousing the values of freedom, reason, and democracy, rejecting political and religious tyranny, and enshrining the spirit of freedom and the dignity of ‘man’. Disappointed in the failure of these values in his own time, Michelet went in search of a historical moment where the values of liberty and egalitarianism triumphed and promised a modern world free of tyranny.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*the Iberian* [ˈaɪbərɪən] peninsula – Пиренейский полуостров

*overlapped* – to have some parts that are the same

*consensus* – a generally accepted opinion

*enduring* – existing for a long time

*upheaval* – a great change, especially causing or involving much difficulty, activity, or trouble

*validity* – truth

*underpin* – support

*egalitarian* – believing that all people are equally important and should have the same rights and opportunities in life

*vociferous* [vəˈsɪf.ər.əs] – express their opinions and complaints loudly and repeatedly in speech
condemnation – criticize something or someone strongly, usually for moral reasons
cherished – beloved
espousing – to become involved with or support an activity or opinion
enshrining – to contain or keep something as if in a holy place

Answer the following questions:
1. Where was the Renaissance?
2. How is it better to see the Renaissance?
3. How do we see the Renaissance today?
4. Where does this term come from? And what does it mean?
5. What were the views of art historians, literary scholars and historians on the Renaissance?
6. How did it affect the Renaissance?
7. When was the Italian word for the Renaissance used and for what?
8. Who was the first person to use the term ‘Renaissance’? What was he?
9. When did he use this term? What did he mean by this term?
10. How did he see the Middle Ages?
11. What virtues did he value?
12. How did Michelet define the Renaissance?
13. Where and when did this phenomenon happen according to Michelet?
14. What influenced his story of the Renaissance?
15. What values were of the French Revolution?

Text 2: The Beginnings of Luther’s Reformation

Staupitz laid instructional responsibilities at the infant university of Saxon Elector Frederick the Wise upon Luther as he completed his formal studies. On October 18, 1512, he received the degree Doctor of Bible, pledging to devote his life to searching Scripture and defending its truth at all costs. In accord with the medieval plan of learning and teaching, he had earlier lectured on Aristotle, the Sentences of Peter Lombard, and patristic texts, above all Jerome. In 1513 he
assumed lectures on Biblical books, beginning with Psalms (1513–15), Romans (1515–16), Galatians (1516–17), Hebrews (1517–18), and then the Psalms again. To the end of his life he continued such lectures, the most important on Galatians (1531) and Genesis (1535–45). In the 1510s his departure from strict adherence to the “allegorical” method of medieval exegesis and his development of a literal-prophetic interpretation, coupled with the theological hermeneutic of the distinction of God’s accusing law from his life-restoring Gospel, initiated a new era in Biblical exposition and theological method. Recent interest in the history of exegesis and hermeneutics has opened new fields of inquiry in the rich resources of Luther’s sermons, commentaries, and other works (Ebeling, Evangelische Evangelienauslegung; Hagen).

While lecturing on Hebrews this young monk and professor at an obscure new university became a controversial figure of European prominence. Luther’s spiritual struggles had sharpened his sensitivity to the crisis of pastoral care enveloping western Christendom by 1500. The medieval system of “Seelsorge,” centered on the mass and penance, was not working well as societal change loosened the dependence upon the clergy of small but significant groups of merchants and artisans in towns. When Albrecht von Hohenzollern, brother of the elector of Brandenburg, employed the sale of indulgences for building St. Peter’s basilica in Rome to pay fees required by his acquisition of his third high ecclesiastical office, the archbishopric of Mainz, Luther protested against attendant abuses which harmed laypeople’s consciences. This protest, posted October 31, 1517, took the form of academic theses – proposals for public debate. They provoked a storm of discussion and propelled Luther into the role of reformer. Although the first of his Ninety-Five Theses on Indulgences, “the whole life of the Christian is a life of repentance,” summarized a lifelong concern, the document’s theological content was not of critical importance. Its significance lies in the fact that enterprising printers published it, without realizing that they were instituting a communications revolution. For this publication became the first modern media
event, the first public relations happening, as Johannes Gutenberg’s technology was placed at the service of Luther’s thinking.

Luther lived in an oral culture; his message commanded popular attention above all because preachers – many former Wittenberg students – proclaimed it in villages and towns across Germany and lands beyond. Nonetheless, Mark Edwards correctly notes that “the printed word played a crucial role in the early Reformation, and when multiplied by the effects of preaching and conversation, can be said to be a major factor in spreading it as a relatively coherent message.” The appeal for reform disseminated “with a rapidity that had been impossible before [the] invention [of the printing press, which] . . . allowed the central ideological leader, Martin Luther, to reach the ‘opinion leaders’ of the movement quickly, kept them all in touch with each other and with each other’s experience and ideas, and allowed them to ‘broadcast’ their (relatively coordinated) program to a much larger and more geographically diverse audience than ever before had been possible” (Edwards, *Printing*, pp. 11, 37, 172, 7). By 1520 some 30 publications had appeared from Luther’s pen, with estimated sales of 600,000 copies. Twenty percent of the pamphlets published in Germany between 1500 and 1530 bore his name. Edwards argues that the impact of these writings was limited, however, by selective publication of titles in specific areas. Further research will extend Edwards’s own study of Strasbourg printing. Robert W. Scribner has laid groundwork for further investigation of the communication of Luther’s thought to the German public with his assessment of how popular propaganda by and about Luther was constructed. Scribner examines visual images, such as Luther as monk, teacher, and man of the Bible, in addition to the oral and written/printed word, showing how Luther met and capitalized on the apocalyptic longings of the age.

These printed media appeared in the midst of a political and legal process launched by Roman Catholic officials in Germany and Rome soon after the *Ninety-Five Theses* were published. Pressure was put upon the German Augustinians to discipline the rebellious monk. Staupitz invited him to address the order’s Reform Congregation in Heidelberg in April 1518. Instead of treating the ecclesiastical-
political issues at hand, Luther advanced his “theology of the Cross.” Contrasting it with medieval “theologies of glory,” which glorified human reason and good works, he grounded theology upon Paul’s “word of the Cross” (1 Corinthians 1: 18–2: 15). The term vanished from Luther’s vocabulary; its principles remained lifelong presuppositions. His Heidelberg Theses distinguished the “hidden God” (Deus absconditus) (God beyond human ability to grasp or as he is shaped by human imagination) from “God revealed” (Deus revelatus) in Christ and Scripture. Access to God comes not through human paths to knowledge (signs or proofs and logic) but only through trust in his Word, which restores humanity by pronouncing the forgiveness of sins and new life. Forgiveness and new life rest upon God’s act of atonement through Christ’s death and resurrection. The Word brings upon sinners the judgment of God’s law (his plan and standard for evaluating life) and gives them the Gospel (the good news of his mercy delivered through Christ). Finally, Luther’s understanding of daily Christian living also followed Jesus’s command to take up the cross to follow him, in a life of self-sacrificial love. Discussion of the theology of the Cross begun by von Loewenich continues in works by Ngien, Forde (On Being a Theologian of the Cross), Schwarzwäller (Kreuz und Auferstehung), and others. The centrality of Christ remained a pillar of Luther’s thought throughout his life (see Lienhard and Siggins).

Luther’s own order did not discipline him. Dominican curial theologians in Rome, led by the Master of the Sacred Palace Silvester Mazzolini Prierias, charged Luther with heresy and pressed for citing him to Rome for trial. Luther’s prince, Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony, intervened. At the imperial diet in Augsburg in autumn 1518 Luther was summoned before papal legate Thomas de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, who refused to hear his argument for reform but simply demanded his recantation and submission to the pope. Luther fled Augsburg in fear that the popular association of his efforts with the Bohemian Jan Hus a century earlier would be realized in his being burned at the stake. Negotiations between papal diplomat Karl von Miltitz and Frederick over Luther’s fate came to naught.
Johann Eck, professor in Ingolstadt, challenged Luther’s Wittenberg colleague Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt to debate the Wittenberg reform program in Leipzig in June/July 1519. The topic was authority in the church. Drawing Luther into the debate, Eck led him to admit that he rejected the authority of popes and councils in favor of the sole authority of Scripture. Luther’s view of the papacy developed between 1517 and 1522 from ambivalence to the conviction that the institution of papal power was the Antichrist (Hendrix, Luther and the Papacy).

The list of words and word combinations under study:

to pledge – to make a serious or formal promise to give or do something
Psalm [saːm] – a holy poem or song, especially one of the 150 collected together in the Bible
Genesis – the first book of the Bible, which describes how God made the world
adherence [ədˈhɑːrəns] – the fact of someone behaving exactly according to rules
exegesis [ek.sɪˈdʒiːsɪs] – an explanation of a text, especially from the Bible, after its careful study
hermeneutic [hɜːməˈnjuːtɪk] – relating to the meaning of texts and the ways in which they are understood
inquiry [ɪnˈkwaɪrɪ] – a question that you ask when you want more information
sermons [ˈsɜːmən] – preaching
prominence [ˈprɒmɪnəns] – the state of being easily seen or well known
penance – an act that shows that you feel sorry about something that you have done, sometimes for religious reasons
indulgence – an occasion when you allow someone or yourself to have something enjoyable, especially more than is good for you
repentance [rɪˈpentəns] – the fact of showing that you are sorry for something wrong that you have done
to disseminate – scatter
longing – a feeling of wanting something or someone very much
atonement – something that you do to show that you are sorry for something bad that you did

resurrection – the act of bringing something that had disappeared or ended back into use or existence

pillar – a strong column made of stone, metal, or wood that supports part of a building

diet – meeting

summon – order to appear

recantation – to announce in public that your past beliefs or statements were wrong and that you no longer agree with them

ambivalence – having two opposing feelings at the same time, or being uncertain about how you feel

Answer the following questions:

1. What did we learn from Luther’s early ages?
2. What did he change in the process of lecturing/preaching?
3. Why did he write his theses?
4. What was the significance of this publication?
5. Why was the printed word crucial in the early Reformation?
6. What was the impact of Luther’s writings?
7. What was the reaction of the Church to him?
8. What were his views?
9. What was the pillar of his thought?
10. What happened in 1518?
11. Why did Luther flee Augsburg?
12. What happened during the debate of the Wittenberg reform program?
13. What was Luther’s view of the papacy?
Text 3: John Calvin

July 10, 1509 Noyon, Picardy, France
May 27, 1564 Geneva, Switzerland
Theologian, religious leader

John Calvin was perhaps the most influential of all leaders of the Protestant Reformation, a movement to reform the Roman Catholic Church in Europe. He was involved in reform efforts at the same time as Martin Luther (1483–1546), the German priest who initiated the Reformation, but Calvin was twenty-six years younger than Luther. The two men developed some important theological differences. Significantly, Calvin’s stern, “puritanical” interpretations of Christianity brought a renewed vigor to the Protestant Reformation, a religious reform movement within the Roman Catholic Church initiated by Luther in the early sixteenth century. Calvin established a distinct form of Protestantism – called “Calvinism” – at his base in Geneva, Switzerland. Calvinism proved to be adaptable to the current social and political changes in European society. Under his tireless direction, Geneva became the cosmopolitan focus of an effective and far-reaching evangelism (personal commitment to the teachings of Jesus Christ, founder of Christianity) to which many Protestant churches today owe their birth.

A. John Calvin was born Jean Cauvin in Noyon, France, on July 10, 1509. His father, Gérard Cauvin, was an ambitious lawyer who worked for the local bishop. His mother, Jeanne Lefranc, was the daughter of a fairly well-to-do innkeeper. Calvin received his early education in Noyon until 1523, when he was awarded a benefice (church office in which income is used for education). He enrolled at the University of Paris, which was then the main center for the study of theology (religious doctrines and practices) in Europe. Calvin remained at Paris for five years with the intention of entering the priesthood, but in 1528 his father ordered him to switch his emphasis from theology to law. The reason for this was probably a matter of practicality, as more money could be made in the law than in the priesthood. Calvin obeyed his father’s order and left Paris to study first at the
University of Orléans, and later in Brouges, both located in France. Although he had already developed a passion for theology, Calvin embraced the study of law.

In 1532 Calvin published his first book, an edition of De clementia by the Roman political leader and philosopher Seneca (c. 4 B.C.–A.D. 65), which demonstrated his potential as an intellectual, and indicated a bright career. The death of his father earlier that year changed his life drastically and caused him to return to Paris. Calvin was now free to indulge his humanist and theological interests. (Humanism was the study of ancient Greek and Roman literature and language as well as early biblical texts, with the purpose of exploring the human capacity for achievement and improvement. Humanism was based on rhetoric, or effective speaking and writing, which provided momentum for the Renaissance.)

He studied with several royal lecturers who introduced new humanistic ideas and disciplines into the intellectual community. Calvin, who already displayed a distinct moral uprightness, began to examine his own religious beliefs more fully. Despite being a Catholic, he accepted the Protestant doctrine emphasizing the omnipotence (supreme, unlimited power and presence) of God and felt a personal challenge to be an instrument of God’s will.

B. Calvin’s first significant publication was Commentary on Seneca’s “De clementia,” in which he expanded on the work of Dutch humanist and scholar Desidius Erasmus (1466 – 1536), who was influencing religious thought throughout Europe. Calvin’s work displayed both his fluency in Latin and his ability to use Greek sources. He was clearly well educated in the classic traditions and the work of contemporary humanist commentators. In the intellectual community of the time, a dialogue had been ongoing between the humanists and scholastics. (Scholastics were scholars who followed a method developed in the Middle Ages, which sought to integrate Christian faith with the philosophy of reason found in the works of such ancient philosophers as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle). Calvin’s writing shows that he was a firm humanist rhetorician.

During this time, under circumstances which are still unknown, Calvin converted to Protestantism and began openly associating with other Protestants in
and around Paris. Late in 1533 there was a general crackdown by the royal government on all Protestants, causing Calvin to flee Paris.

He left France altogether in 1534 and traveled under the assumed name Martianus Lucianius. He settled in Basel, Switzerland, and spent the next two years in private study, reading the works of Luther and Augustine (354–430), a founding father of the Catholic Church and an important early theologian. Calvin also met a number of men who shared his theological beliefs, giving him a sense of belonging to a community. In 1536 he published the first edition of his major work, Christianae religionis institutio (Institutes of the Christian Religion). The book explained the essentials of the Christian faith from a Protestant perspective for common readers, not theologians. He used basic language and avoided scholastic terms and traditions, hoping to gain favor for his new vision of the Christian faith. Institutes, which stated the essentials of Calvinist thought, gave Protestant theology a much-needed expression. It became the single most widely read and influential work of theology published in the Reformation period. Institutes marked Calvin as a religious leader of significance and authority. No Roman Catholic work of theology reached such a large audience, and Calvin spent much of the rest of his life revising, translating, and expanding the book. Final versions appeared in Latin in 1559 and in French in 1560.

C. Due to the popularity of the Institutes and the strength of its theological ideas, Calvin was invited by the French reformer Guillaume Farel (1489–1565) to become a lecturer in Geneva in 1536. In June of that year Farel convinced Calvin that it was his duty to God to remain in Geneva. Farel claimed that it was God’s will for Calvin to stay in Geneva to help expel the remaining elements of Catholicism from the area. The city had recently won its independence from the Catholic Church and Farel saw an opportunity to gain support for Calvin’s brand of Christianity. Despite his dislike for the city and its politics, Calvin would focus most of his ministry on Geneva for the rest of his life. Together Farel and Calvin directed the Reformation in the city, hoping to fully establish Protestantism as part of a total moral reform and to eliminate the lack of discipline associated with
Catholicism. However, within a couple of years both men were expelled because of their moral strictness and their encouragement of French immigration into the city. Calvin was not bothered by the expulsion, feeling that it simply meant freedom from the burden of politics and ministry. He went on to Strassburg, France, where he taught at an academy, preached, and developed his ideas on the nature of the ideal Christian church.

In August 1540, upon the urging of friends in Strassburg, Calvin married Idelette Bure, the widow of one of his converts. Bure already had a son and a daughter from her previous marriage, the only child she had with Calvin died shortly after birth in 1542. Bure died seven years later, and Calvin never remarried. Little is known of their life together, though Calvin’s relations with women were not entirely warm. Due to his outspoken criticism, most of his vocal opponents were women.

D. In 1541 Calvin reluctantly returned to Geneva in response to a call from the now floundering Protestant church. He was assured that he would be given the freedom he felt was necessary to build God’s earthly kingdom. He soon organized the local church government outlined in his work titled Ecclesiastical Ordinances (1545). He began to develop a well-regulated social network within a morally disciplined society. Despite considerable opposition within the city, Calvin’s influence grew steadily. He defeated theological and political opponents alike. Calvin overcame most remaining opposition to his plans and in 1555 his group called the Consistory, which acted as a sort of moral court, was accepted and given great powers by the city. From that point on moral discipline was strictly enforced in Geneva. Taverns were closed and replaced with abbayes in which patrons were closely watched for signs of excessive drinking and rowdy behavior. Throughout Geneva, citizens monitored one another’s conduct, ready to report any sort of wrongdoing. A strict moral order, based on Calvin’s particular vision of Christianity, eventually emerged in the city. Calvin associated himself with godliness and truth in every battle, religious or otherwise. Thus, for him, to tolerate opposition of any kind was to tolerate evil. Though Calvin was particularly
enthusiastic in enforcing his will, it must be remembered that he was not entirely unlike his sixteenth-century contemporaries in their intolerance of dissent.

Constantly preaching and writing, Calvin involved himself in all aspects of civic affairs in Geneva, including education, trade, diplomacy, and even sanitation. In 1559 he established the Genevan Academy (now the University of Geneva) for the training of clergy. Calvin was also interested in the spread of the Reformation movement abroad, especially within his native France. Under his direction Geneva became a haven for persecuted Protestants and the unofficial center of growing Protestant movements in places as far removed as Scotland. Calvin’s constant activity was a major factor in his failing health. In 1558 he had suffered an attack of pleurisy (disease of the lungs), and later, after delivering a sermon, began to cough blood. By 1563 he was effectively bedridden. Yet Calvin remained true to his moral standards and dutifully bound to his ethic of hard work, determined to continue his mission in whatever manner possible. On May 27, 1564, he died of pulmonary tuberculosis (severe lung disease).

The list of words and word combinations under study:

- stern – severe, or showing disapproval
- vigor – strength, energy, or enthusiasm
- bishop – a priest of high rank
- to indulge – to allow yourself or another person to have something enjoyable, especially more than is good for you
- momentum – the force that keeps an object moving or keeps an event developing after it has started
- uprightness – the quality of being honest, responsible, and moral
- ongoing – continuing to exist or develop, or happening at the present moment
- crackdown – a situation in which someone starts to deal with bad or illegal behaviour in a more severe way
- convert – someone who changes their beliefs, habits, or way of living
outspoken – expressing strong opinions very directly without worrying if other people are offended

to flounder – experience great difficulties

Consistory [ˈkɒnsɪstəri] – церковный суд
dissent – disagreement

sanitation – the systems for taking dirty water and other waste products away from buildings in order to protect people’s health

bedridden – having to stay in bed because of illness or injury

Match the parts (A-D) with the headings (1-4):

1. Embraces humanism
2. Calvin returns to Geneva
3. Accepts Protestantism
4. Establishes reform center

Answer the following questions:

1. Where was a new form of Protestantism initiated?
2. What became of Geneva? How do you understand this?
3. What was said about his parents?
4. What was mentioned about his education?
5. What event changed his life dramatically? When did it happen? What did he do?
6. What is humanism?
7. What did he choose to do?
8. What do you think about his decision to follow his father’s instructions?
9. What was said about his first book? When was it published?
10. What was said about scholastics?
11. How do you understand ‘humanist rhetorician’?
12. Why did Calvin leave Paris?
13. What was his assumed name? Why?
14. What did he do in Switzerland?
15. Who was Augustine?
16. Why was the first edition of his major work important?
17. What impact did the book have during this period?
18. When did the final version appear?
19. How did he spend much of the rest of his life?
20. Who did he meet in Geneva?
21. What was God’s will?
22. What did they hope to establish in Geneva?
23. Why was he expelled?
24. Where did he go after it? What did he do there?
25. What was said about his wife?
26. Why did he have bad relations with women?
27. Why and when did he return to Geneva?
28. What is “Ecclesiastical Ordinances”?
29. What changes had appeared in Geneva after his return?
30. What do you think about citizens monitoring one another?
31. How and when did he die?

**Text 4: Italian Wars (1494–1559)**

A series of sharp but also intermittent conflicts broke out over control of Italy at the close of the Italian Renaissance, shattering the peninsular balance of power system achieved in the Peace of Lodi (1454). The main antagonists were no longer Italy’s city-states, but two rival dynasties: the Valois of France and the Habsburgs of Austria and Spain. Northern Italy – occupied by small and fractious states – was vital to Habsburg security, and secondarily to their control of Burgundy and the Netherlands: it was both a base for the strategic Spanish Road and a recruitment area for reinforcements for the Army of Flanders. Open warfare began when France’s young king, Charles VIII (1470 – 1498), invaded Italy in 1494 with an army of 25,000, including a cohort of Swiss mercenaries. With a siege train of 40 smaller and mid-sized mobile cannon he blasted through and captured, in just days, fortified towns that had stood against prior sieges for months or in some cases for years. His powerful artillery astonished Italian observers, including Machiavelli. The French penetrated as far south as Naples, entering the city in February 1495.
That provoked formation of an anti-French coalition (“Holy League”) comprised of Spain, the Holy Roman Emperor, the pope, Milan, and Venice. But Charles won at Seminara in June and still held Naples. Under Louis XII, in 1499 the French took Genoa and seized Milan, where they deposed the Sforzas (1499). A brief respite from fighting resulted from the Peace of Trent (1501) between Louis XII and Ferdinand II of Spain, who agreed to partition Naples but leave the French in occupation of northern Italy. A quarrel soon broke out over details of the Milanese partition and the war resumed in 1502. The Battle of Barletta (1502) was indecisive, but the Spanish won definitively at the Garigliano River (1503), where French and Swiss troops suffered sharp reverses at the hands of the new Spanish tercios (troop in Spanish), even though French artillery sometimes ripped bloody lanes in the Spanish ranks. France accepted the permanent loss of Naples to Ferdinand of Aragon in the Treaties of Blois (1504–1505), in return for confirmation of French control of Milan. In 1508, Pope Julius II (1443–1513) arranged an aggressive alliance, the League of Cambrai, nominally aimed at the Ottomans but in fact intended to reduce or at least contain Venice. That city-state had taken advantage of the chaos in the peninsula engendered by the Italian Wars to expand its holdings within Italy, not least at papal expense. The Venetians were bested by a French army at Agnadello (May 14, 1509). Meanwhile, armies and populations alike were decimated by epidemics of syphilis and typhus directly related to the spread of fighting, and therefore of infected soldiers, flowing from the Italian Wars. Syphilis notably infected the ruling House of Valois in France, and spread as well into the harems and blood streams of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, weakening both royal families.

French success broke up the League of Cambrai, as Venice appeased the pope and emperor with fresh concessions. The renowned army of the Swiss Confederation then intervened, taking Milan from the French in 1512. At Ravenna (April 11, 1512), the French destroyed a sizeable Spanish army, but at Novara (1513) the Swiss routed the French to take control of Lombardy. The young French king, Francis I, crushed the Swiss at Marignano (1515), regaining Milan and most
of Lombardy for France. The Peace of Noyon (1516) essentially partitioned Italy between France and Spain until a vigorous young Emperor, Charles V, united all Habsburg power in a single pair of hands in 1519. Fighting recommenced in 1521. Francis was defeated at La Bicocca (April 22, 1522), and trounced and taken captive at Pavia (February 23 – 24, 1525). That forced him to sign the Treaty of Madrid renouncing French claims in Italy. Francis denounced this coerced concession once he was ransomed and set free. He assembled an anti-Habsburg alliance, the “League of Cognac”, that included England, Florence, Venice, and the Papal States. Charles responded to the pope’s perfidy by sending an army to take Rome, which it did with real ferocity, running amok there in May 1527. Francis besieged Naples but could not take the city. In September 1529, Charles and the Austrians were briefly distracted by the first Ottoman siege of Vienna. This may have been coordinated in secret with Francis to draw the Emperor east. If so, the plan failed: Charles stayed in the west and forced France to terms in the Treaty of Cambrai (1529), which reconfirmed renunciation of French claims to territory in northern Italy.

War between the Valois and Habsburgs over control of Italy resumed from 1542 to 1544. Battles, such as the French victory at Ceresole (April 14, 1544), were indecisive: neither victory nor defeat led to permanent political change. In any case, France was militarily incapable of matching its Habsburg enemies or displacing them by force from north Italy. A final try to push back the French frontier in the south came in 1556 – 1557. At St. Quentin (August 10, 1557) the French lost 14,000 men out of a 26,000-man army and Coligny and Montmorency were both captured. This time the defeat was complete: the supremacy of Philip II and the Habsburgs in Italy was codified in the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559). It was then sanctified by royal marriages between and among the various warring houses. The end of the Italian Wars and the start of the French Civil Wars (1562 – 1629) then together opened the door to the Spanish effort to crush rebellion in the Netherlands during the Eighty Years’ War (1568 – 1648).
The list of words and word combinations under study:

intermittent – not happening regularly or continuously; stopping and starting repeatedly or with periods in between


to shatter – to shake
to partition – to divide
reverse – a defeat or failure
to engender – to start
to bestead /ˈbiːsted/ – to surround
to decimated – to kill a large number of something, or to reduce something severely
typhus /ˈtaɪfəs/ – сыпной тиф
appeased – calm
concession – something that is allowed or given up, often in order to end a disagreement, or the act of allowing or giving this
to rout /ˈraʊt/ – to defeat an enemy completely and force them to run away
to trounce /ˈtraʊns/ – to defeat a competitor by a large amount
to renounce – to refuse
perfidy /ˈpɜː.ʃə.di/ – behaviour that is not loyal, treason
ferocity – fierceness
to run amok – to be out of control and act in a wild or dangerous manner
supremacy – superiority
to codify – to arrange something, such as laws or rules, into a system
to sanctify – to make something socially or officially acceptable

Answer the following questions:
1. When did the conflicts break out?
2. Who was the main antagonists?
3. What was said about Northern Italy?
4. When and how did open warfare begin?
5. When did the French enter Naples?
6. What was “Holy League”?
7. What happened in 1501?
8. When and why did the war resume?
9. What happened at the Garigliano River?
10. What were the terms of the Treaties of Blois?
11. Why was the League of Cambrai formed and by whom?
12. What was said about Venice?
13. What weakened royal families? And how did it start?
14. Why did the League of Cambrai break up?
15. What was said about Francis I?
16. Why did he form the League of Cognac?
17. What did Charles do?
18. What were the terms of the Treaty of Cambrai?
19. What were the outcomes of the Italian Wars?

**Text 5: Martin Luther**

November 10, 1483 Eisleben, Germany
February 18, 1546 Eiselben, Germany

Scholar, professor, writer, religious reformer

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were a time of transition from the Middle Ages (c. 400 –1400; also called the medieval period) to the modern era. Throughout the Middle Ages the Roman Catholic Church (a Christian religion headed by a pope and based in Rome, Italy) controlled all aspects of social, political, and religious life. It was the largest institution (complex organization) in western Europe and consisted of an elaborate hierarchy (ranks of officials) – the pope, cardinals (officials ranking below the pope), bishops (heads of church districts), canons (legal administrators), priests (heads of local churches), and numerous other clergymen. The pope was considered infallible (always correct), and he was the most powerful ruler in Europe. The Catholic Church was also
immensely wealthy, owning vast properties and collecting huge sums in taxes, tithes (one-tenth of income), and other forms of payment from the people.

Beginning in the fifteenth century, the medieval view of the world underwent radical change. Renaissance humanists (scholars who revived the literary culture of ancient Greece and Rome) had freed scholarship and the arts from the sponsorship of the church. In so doing, humanists not only rediscovered the individual but also challenged the blind acceptance of authority and encouraged the individual search for truth through reason. Now people were seeking a better way to understand God in terms of their own experience. Into this changing world was born Martin Luther. Now known as the father of the Protestant Reformation, Luther was a German priest who singlehandedly altered the course of European history.

A. Martin Luther was born at Eisleben in Saxony (a duchy in northwest Germany) on November 10, 1483, the son of Hans and Margaret Luther. His parents were of peasant stock, but his father had worked hard to raise the family’s social status. Hans Luther began his career as a miner, then became the owner of several small mines that brought the family a fair degree of financial comfort. This process took nearly a decade, however, and life for the nine Luther children (five boys and four girls) was sometimes difficult. Young Martin was severely beaten by both his mother and his father for relatively minor offenses. This type of discipline was common at the time. In 1490 Martin was sent to the Latin school at Mansfeld, Germany. Seven years later he was sent to a better school in Magdeburg, Germany. In 1498, after he had shown academic excellence, he enrolled in a school located in Eisenach, Germany. Here he met Johann Braun, a dedicated cleric who became his role model.

Luther’s early education was typical of late-fifteenth century practices. To a young man in his circumstances, only the law and the church offered likely avenues to success. His parents believed that the financial success of their children would guarantee them, the elder Luthers, comfort in their old age. Hans Luther had a dislike for the priesthood, a feeling that probably influenced his decision that Martin should be a lawyer. In 1501 Martin enrolled at the University of Erfurt, one
of the oldest and most prestigious universities in Germany. Within four years he earned both bachelor’s and master’s degrees. In 1505 he had just begun the study of law and was on his way to a career in service to the church or to one of the many German princes (rulers of states). Then he abruptly abandoned the university for the disciplined life of a monastery (house for men in a religious order). This dramatic change occurred on July 2, 1505, while Luther was returning to the university from a visit with his parents. Along the way he was suddenly caught in a thunderstorm. As lightning struck nearby, he cried out in terror to his patron saint: “Save me, Saint Anne, and I will become a monk.” Just two weeks later, Luther joined the Eremites of Saint Augustine (a religious order) in Erfurt. He was ordained a priest within a year.

Luther was no ordinary monk, for he was deeply troubled by the teachings of the church. Since the early Middle Ages, Catholic leaders had taught that the church was the only link between the individual and God. The church provided salvation (deliverance from sin, or wrongdoing) to repentant sinners through the sacraments (holy rituals), most notably communion (also called the Holy Eucharist). Administered in a ceremony called the mass, communion is a ritual in which bread and wine symbolize the body and blood of Jesus of Nazareth (called Christ), the founder of Christianity. Also, the church taught that the individual had a duty to use his or her own free will (ability to make independent choices) to love and serve God. This was the way to earn salvation from God. In short, the individual participated in his or her own salvation through good deeds. Such teachings brought comfort to many, but they caused distress for Luther. His problem was that no matter how hard he “worked” at earning his salvation, he could not find any peace with God.

Luther found the answer to his spiritual problem sometime during the fall of 1515. By then he was a professor of theology (study of religion) at the University of Wittenberg and in charge eleven monasteries. The answer came while he was preparing a series of lectures in his study in a tower of the monastery. He was pondering the meaning of verse 17 in chapter 1 of the book of Romans in the New
Testament (second part of the Bible, the Christian holy book): “For it is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, The just shall live by faith.” In that little verse was contained the heart of Luther’s problem, as well as the solution. He was perplexed by the two phrases, “the righteousness of God” and “The just shall live by faith.” In accordance with church teachings, Luther understood “the righteousness of God” to mean that a righteous, even angry, God punishes all sinners. Such a view caused him to hate the God he knew he should love. Then, as Luther meditated over the verse, he realized that a morally upright person gains salvation through faith in God alone, and not through the interpretations of the Scriptures that were enforced by church officials. Luther’s idea came to be known as justification of faith.

B. Luther had made a revolutionary discovery – that salvation comes through faith alone. He then reached an even more startling conclusion. This truth is revealed in the Bible, not through the mass and other sacraments (holy rites) administered by priests. Therefore, all of the clergy, from the pope down to the parish priest, were unnecessary. Luther did not immediately challenge the church with this discovery. What spurred him to action was the appearance, in 1517, of a monk peddling indulgences (payments to church officials for forgiveness of sins; see accompanying box) outside Wittenberg. The monk was selling indulgences on behalf of the new archbishop of Mainz, twenty-three-year-old Albert von Hohenzollern, who had “purchased” his position. To pay back the funds he borrowed from the Fugger bank in Augsburg to finance the purchase, Albert was authorized by Pope Leo X (1475–1521; reigned 1513–21) to sell indulgences in Germany.

The abuse of the indulgence system was evident in the aggressive sales tactics of John Tetzel (1465–1519), an experienced indulgence salesman who appeared outside Luther’s door in October 1517. Tetzel was selling indulgences to finance the new Saint Peter’s Basilica, which was under construction in Rome. He claimed that indulgences could be purchased for relatives already dead, or for sins one
might commit in the future. “As soon as the coin in the coffer rings,” Tetzel said, “the soul from purgatory springs.”

C. Luther felt impelled to respond to the obvious misuse of indulgences. According to popular legend, on October 31, 1517 (the eve of All Saints’ Day; now called Halloween), Luther defiantly nailed a document titled “Ninety-Five Theses or Disputation on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences” to the door of the church at the University of Wittenberg. Some scholars downplay the drama of this act, suggesting that Luther simply tacked the “Ninety-Five Theses” to the church door, which served as a kind of bulletin board at the university. Others say he attached the theses to the letter he wrote to the archbishop of Mainz, protesting the sale of indulgences. In any case, he intended the document as an invitation to his colleagues to debate the issue.

Most modern scholars agree that Luther never intended to begin a widespread reform movement within the Catholic Church. He merely wanted to spark academic debate about a serious issue. Initially, his protest fell on deaf ears, since the archbishop of Mainz was sharing the profits of indulgence sales with the pope. Had someone not translated the “Ninety-Five Theses” from Latin (the language used in all formal communications) into German, they might have gone unnoticed. With the aid of the recently invented printing press, the translation appeared throughout Germany. The theses were thus made available to theologians, scholars, and anyone else who could read German.

D. Although Luther had directly challenged the authority of the pope, Leo X did not move immediately to silence him. In 1519 Luther attended a debate at the University of Leipzig. The debate raged on for eighteen days before it was called off. Luther had defended his beliefs by stating that people should live their lives by following the Bible, not the pope. He said people could find their own salvation through faith – they did not need the church. Luther began writing his views in pamphlets, and his ideas soon spread throughout Germany. Many people backed him. In June 1520 Leo X issued a bull (papal order) criticizing Luther and excommunicating (expelling) him from the church. When Luther received this
document, he publicly burned it. The following April, Luther was summoned to the town of Worms, where an assembly of German princes (called the Diet) had been convened by the new Holy Roman Emperor, nineteen-year-old Charles V (1500–1558; ruled 1519–56). The Diet wanted Luther to withdraw his views. He refused, so Charles declared him an outlaw of the church and ordered his arrest. But Frederick the Wise (1463–1525), Luther’s friend and the prince who ruled Wittenberg, kidnapped Luther and hid him in Wartburg Castle, one of Frederick’s residences near Eisenach. There, over the next eleven months, Luther spent his time translating the New Testament from Latin into German.

Returning to Wittenberg in March 1522, Luther tried to unify his followers. By then, almost half the people of Germany had adopted his views. Many called themselves “Lutherans” (only later did the reformers come to be known as Protestants). Yet the movement began to fragment almost immediately. The Bible may be the final authority, but according to Luther every believer is his own priest, his own interpreter of what the Bible says. As a result of Luther’s view, numerous Protestant sects (groups) were formed – and they are still being formed. In 1525 Luther married Katherine von Bora (1499–1552), a former nun (a woman who belongs to a religious order). They had six children, some of whom died early, and adopted eleven others. By all accounts, their home was a happy one. Luther called his wife “my beloved Katie,” and she was a great source of strength for him.

E. All that happened after the Diet of Worms was anticlimactic. Luther tried to halt the extreme views of some of his followers. But fragmentation, not unity, was to characterize the future of the Protestant churches. In 1530 Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), Luther’s closest associate, drafted a confession (statement) of faith. Both he and Luther hoped it might provide a basis for unity between the Lutherans and the Roman Catholic Church. Rejected by the Diet of Augsburg, Melanchthon’s confession, called the “Augsburg Confession,” became the basis for the doctrine (beliefs and teachings) of Lutheran churches. Luther introduced numerous reforms in the worship service. He placed an emphasis on preaching and teaching from the Bible, and he reintroduced music and congregational singing. A fine musician,
Luther wrote many popular hymns, including A Mighty Fortress Is Our God and Away in a Manger. Throughout the remaining years of his life, Luther continued writing, preaching, and teaching. He died on February 18, 1546, four days after he had preached in Eisleben, his hometown. He was buried on the grounds of the church in Wittenberg.

Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.

Match the parts (A-E) with the headings (1-5):

1. Called before Diet of Worms  
2. “Save me, Saint Anne”  
3. Protestants fall into disunity  
4. Posts theses at Wittenberg  
5. Makes revolutionary discovery

Text 6: Niccolò Machiavelli

May 3, 1469 Florence, Italy  
May 22, 1527 Florence, Italy  
Statesman, author

The Italian author and statesman Niccolò Machiavelli is best known as the author of The Prince (Il principe), in which he described how a ruler must do whatever is necessary to stay in power. Over the centuries Machiavelli became famous as a sinister and ruthless politician because of this philosophy. Many historians suggest that this reputation is largely undeserved. They point out that Machiavelli lived by his own ideals as a loyal and self-sacrificing servant of government. Furthermore, he never suggested that the political dealings of princes should be a model for day-to-day interactions among ordinary citizens.

Niccolò Machiavelli was born into an aristocratic family in Florence, Italy. Though the Machiavellis came from the upper class, they were by no means wealthy. Little is known about the first half of Machiavelli’s life prior to his first appointment to public office. His writings show, however, that he was well educated in the classics (works by ancient Greek and Roman writers). Scholars believe he probably knew these works in translations from the original Greek and
Latin into his native Italian. They also theorize that his father, who was a lawyer, had connections in the city that enabled young Machiavelli to meet the important Florentine humanists and literary figures of the time. (Humanists were scholars that promoted the human-centered literary and intellectual movement based on the revival of classical culture that started the Renaissance.) The few known facts of Machiavelli’s early life include his friendship with Giulianio de’ Medici (1479–1516), brother of the duke of Florence, Lorenzo de’ Medici (1449–1492).

A. In 1498 Machiavelli was named chancellor (head) and secretary of the second chancellery (administrative council) of the Florentine Republic. (A republic is a form of government that is run by representatives of the people and based on a constitution, a document that specifies the rights of citizens and laws of the state.) His duties consisted chiefly of executing the policy decisions of others, conducting diplomatic correspondence, reading and composing reports, and compiling minutes (written records of meetings.) He also undertook some twenty-three missions to states under Florentine rule. He was sent to Pisa, which had rebelled against Florence in 1494, and to the courts of rulers in the unstable Romagna region of north-central Italy. He was twice sent to Imola and Cesena, which were under the leadership of the ruthless military and political leader Cesare Borgia (c. 1475–1507).

In 1503, while on one of these missions, Machiavelli wrote a report titled “Description of the Manner Employed by Duke Valentino [Cesare Borgia] in Slaying Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, Signor Pagolo and the Duke of Gravina, Orsini,” in which he detailed a series of political murders ordered by Borgia. Machiavelli’s later writings reveal that encounters with Borgia made a particularly vivid impression on him. His reports to the Florentine government sometimes caused controversy because he did not hesitate to express his own opinions instead of just presenting the facts of his meetings. Examples include his support of an alliance between Florence and the Borgias and his criticism of the Florentine Republic’s lack of a local military force. Despite, or perhaps as a result of, his direct approach, Machiavelli won the confidence of Piero Soderini, who was
elected gonfalonier (head political leader) of Florence in 1502. With Soderini’s support, and against the objections of the upper-class families, Machiavelli planned and trained a militia (citizens’ army) that played an important role in the reconquest of Pisa in 1509. Also of note from this period were his four diplomatic trips to the French court and two to the court of Rome. In 1502 he married Marietta Corsini, with whom he had four sons and two daughters.

In August 1512 a Spanish army entered Tuscany and raided Prato, a town in the Florentine Republic. Machiavelli’s army was no match for the invading forces. Soderini was removed from office and the Medici family was returned to power. (The Medicis had been forced out of Florence when Soderini was elected to office.) The Lorenzo Medici’s son, also named Lorenzo and known as Lorenzo the Younger, assumed command of the regime in Florence. On November 7 Machiavelli was dismissed from his post because he had collaborated with Soderini. Machiavelli was ordered to pay a heavy fine and forbidden to travel outside Florentine areas for a full year. The worst came in February 1513, when he was arrested for suspected involvement in a plot against the Medicis. Although there was no evidence that he was involved, he was imprisoned and tortured by Medici supporters who tried to gain incriminating information from him. Machiavelli begged for help from Giuliano de’Medici in a pair of sonnets (type of Italian poetry). Machiavelli was released in March, not through the efforts of Giuliano, but because of a general amnesty (freedom from arrest or criminal charges) declared in celebration of the election of Guiliano’s brother, Giovanni (1475–1521), as Pope Leo X (reigned 1513–21). The pope is the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church. At that time the pope not only controlled the church but he also had great political power.

B. Machiavelli’s diplomatic career was now finished. He spent much of the next few years in seclusion at his family’s country home at Sant’Andrea in Percussina, a few miles south of Florence. His major contact with the outside world was Francesco Vettori, a longtime friend and Florentine diplomat who had been appointed ambassador to the papal (pope’s) court. From their correspondence came
many of the themes of The Prince, which Machiavelli wrote in the second half of 1513. (Many scholars believe the text was significantly changed and expanded in either 1515 to 1516 or 1518.) In 1513 and 1514 he hoped that The Prince might find favor with the Medicis and pave the way for his return to political service. Perhaps in an effort to promote his case, Machiavelli first dedicated, or “addressed,” the work to Lorenzo the Younger in August 1513. Despite these efforts, the Medicis made clear in early 1515 that they had no intention of employing Machiavelli.

Prior to beginning work on The Prince Machiavelli had been writing Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius, which he finished in 1517. Certain passages in this work set forth Machiavelli’s quarrel with the church. Here he claimed that the corrupt papal court in Rome had set a bad example and caused Italy to lose its devotion and religion. The Italian states were weak and divided, Machiavelli wrote, because the church was too feeble politically to dominate them, but prevented any one state from uniting them. He suggested that the church might have been completely destroyed by its own corruption had not the Italian priest Saint Francis of Assisi (c.1181–1226) and the Spanish preacher Saint Dominic (c.1170–1221) restored it to its original spiritual principles by founding new orders (organizations for religious men and women). Machiavelli’s other works include The Art of War and the Life of Castruccio Castracani (1520); three plays, The Mandrake (1518), Clizia (c. 1525), and Andria (date uncertain); History of Florence (1526); a short story, Belfagor (date uncertain); and several minor works in verse and prose.

In History of Florence Machiavelli told the story of the Florentine Republic from Lorenzo the Elder’s death in 1492 until 1526. Scholars consider it an advance over earlier histories because Machiavelli identified underlying social and political causes rather than merely reporting events. The work was also influential to Machiavelli’s political career because he wrote it under a contract from the University of Florence that was approved by Cardinal Giulio de’ Medici (1478–1534), soon to be Pope Clement VII (reigned 1523–34). Machiavelli dedicated the
work to the pope, perhaps for political reasons. Whether a conscience decision or not, the move worked and opened the door to other opportunities for occasional employment and minor public service, as well as to the publication of the Art of War in 1521. During these years Machiavelli and Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540), Papal Commissary of War in Lombardy, became friends and exchanged some memorable letters. In 1526 Machiavelli was commissioned by Pope Clement VII to inspect the fortifications of Florence. Later that year and in early 1527 Guicciardini employed him in two minor diplomatic missions. In 1527 the Florentines drove the Medicis out one last time and restored the republican constitution, which had been written in 1494 and disbanded 1512. Ironically, Machiavelli’s recent involvement with the Medicis made him suspect to the republicans, even though his writings gave the greatest support to republicanism during the Renaissance. Machiavelli died in Florence in 1527, receiving the last rites (ceremony performed upon a person’s death) of the church that he had bitterly criticized.

C. Machiavelli is now remembered for the contributions to political theory that he made in The Prince. He shared with Renaissance humanists a passion for the revival of ancient literary and spiritual values. To their efforts he added a fierce desire for political and moral renewal on the model of the Roman Republic as depicted by the Roman historians Livy (59 B.C.–A.D. 17) and Tacitus (c. A.D. 56–c. 120). Though a republican at heart, Machiavelli saw the need for a strong political and military leader who could forge a unified state in northern Italy to eliminate French and Spanish domination. Since 1494 France and Spain had been involved in a conflict called the Italian Wars (1494–1559) for control of Italy. When Machiavelli wrote The Prince he envisioned the possibility of a strong state while the restored Medicis ruled both Florence, under Lorenzo de’ Medici the Younger, and the papacy, under Pope Leo X. Machiavelli had admired Cesare Borgia’s energetic creation of a new state in Romagna in the few brief years while Borgia’s father, Pope Alexander VI (1431–1503; reigned 1492–1503), occupied the papal throne. The final chapter of The Prince is a ringing plea to the Medicis to set
Italy free from the French and Spanish “barbarians” (those who lack refinement and culture). It concludes with a quotation from the Italian poet Petrarch’s patriotic poem Italia mia (My Italy): “Virtue will take arms against fury, and the battle will be brief; for the ancient valor in Italian hearts is not yet dead.” His call fell on deaf ears in 1513 but was to play a role three centuries later.

Machiavelli wrote the twenty-six chapters of The Prince in a direct style, using examples from history and current political situations to explain his points. According to scholars, in this work Machiavelli was the first to define politics as a separate field. Up to that time political writers, from the ancients Plato and Aristotle to the fifteenth-century humanists, had treated politics as a branch of morals. This means that they wrote about political life being a mirror of moral life. How the individual person conducted his or her life was a smaller representation of how the society at large should be conducted. Machiavelli’s chief innovation was to break with this long tradition and to say that politics is separate from morality. In chapter fifteen of The Prince he wrote:

My intent being to write a useful work for those who understand, it seemed to me more appropriate to pursue the actual truth of the matter than the imagination of it. Many have imagined republics and principalities which were never seen or known really to exist; because how one lives is so far removed from how one ought to live that he who abandons what one does for what one ought to do, learns rather his own ruin than his preservation.

In other words, Machiavelli chose to describe the world as it is rather than as people were taught that it should be.

Central to Machiavelli’s view of history and politics are the concepts of fortuna (fortune) and virtù (virtue). Abandoning the Christian view of history as providential (that is, dictated by God or “providence”), Machiavelli interpreted events in purely human terms. Often it is fortune that gives, or terminates, a political leader’s opportunity for decisive action. Machiavelli said that Cesare Borgia, though a great politician, experienced an “extreme malignity of fortune” by falling ill just as his father died. What Machiavelli meant was that God did not
decide that the rule of the Borgias should come to an end and therefore caused Cesare to become ill at the time of his father’s death. Instead, Machiavelli argued, the Borgias were merely victims of random fortune. Machiavelli wrote that Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, and Theseus also received opportunities for leadership from fortune. In drawing comparisons among these religious and political figures, Machiavelli asserted that sacred (religious or biblical) history was influenced by the same forces as secular (nonreligious) history.

In some passages of The Prince Machiavelli seems to suggest that fortune itself hinges upon human actions and institutions: “I believe that the fortune which the Romans had would be enjoyed by all princes who proceeded as the Romans did and who were of the same virtue as they.” Like others during Renaissance, Machiavelli believed in the capacity of human beings to determine their own destiny. This was different from the medieval concept of an omnipotent, or almighty, divine will or the ancient Greek belief in a crushing fate. Machiavelli also claimed that virtù in politics, unlike Christian virtue (capacity for doing good), is an effective combination of force and shrewdness with a touch of greatness. Therefore, virtue is not a system of ethical behavior that is outlined in the Scriptures or determined by the church, but instead it is the result of a person’s own desire and actions, which then lead to greatness.

The main points of The Prince are found in chapter seventeen titled “On Cruelty and Clemency and Whether It Is Better To Be Loved or Feared,” and in chapter eighteen, “How Princes Should Keep Their Word.” As Machiavelli frequently says in other works as well, the natural badness of men requires that the prince instill fear rather than love in his subjects. Furthermore, when necessary the prince must break his pledge with other princes, who in any case will be no more honest than he. Moralistic critics of Machiavelli have sometimes forgotten that he was attempting to describe rather than to invent the rules of political success. For him the state is an organism, greater than the sum of its citizens and individual interests, which is subject to laws of growth and decay. He claimed that the health
of the state consists in unity, but even in the best of circumstances its longevity is limited.

The influence of The Prince on political developments in Europe, especially during the nineteenth century, cannot be overemphasized. Many of Machiavelli’s concepts formed the basis of nineteenth-century liberalism, a political philosophy that advocates change for the good of the state and its citizens. Among these concepts were the supremacy of civil over religious power, requiring men to serve in citizen armies, the preference for republican rather than monarchical government, the Roman republican ideals of honesty and hard work, and people’s ultimate responsibility to their community, not simply to themselves. The Prince remains one of the most important political writings of Western (non-Asian) civilization.

Explain the underlined words and word combinations in English.

Match the parts (A-C) with the headings (1-3):
1. Turns to writing
2. Defined field of politics
3. Political fortunes rise and fall

II. Listening

1. Luther and the Protestant Reformation (Prof. Rufus J. Fears’s lecture)

   Part 1. Answer the following questions:
   1. What did Christianity add to the idea of individuality?
   2. What belief did Christianity rest upon?
   3. What consequence did Christianity have for the Church?
   4. What proclamation was made by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302?
   5. What consequence did it bring?

   Part 2. What was said about:
   1. Luther and his background
   2. Grace and deeds
   3. Fundraising
   4. Debate
Part 3. Answer the following questions:
1. What did he say when he understood that he could be sentenced to death?
2. What did he want to do?
3. What happened in 1521 and why?
4. What are two premier issues of freedom?
5. What is his view and why?
6. What was his central element in his reformation?

Part 4. Answer the following questions:
1. What did he unleash?
2. What happened in 1524?
3. What was his reaction to this?
4. What did he believe?
5. What ideas did he abolish?
6. What are the two ideas spread by Luther?

2. New Modes and Orders: Machiavelli, The Prince (chaps. 1-12) (Prof. Steven Smith’s lecture)

Summarize the following chapters:
Chapter 1. Introduction: Video of The Third Man [00:00:00]
Chapter 2. Introduction: Who Was Machiavelli? [00:02:20]
Chapter 3. The Prince: Title and Dedication of the Book [00:15:33]
Chapter 4. The Distinction between Armed and Unarmed Prophets [00:21:52]
Chapter 5. Good and Evil, Virtue and Vice [00:26:10]

III. Quiz

Test 1:

Answer the following questions:
1. When and where did the Renaissance take place?
2. What happened when the plague spread across Europe?
3. What kind of people belonged to the new middle class?
4. Which city became the centre of the Renaissance in Italy?
5. Why could explorers travel longer distances?
6. Why was India and Asia so important to Europeans?
7. Which places did the Spanish explore and conquer?
8. How did Gutenberg change the lives of many Europeans?
9. What kind of books did people in Europe want to read?
10. What was humanism and how did it change the lives of the people?
11. What did Renaissance artists experiment with?
12. Which guilds were very important in Florence?
13. Which was the most famous family in Florence?

Test 2:

Multiple choice questions:

1. Renaissance is the French word for
   a. destruction  
   b. rebirth  
   c. the plague  
   d. middle class

2. Before the Renaissance merchants couldn’t sell their goods because
   a. the plague killed half of Europe.  
   b. cloth was too expensive  
   c. cloth was of bad quality  
   d. bankers didn’t give them any money

3. Portuguese navigators explored
   a. the southern part of Europe  
   b. the western part of Africa  
   c. North America  
   d. South America

4. What did traders bring back from Asia?
   a. new books  
   b. meat  
   c. gold and silver  
   d. spices and cloth

5. The “classics” are about
   a. Italian artists  
   b. French singers  
   c. Greek and Roman writers  
   d. German bookmakers

6. Martin Luther
a. thought the church should be changed  
b. became the first German pope  
c. was a priest in Italy  
d. liked what the church did  

7. The most powerful city of the Renaissance was  
a. Paris  
b. Rome  
c. Venice  
d. Florence  

8. Michelangelo studied painting and  
a. mechanics  
b. science  
c. literature  
d. sculpture  

9. The Medici were famous  
a. priests  
b. bankers  
c. artists  
d. traders  

10. Da Vinci’s *Last Supper* shows Jesus with  
a. his twelve apostles  
b. Maria  
c. God  
d. Holy Peter  

11. Perspective in art means to put  
a. all objects in the background  
b. large objects in the background  
c. small objects in the background  
d. small objects at the top  

12. People read a lot during the Renaissance because  
a. there was a lot of paper  
b. they had nothing else to do  
c. traders brought them home from India  
d. books became very cheap  

**Test 3:**

*Match the words on the left with the definitions on the right:*

| a. citizen | 1. a very big country controlled by a king or a queen |
| b. cloth | 2. it lets you jump out of an airplane and slows you down when you fall to the ground |
| c. empire | 3. the top part of a room |
| d. ivory | 4. an intelligent person who reads and writes a lot |
| e. printing press | 5. the special way of doing something |
| f. scholar |  |
The Renaissance was an age of _______________ in Europe. A new middle class ___________________ after the _______________ had killed millions of people. Many people became _____________ because they had more money to spend. They bought clothes made of valuable _____________ and paintings from well-known artists. They also read a lot because books were written in their own _______________ and not in Latin any more.

The cities became the centres of the Renaissance. They had famous _______________ who gave them much money. Bankers and _______________ were the wealthiest people during this time in history.

Explorers were able to _______________ longer distances with the help of boats that had sails. They also had better instruments and _____________. Many
explorers tried to find a route to India and other parts of Asia where they could buy ________________ and silk.

The ________________ in the Renaissance did not believe that much in religion and god. They thought that being rich and having money was more important. Martin Luther, a German ________________, wrote a list of things he didn’t like about the church and ________________ them on the door of his own church in Germany.

Artists found new ways of ________________ pictures. They experimented with ________________ and painted with realism. One of the most famous was Leonardo da Vinci, who also drew plans for new ________________ and tried to find out a lot about the human ________________.

IV. Supplementary Reading

The Peasants’ War

In the summer of 1524 on the southern fringes of the Black Forest near the River Rhine and the border with the Swiss Confederation, according to contemporary accounts, the Peasants’ War, which was to convulse the whole of southern and central Germany and the Austrian lands over the following two years, broke out. What grounds did contemporaries have for believing that localized unrest – a venerable tradition in the German southwest – would from mid-1524 onwards erupt into a war of liberation, transcending the particularity of feudal lordships to embrace overarching principles of Christian egalitarianism? Were the chroniclers simply writing with the benefit of hindsight? Might events in the southern Black Forest have taken a different turn? Are we even justified in speaking of a Peasants’ War at all before the onset of armed rebellion – manifest in the formation of regional peasant bands – further to the east throughout the length and breadth of Upper Swabia in the spring of 1525?

These are nagging questions because the chroniclers themselves chose to pick out the seemingly trivial and adventitious. All agreed that the inception of rebellion occurred in the landgraviate of Stühlingen, a territory largely (though not
exclusively) under the rule of the counts of Lupfen, at midsummer 1524, and several saw its trigger in the unconscionable insistence of the countess that the peasants during harvest-time should gather snail shells for her maidservants to wind yarn upon. This may be no more than a fairy tale, but the Stühlingers themselves subsequently set forth grievances of an equally bizarre nature: that they had been forced to gather roots, morels, juniper berries, and even barberries so that their lords could make barberry compôte. The sting, of course, lay in the very triviality of the task: how humiliating to have to perform such superfluous work to satisfy the self-indulgent whim of their overlords.

Yet the Stühlingers demanded to negotiate in the hope of redress; there was no initial recourse to arms. The judicial process dragged on (as it always does) through various fruitless meetings well into the autumn until the case was scheduled to be heard before the imperial court of chancery in April 1525, for which the Stühlingen subjects drew up a list of 62 articles in support of their demands. Amidst the welter of protests, negotiations, and accords which had stamped relations between lords and their subjects throughout so much of southern Germany during the preceding century – culminating in several instances in so-called treaties of lordship, in which both parties acted as signatories on an equal footing – what, if anything, made the revolt in the landgraviate of Stühlingen special? The short answer is that it threw up one of the most audacious, resolute, and militarily experienced commanders of the Peasants’ War, Hans Müller, a serf from the abbey of St. Blasien’s village of Bulgenbach, not far from Stühlingen, whose endeavors to raise the whole of the Black Forest and the Upper Rhine from the autumn of 1524 onwards (quite separately from the rebellion that engulfed Upper Swabia) were crowned by the capitulation of the Austrian stronghold of Freiburg im Breisgau in May 1525. The longer answer is that the Stühlingen revolt took place in a region of almost endemic military and political turmoil along the contested frontier with the Swiss. Into these already troubled waters there dropped the depth-charge of the communal Reforming doctrines emanating from Zwingli’s headquarters in Zürich, or more especially from his radical acolytes in the countryside and neighboring territories.
For decades the example of the “free” or republican Swiss cantons had served as a source of constant irritation to the feudal lords of southern Germany. The attempt by Emperor Maximilian to bring them to heel had led in 1499 to a string of vicious campaigns along the border, cast in effect as a civil war between the “cow-Swiss” and the “sow-Swabians,” which ended in ignominious defeat for the imperial troops at the battle of Dornach south of Basel. The commander-in-chief of Maximilian’s army in the west had been Count Sigismund von Lupfen, and his lordship became the target of reprisals by the Swiss in the wake of their victory. After 1500 the loyalty of peasants north of the Rhine to their lords and to the Habsburgs as dynastic rulers of the Austrian lands, which lay scattered in the west along a belt stretching from Vorarlberg through Upper Swabia to the Upper Rhine and Alsace, came under strain from other quarters. The French crown quarried these borderlands for mercenaries to fight its campaigns in Italy (Hans Müller himself had seen service in French ranks), while Duke Ulrich, the ruler of Württemberg, the Swabian principality to the northeast of the Black Forest, used his fortress of Hohentwiel, perched on a volcanic outcrop dominating the western end of Lake Constance, as the base from which to regain control of his duchy after his expulsion in 1519. Ulrich’s intrigues depended upon stirring up support amongst the local peasantry on both banks of the Rhine, for he had no other troops to call upon. For a time at the turn of 1524 it looked as though his campaign might succeed, for Hans Müller and his Black Foresters joined the early sorties northwards, but Ulrich’s footsoldiers melted away as their pay was not forthcoming, and as news of the imperial victory over the French at Pavia in February 1525 (with many Swiss mercenaries falling on the field) filtered through.

By then, the Reforming doctrines emanating from Zürich had been thoroughly transvalued by local preachers and parishes in a broad swathe of countryside to the north of the city into a clarion for communal control of the church with openly antifeudal overtones. The issue over which Zwingli and his radical followers parted company was above all tithing, for many benefices had been incorporated not merely by powerful ecclesiastical corporations but by secular lords as well,
including members of the Zürich magistracy, both singly and collectively. But tithing in many cases reflected a more general ideological desire for the Word of God to become the template of all human conduct and social relations. When the villagers of Hallau, a Schaffhausen village only a few miles from Stühlingen, declared in July 1524 that they would have no Lord but God alone, they proceeded to demand on that basis not only full congregational control of the appointment of pastors and their remuneration from tithes (which they had already voiced four years earlier), but also the abolition of all labor services and servile dues. That implicit rejection of feudal lordship had in fact already been explicitly addressed in the demands of the peasants of Zürich’s village of Embrach in January 1524, who had roundly asserted that nowhere in the Holy Gospel or any other divine text was any passage to be found stating that one man should be the serf of another, or be subject to fines (such as merchets) arising from servile status.

In other words, at the very time when the Stühlingers rose up, their neighbors to the east and south had already embraced a general demand for liberation based on the Gospel. Hallau was to become a refuge for the Zürich radicals in 1525, while the preacher of Schaffhausen, Sebastian Hofmeister, was not backward in showing his support for the city’s disaffected wine-growers and fishers, and in encouraging them to forge an alliance with the surrounding rural rebels.

To the west, however, the Stühlingers had an even more potent source of inspiration. The little community of Waldshut, one of the four so-called Forest Towns on the Upper Rhine under Austrian jurisdiction, had fallen under the spell of a charismatic evangelical preacher, Balthasar Hubmaier, who had arrived in the town as early as 1521, after a checkered career in Regensburg, where he had led calls in 1519 for the expulsion of Jews from the city and the destruction of their synagogue; the church erected on the site and dedicated to the Virgin became a popular place of pilgrimage. During his sojourn in Waldshut Hubmaier’s own theological convictions underwent a radical transformation. By 1523 he had become an ardent follower of Zwingli, but by the end of that year it transpired that his sympathies lay more with the radical Congregationalists (such as Hofmeister),
whose stance on tithing he fully shared. It was these contacts with the Zürich radicals which led Hubmaier ultimately to break with Zwingli and embrace Anabaptism, he himself being rebaptized at Easter 1525.

During the summer months of 1524 while negotiations were under way, detachments of rebellious Stühlingers twice marched to Waldshut in full array under their commander Hans Müller, on the second occasion, according to older accounts, in order to conclude an evangelical brotherhood with the citizenry. The fusion of secular protest and spiritual liberation – the hallmark of the Peasants’ War as it swept through Germany – seems encapsulated in these actions. And that is certainly how the Austrian authorities, as upholders of the Catholic faith, saw it. At the beginning of June 1524 the Austrian military commander of the four Forest Towns warned that any failure to suppress the religious movement in Waldshut would soon lead to open revolt in the other Forest Towns and throughout the Black Forest as a whole. A month later, the Austrian roving ambassador, Veit Suter, outlined the danger posed by the evangelical adherents in Zürich, Schaffhausen, and Appenzell: in parts of Zürich’s territory iconoclasm was in full swing, while the Reforming preacher of Konstanz, Jakob Windner, was denouncing from his pulpit all princes as tyrants. Within a few days Suter’s fears had become a self-fulfilling prophecy, as peasants from the Thurgau and the Zürich countryside stormed the charterhouse at Ittingen near Frauenfeld, setting fire to the abbey (having taken care to drink its cellar dry first) and sacking it. The city fathers of Zürich understandably viewed these excesses with alarm, since they played straight into the hands of their Catholic opponents.

On closer inspection, the links between radical evangelism and social protest, as unrest fanned outwards from the southern Black Forest in the autumn and winter of 1524, are less compelling than the apprehensions of the authorities suggest. The Stühlingers’ articles of grievance, it has often been noted, were concerned solely with infringements of their customary rights, for which they were seeking redress under the terms of feudal law. At no stage did they invoke radical Christian precepts to legitimate their demands, or seek to overthrow the feudal order and
replace it with a Christian commonwealth. That verdict is broadly accurate, but requires further comment. The articles as they have been handed down are not the original grievances of June 1524, but rather the pièces justificatives of their suit before the imperial court of chancery, whose procedures would not have admitted claims grounded in divine law. At the end of their submission the peasants nevertheless came quite close to an overarching legitimating principle when they expressed the hope that their demands would be judged in the light of “godly, natural equity, reason, and understanding.” Moreover, although the bulk of their demands was quite specific in character, Article 59 demanded the complete abolition of serfdom (even though no general justification was advanced).

Yet actions frequently speak louder than words. The Stühlingers’ continuing truculence in the months after midsummer, and the repeated breakdown of negotiations in Schaffhausen, must surely indicate that something more than the rectification of local grievances was at stake. The truth is that the Stühlingers were split. When news of an agreement between Count Georg von Lupfen and 22 delegates from the landgraviate on September 10 reached the armed contingent under Hans Müller, fresh from its second march to Waldshut, there was uproar. Any acceptance of its terms, which involved swearing a renewed oath of fealty and surrendering their banner, was rejected out of hand by Müller’s followers, so that the peasant negotiators abandoned any hope of compliance under the threat of coercion.

From his subsequent actions it is quite clear that Hans Müller was bent from the outset upon turning the Stühlingen uprising into a general war of liberation, in which the marches to Waldshut were a calculated act of defiance, designed to demonstrate the parlousness of the authorities’ response and to strike a propaganda blow for his cause. At the beginning of October Müller began his campaign in earnest, embarking upon a sweeping march northwards to rally support from subjects of the abbey of St. Blasien in the Black Forest and peasants from the lordships of Fürstenberg and Schellenberg on its eastern fringes. In early December he led a second expeditionary force, with peasants from the landgraviate of
Klettgau bordering Stühlingen to the southeast in tow, through the Black Forest, picking up recruits all the way, whose openly military intent was revealed when it laid siege to the abbey of St. Trudpert on the western slopes of the Black Forest overlooking the Upper Rhine, and plundered its inventory. By then peasants in the Baar to the east of the Black Forest, including subjects of the Austrian town of Villingen, as well as subjects of St. Blasien in the county of Hauenstein, were in open revolt. Müller’s campaign had by and large been a resounding success – yet nowhere in these areas seized by rebellion was there any recourse to Biblical legitimation or slogans of divine justice. That was to change the following spring, but until then it seems that Müller’s guiding star was the republican liberty of his unruly neighbors across the Rhine, the Swiss Confederates.
UNIT 5
The XVIIIth century and the Enlightenment

I. Reading

*Text 1: African Americans in the Age of the French Revolution*

In 1820, Thomas Jefferson famously wrote of slavery, “we have a wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go.” Jefferson, like many leading revolutionaries who were also slaveholders, had expressed hopes that slavery in the South would *wither* and die in the wake of the Revolution. Although the War of Independence provided a shock to southern slavery, the institution survived and indeed thrived in subsequent years. In large part this was because leading southerners who disapproved of slavery failed to take decisive action in favor of *emancipation*. Nonetheless, in the face of the pressure brought to bear by rebellious slaves during the war and the force of the natural rights ideology that lay at the heart of the revolutionary movement, southern whites modified slavery in significant ways.

The most significant change to the southern slave system in the wake of the Revolution was a liberalization of the manumission laws in the South. Prior to the Revolution, there had been strict legal limits on the ability of masters to set their slaves free. For example, under a law adopted in 1723, Virginians could only set their slaves free with the consent of the colony’s governor and his council. In 1782, the Virginia Assembly adopted a law allowing slaveowners to free their *chattel* in their wills. Other slave states adopted similar *statutes*. A significant number of planters took advantage of these laws. Many were motivated by the late Revolution. Richard Randolph, a Virginia planter, explained in his will that he desired to *manumit* his slaves: To make retribution, as far as I am able, to an unfortunate race of *bondsmen*, over whom my ancestors have usurped and exercised the most lawless and monstrous tyranny, and in whom my countrymen (by their *iniquitous* laws, in contradiction of their own declaration of rights, and in violation of the every sacred law of nature; of the inherent, inalienable, and imprescritable rights of
man, and of every principle of moral and political honesty) have vested me with absolute property.

As a result, there was a dramatic increase in the number of free African Americans in the South. The free black population in the South numbered between 3,000 and 5,000 in 1780, but increased steadily over the next generation. There were 60,000 free African Americans in the South in 1790, and more than 180,000 in the United States by 1810. Despite the gradual emancipation of northern slaves during the same period, which contributed to this total, more liberal manumission laws allowed the South to have the largest free African American population in the country. The practice was most common in the Chesapeake states. One-third of all free blacks in the United States resided in Virginia and Maryland in 1810. The change was most dramatic in Maryland. Although only 4 percent of Maryland blacks were free in 1755, the proportion increased steadily after the Revolution. In 1810, 20 percent of Maryland blacks were free, and by the outbreak of the Civil War nearly half of the state’s African Americans were free.

The prospects of free African Americans in the United States, north or south, during the early republic were not enviable. The growth of the free African American community was accompanied by an increase in racist feeling among whites. In consequence, many free African Americans congregated in cities such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston, where their numbers afforded them a degree of safety from white hostility as well as opportunities to forge an autonomous cultural life. Economically, most free African Americans were relegated to menial and low-paying jobs. Females frequently labored as domestics, while males often found work in the maritime community of the port cities. In the face of white intolerance, and in an exercise of their newly won freedom, former slaves worked assiduously to construct their own independent cultural life by forming families, churches, and voluntary organizations such as Masonic lodges free from the interference of their former masters. Although urban blacks faced considerable barriers of white intolerance and economic privation, rural freedmen and women were often in a more parlous position. They faced the
same snares of racism and poverty, yet they often did so in relative isolation. They were forced to hire themselves as laborers under conditions which were often little different than those they had endured as slaves.

Despite having to contend with very real obstacles to their success, the emergence of the free African American community, especially in the South, was one of the notable legacies of the American Revolution. After the Revolution, race could no longer be automatically equated with unfree servitude. The free African American community, by its very presence, was a challenge to the slave system. Former slaves offered an example and personified the aspirations of their enslaved brothers and sisters. The presence of African Americans who were free and the cultural institutions they created gave testimony to the liberating potential of the Revolution.

In addition to liberalizing restrictions on manumission, several southern states also prohibited participation in the trans-Atlantic slave trade in the aftermath of the Revolution. The trade had been temporarily prohibited by the Continental Association and disrupted by the war. Virginia prohibited the trade in 1778 and Maryland in 1783. Georgia followed suit in 1798, and North Carolina levied a prohibitive import duty to discourage human imports. These actions were motivated more by local conditions than a concern over the inhumanity of the trade or a revolutionary concern for liberty. Notwithstanding the substantial loss of slaves as a result of the war, the slave population, especially in the Upper South, grew rapidly in the years after the conflict. Virginia’s slave population expanded from 165,000 in 1776 to more than 290,000 in 1790. Likewise, in Maryland the slave population increased from around 80,000 in 1776 to 103,000 in 1790. This population boom occurred as tobacco declined in profitability and many Chesapeake planters made the transition to raising cereals. In the Upper South, at least, there was little need to import additional slaves. By closing the slave trade, planters could help maintain the value of their slaves as they sought to sell them in the internal market for slaves that flourished in the early republic.
Increased manumission and restrictions on the slave trade were the biggest concessions made by white southerners in the wake of the Revolution. In contrast to these steps, efforts were made to strengthen slavery during the same period. Despite more liberal manumission laws, the overwhelming majority of African Americans in the South remained enslaved and most whites remained committed to the slave system. Outside of the tidewater areas of the Chesapeake, especially in Maryland, manumission was relatively rare.

Indeed, fewer than three hundred slaves were manumitted in South Carolina between 1770 and 1790. More significantly, the postwar years witnessed the expansion of southern slavery. Before the Revolution the southern slave population was concentrated along the coast, especially in the Chesapeake and in lowland South Carolina. During the war, many slaveholders fled to the backcountry with their slaves. Their flight initiated a westward shift in the slave population, which continued during the early republic and antebellum years as the introduction of cotton as a staple crop encouraged the rapid spread of the plantation regime across the Southwest to the Mississippi. Rather than simply fade away in the wake of the Revolution, as Jefferson and some slaveholders hoped, the institution spread and flourished. The growth of slavery after the war can be measured by the willingness of South Carolinians to import new slaves. In 1783–84 alone, South Carolina planters imported more than 6,500 new slaves. In the decade between 1790 and 1800, they imported approximately 14,000 slaves, and in the years between 1800 and the final abolition of slave imports in 1808, Carolina planters purchased nearly 40,000 more Africans.

Thus more than 60,000 Africans paid with their freedom and that of their posterity for the “compromises” which secured the Constitution and kept the slave trade open for another twenty years.

Black resistance to slavery intensified during the years of the early republic. Although African American opposition to slavery, both overt and covert, long antedated the American colonial struggle for independence, the Revolution transformed African American resistance. In the first place, the chaotic wartime
conditions had made flight, while fraught with danger, a realistic option for many slaves. Wartime service moreover gave many male slaves military experience upon which they could draw if they sought to pursue violent resistance to slavery. As Sylvia Frey, the leading student of southern slavery during the Revolution, has written, “African Americans had emerged from the Revolution with a heightened self-awareness, which manifested itself in economic assertiveness and intensified rebelliousness. The wartime experience had also spawned a small nucleus of African American leaders, ‘new men’ who believed in violent rebellion for the sake of the abstract principle of freedom. In the postwar period, they undertook the organization of resistance.” During the final decades of the eighteenth century southern slaves became more restive as the incidence of violent assaults on whites, maroon activities, plots, and insurrections all increased. The most notable example of slave resistance during the postwar period was Gabriel’s Rebellion. Clearly, the rather timid steps taken by white slaveholders – more liberal manumission laws and limits on the slave trade – to reconcile slavery with the ideology of the Revolution, did not satisfy southern blacks. They sought to acquire the independence and autonomy denied them by their white neighbors.

The ideology of the Revolution, with its emphasis on natural rights, equality, and liberty, undoubtedly encouraged militancy among slaves during the immediate postwar years. Revolutionary fervor among slaves intensified during the 1790s, when slaves in the French West Indies successfully revolted and created a black republic. The most radical revolution during the “Age of Revolution” was not American or French, but that which resulted in the creation of the Haitian Republic. Events in the French colony of Saint-Domingue, as Haiti was known before independence, were to have a direct impact on the American republic, particularly its slaves.

In 1789, when Washington took office and French crowds stormed the Bastille, Saint-Domingue had a population of nearly 600,000, five-sixths of whom were black slaves. The free population was divided between a sizable group of mixed race planters and approximately 50,000 French planters and colonial
administrators who controlled the colony. In the wake of the outbreak of the revolution in France, the free mulatto population pressed a claim for greater political liberty. The division among the free population encouraged the enslaved African majority to seize their freedom in 1791. A slave named Boukman initially led the rebels; when he died, another slave, Toussaint L’Ouverture, succeeded him. By 1793, the rebels had seized control of most of the colony. For the next decade violence and confusion reigned in Saint-Domingue. Both the Spanish and British unsuccessfully tried to seize the French colony at great cost. In an effort to keep the rebels loyal, the French Convention abolished slavery in 1794 and named Toussaint general-in-chief of the island in 1797. In 1802, Napoleon sent an expeditionary force of 25,000 troops to reconquer the colony.

Although the French managed to capture and imprison Toussaint, who died in custody, the Saint-Dominguan forces and yellow fever destroyed their army. On January 1, 1804, Toussaint’s successor, Jean-Jacques Dessalines, proclaimed himself the ruler of the independent black republic of Haiti. In a little more than a decade the slaves of Saint-Domingue had effected a political revolution more far-reaching in its implications than those of their counterparts in the French and American republics.

From the beginning of the upheavals on Saint-Domingue, Americans, black and white, took an active interest in the events on the island. There were direct links between the American and Haitian Revolutions. A number of men who played a leading role in the Dominguan rebellion had served with the French forces in America during the War of Independence. Similarly, African American veterans served with the British forces that sought to conquer Saint-Domingue. Saint-Domingue was, after Britain, the most important trading partner of the United States in 1791. Yankee shippers and distillers valued the colony’s sugar and molasses, while American manufacturers sold manufactured goods and supplies to the French planters. With the French Revolution lapping the very shores of America via the Caribbean, the Haitian Revolution posed a complex challenge to American politicians. Despite their professed love of liberty and admiration for the
French Revolution, the Republicans were no friends of the Haitian Revolution. As a party whose leadership was drawn from the ranks of southern slaveholders, the Republican leadership could not countenance the events in Saint-Domingue, which they interpreted as a perversion of republicanism. As president, Thomas Jefferson would advocate a policy of economically and politically isolating the Haitian Republic, a policy which fostered widespread poverty in America’s sister republic. Ironically, the elitist-oriented Federalists were more amenable to a Haitian Republic than the Republicans. During the Quasi-War with France, John Adams pursued a policy of accommodation with Toussaint L’Ouverture and even recommended that he declare Haiti independent.

The Haitian Revolution had its greatest American impact on relations between slaves and their masters. Southern slaveholders were horrified by the news from Saint-Domingue, which represented a direct threat to their way of life. The events in Saint-Domingue were widely covered in the southern press and must have been a major topic of conversation among slaveholders. In such circumstances, slaves could not but have been aware of the rising. African American mariners brought news of the tumult in the Caribbean as well.

Soon southerners, black and white, would have a more direct source of information on events in the rebellious colony. During the summer of 1793, thousands of white Dominguan planters arrived in American ports fleeing from the victorious rebels. Southern slaveholders initially welcomed the refugees, whose plight was a manifestation of their worst nightmares. The refugees brought their slaves with them. The West Indian servants communicated news of the Dominguan situation to their American counterparts. When combined with their own revolutionary heritage, the events in Saint-Domingue inspired American slaves to further resist their bondage. In August 1793, a letter was discovered detailing the plans for a massive slave rising in South Carolina and Virginia, prompted by the Dominguan uprising. The final years of the eighteenth century witnessed an upsurge of similar conspiratorial activity among southern slaves. Ultimately the southern states took steps to ban the importation of slaves from the French West
Indies in an effort to stem revolutionary activity among their own slaves. It is only in the context of events in Saint-Domingue that the persistent militancy of American slaves during the period can be fully appreciated. The slaves of Saint-Domingue and the United States sought freedom in the political disputes that divided their masters. In so doing, they wrought a truly revolutionary movement for black freedom, which threatened slavery in the New World. Governor James Monroe of Virginia explained the connection in the wake of Gabriel’s Rebellion: “The scenes which are acted in St. Domingo must produce an effect on all the people of color in this and the States south of us, more especially our slaves, and it is our duty to be on guard to prevent any mischief arising from it.” In the Dominguan case, the black revolutionary movement was successful. In the American context, where African American slaves were a minority of the population, bondsmen and women failed to overturn slavery. Nonetheless, the tradition of militant resistance of the revolutionary era continued until slavery in America was ultimately destroyed by the Civil War.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

to wither – to slowly disappear, lose importance, or become weaker
subsequent – happening after something else
emancipation – the process of giving people social or political freedom and rights
chattel – a personal possession
statute /ˈstætʃ.uːt/ – a law that has been formally approved and written down
bondsmen – slaves
iniquitous /ɪˈnɪk.wɪtʃ/ – very wrong and unfair
enviable – you wish you were also in that situation
to congregate – to come together in a large group of people or animals
menial – work that is boring, makes you feel tired, and is given a low social value
assiduously – showing hard work, care, and attention to detail
parlous – very bad, dangerous, or uncertain
snare /sneər/ – trap
to contend with – to have to deal with a difficult or unpleasant situation

notable – important and deserving attention, because of being very good or interesting

to equate – to consider one thing to be the same as or equal to another thing

aspiration – hope

to disrupt – prevent something, especially a system, process, or event, from continuing as usual or as expected

to levy – to impose a tax

notwithstanding – despite the fact or thing mentioned

manumission – freedom from slavery

tidewater – shore

antebellum /ˌæn.tiˈbel.əm/ – relating to the time before a war, especially the American Civil War

staple – basic

posterity – the people who will exist in the future

overt – done or shown publicly or in an obvious way and not secret

covert – hidden or secret

to antedate – to have existed or happened before another thing

fraught – full of unpleasant things such as problems or dangers

assertiveness – someone who is assertive behaves confidently and is not frightened to say what they want or believe

restive /ˈres.tɪv/ – unwilling to be controlled or be patient

maroon – fled negro

insurrection – an organized attempt by a group of people to defeat their government and take control of their country, usually by violence

militancy – active, determined, and often willing to use force

fervor – strong and sincere beliefs

mulatto – an offensive word for someone with one black parent and one white parent

expeditionary – a group of soldiers sent to another country to fight in a war
custody – the state of being kept in prison, especially while waiting to go to court for trial

counterparts – a person or thing that has the same purpose as another one in a different place or organization

distiller – a person or a company that makes strong alcoholic drinks by the process of distilling

molasses – a thick, dark brown liquid that is produced during the process of making sugar, used in cooking

to lap – (of waves) to hit something gently, producing quiet sounds

countenance – approval

perversion – the changing of something so that it is not what it was or should be

to foster – to encourage the development or growth of ideas or feelings

elitist-oriented – organized for the good of a few people who have special interests or abilities

amenable /əˈmiːnəbəl/ – willing to accept or be influenced by a suggestion

quasi /ˈkwæz.i.-/ – used to show that something is almost, but not completely, the thing described

tumult /ˈtjuː.mʌlt/ – a loud noise, especially that produced by an excited crowd, or a state of confusion, change, or uncertainty

plight – an unpleasant condition, especially a serious, sad, or difficult one

wrought /rɔːt/ – to cause something to happen

Answer the following questions:

1. How do you understand Jefferson’s point of view about slavery?

2. What do you understand by ‘revolutionary’?

3. Why did the institution of slavery thrive?

4. What was the most significant change to the southern slave system? What did it mean?

5. Why were some people motivated to manumit their slaves?

6. What happened as a result of manumission laws?
7. What was the situation with blacks like by the outbreak of the Civil War?
8. Why were the prospects of free blacks not enviable?
9. Why did free blacks congregate in the mentioned cities?
10. What did females and males do?
11. What were the positions of urban and rural blacks like?
12. What other change was mentioned?
13. Why were such actions motivated?
14. What were the biggest concessions made by white southerners?
15. Why were efforts made to strengthen slavery?
16. Why did many slaveholders flee to the backcountry with their slaves?
17. How can the growth of slavery be measured after the war? Can you give any data proving this fact?
18. How did the Revolution transform African American resistance?
19. What was Sylvia Frey’s opinion on it?
20. What became of southern slaves during the final decades of the eighteenth century?
21. What was the ideology of the Revolution?
22. What was the most radical revolution during the “Age of Revolution”?
23. What happened in 1789?
24. What happened in 1794?
25. Why did the French Convention abolish slavery?
26. What was the outcome of the events on the island?
27. What was the attitude of the Republicans towards the Haitian Revolution?
28. How did they interpret the events in Saint-Domingue? Why?
29. What measures would be advocated by Thomas Jefferson?
30. What was the attitude of Southern slaveholders towards the events in Saint-Domingue?
31. What impact did those events have on the slaves in America?
On April 14, 1775, General Gage received a letter from Lord Dartmouth, the secretary of state for the colonies, instructing him to arrest the leaders of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress and authorizing him to use force in order to disarm the population and end the *incipient* rebellion in Massachusetts. Gage planned to send a column of 600 troops to nearby Concord, where the Provincial Congress was meeting, to arrest its leaders. Concord also served as a depot where the Whig *militiamen* had stored arms and munitions.

Gage’s troops would not only arrest the leaders of the *putative* rebellion, but would also seize and destroy the arms necessary to carry out the rising. When Gage’s soldiers departed from Boston on the evening of April 18, Massachusetts Whigs were *well-apprised* of their intentions. Hundreds of sailors thrown out of work by the Port Act observed the preparations for the expedition. Express riders, including Paul Revere and William Dawes, brought word of the expedition to Concord and its environs.

The British troops arrived in the town of Lexington early in the morning of April 19. As they passed through the village they encountered approximately seventy “minutemen”, militiamen who had *pledged* to turn out at a moment’s notice in the event of an emergency. The minutemen were a cross-section of New England society. Half of Lexington’s adult males turned out that morning. They ranged in age from 16 to 65, and eight father-and-son combinations stood on the green in the misty dawn. An African American, Prince Eastabrook, stood shoulder to shoulder with his white neighbors. Captain John Parker, commanding the Lexington minutemen, ordered his men onto the town green in a show of resistance to the British, who would pass on the road to Concord. A forty-five-year old veteran of the French and Indian War, Parker was aware that his men could not fight highly trained British troops. Sylvanus Wood, a twenty-three-year-old minuteman at Lexington, described the scene many years after the *fateful* morning: The British troops approached us rapidly … with a general officer on horseback at their head. The officer came up to within two rods of the center of the company…. 
The officer then swung his sword and said “Lay down your arms you damned rebels, or you are all dead men. Fire!” Some guns were fired by the British at us…. Just at this time Capt Parker ordered every man to take care of himself. The company immediately dispersed, and while the company was dispersing and leaping over the wall, the … British fired and killed some of our men.

This may not be true. It is unclear who fired the first shot at Lexington. It is clear, however, that once the shooting began the British soldiers, after months of frustration and boredom punctuated by abuse and defiance at the hands of Americans, proved difficult to control. The soldiers were “so wild”, reported Lieutenant John Barker, “they could hear no orders and they ignored their commander, uselessly cutting the air with his sword as the signal to cease firing.”

Eight Americans lay dead, mostly shot in the back. Among the dead was Captain Parker. Having spent no more than half an hour in Lexington, the British had begun the American Revolution. Fighting continued when the British arrived in nearby Concord. Here they managed to destroy 500 pounds of musket balls and 60 barrels of flour. They remained in Concord until noon, inflicting property damage. When they left, they were assaulted by thousands of massing militiamen who fought and harassed the British with deadly fire from concealed places along their route of march. The fighting was so fierce and the progress of the column so slow that Gage was compelled to send a relief column from Boston to rescue the expedition. Although a British veteran of the fighting described the fighting as a “little fracas”, the events of April 19 resulted in 73 redcoats killed and 200 wounded or missing. The rebels, whom the same officer described as “the most absolute cowards on the face of the earth,” sustained 49 dead, 39 wounded, and four missing in the fighting. Most significantly, the events of April 19 transformed the political dispute between the colonists and the British into a military struggle. In the next eight years there would be many more casualties. Significant human suffering would be the price of American independence.

Word of the fighting in Massachusetts spread rapidly throughout the colonies and as many as 17,000 militiamen from around New England poured into camps
around Boston. Faced with an impromptu siege, General Gage was under pressure to take action. On May 25, he was joined in Boston by three ambitious major-generals, William Howe, Henry Clinton, and John Burgoyne, who were sent to Boston to advise him. They demanded action, and they had the support of London to do so. Gage declared martial law on June 12, and agreed to occupy the surrounding heights of Dorchester and Charlestown outside of Boston before the rebels did. On June 15, the Massachusetts Committee of Safety, which received intelligence of Gage’s intentions, called for the occupation of Bunker Hill on the Charlestown peninsula. On the evening of June 16, about 1,600 Americans under Colonel William Prescott and General Israel Putnam began to fortify positions on Breed’s (not Bunker) Hill. Rather than outflank the rebels, which he could easily have accomplished, General Howe led a bloody frontal assault on the rebel defenses on June 17. The rebels were forced to relinquish their positions when they ran out of gunpowder. The Americans suffered 100 dead, 271 wounded, and 30 taken prisoner. Among the American dead was Dr. Joseph Warren, President of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress and a leading radical. Warren would become one of the earliest heroes of the rebel cause. The British endured their worst casualties of the war, 228 dead and 826 wounded, or 42 percent of the 2,500 troops engaged that afternoon.

Bunker Hill was a Pyrrhic victory for the British. Thomas Gage gave his assessment of the American situation a week after the battle, based on his long experience in the colonies in both peace and war:

These people shew (= show) a spirit and conduct against us they never shewed against the French, and everybody has judged of them from their formed appearance and behavior when joined with the Kings forces in the last war, which has led many into great mistakes. They are now spirited up by a rage and enthusiasm as great as ever a people were possessed of, and you must proceed in earnest or give the business up. A small body acting in one spot will not avail. You must have large armys, making diversions on different sides, to divide their force. The loss we have sustained is more than we can bear. Gage had accurately
described the situation. Unfortunately for Gage, his perspicacity was not enough to redeem his reputation or his career. In October he was replaced by William Howe.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

*incipient* – just beginning
*depot* – a building where supplies of goods are stored
*militiamen* – a group of people who have been trained as soldiers but are not part of a country’s official army
*putative* – generally thought to be or to exist, even if this may not really be true
*well-apprised* – well informed
*environs* /ɪnˈvaɪrənz/ – the area surrounding a place, especially a town
*pledge* – a serious promise
*fateful* – an important and usually bad effect on the future
*to disperse* – to separate and go in different directions, or to make something do this
*defiance* – when you refuse to obey someone or something
*fracas* /ˈfræk.ə:/ – a noisy fight or argument
*impromptu* – not planned or prepared
*to outflank* – to move forward past an enemy position in order to attack it from the side or from the back
*to relinquish* – to allow something to be taken away from you
*perspicacity* – the ability to understand things quickly and make accurate judgments
*to redeem* – to make something seem less bad

Answer the following questions:

1. Who were „minutemen”?
2. Captain John Parker?
3. How did Sylvanus Wood describe the scene?
4. Why was it difficult to control soldiers?
5. Who began the American revolution?
6. Why did Gage send a relief column?
7. What was the outcome of the events of April 19?
8. Why did three major-generals join general Gage?
9. What happened between May 25 and June 17?
10. What was the outcome of it?
11. How did Gage assess the situation?
12. Why was he replaced?

**Text 3: Independence and Revolution**

In 1776, the men who led the colonial resistance to Britain made two daring decisions of enduring importance to American history.

First, they declared that the colonies were an independent nation. Second, they committed the new nation to republicanism, which is to say a government whose sovereignty was derived from the consent of the governed as expressed through the vote. Popular input was to be limited to white men with property. Nonetheless, these decisions transformed a rather narrow dispute over the constitutional relationship between the British Parliament and the North American colonies into a revolutionary struggle.

From the time the Second Continental Congress began sitting in May 1775, it confronted the ultimate question the controversy with Britain had spawned: how could American rights best be protected – within the British Empire or without? The war both complicated and simplified the situation. How could one remain a subject to a government with which one was actively engaged in combat? The moderate position was that it was acceptable to raise an army and engage in armed self-defense of colonial rights. For example, the Provincial Assembly of Connecticut declared that its troops besieging British soldiers in Boston were enlisted in – His Majesty’s Service … for the preservation of the Liberties of America. Similarly, when rebel forces seized the royal outpost of Fort Ticonderoga in May 1775, Congress ordered that the colonists carefully catalogue the fort’s
ordinance so it could be returned to the crown when peace was restored. This step was taken to cast what was patently an offensive action as a defensive measure. In a similar vein, Congress authorized the invasion of Canada on the condition that Canadians approved the action. While such decisions appear inconsistent and contradictory, they reveal the strength of feeling in favor of reconciliation even after the war began. As the war spread and intensified in the latter part of 1775 and it became clear that George III would not intervene to affect a reconciliation, sentiment in favor of independence began to grow in America.

Independence represented a massive leap into the unknown for the colonists. To declare the colonies independent, opponents of such a step argued, would not only invite an unrestrained military assault by the British, but if the colonies were to win their independence on the battlefield, they would probably be conquered by another European power with interests in the New World, such as Spain or France. Independence would mean severing ties that had grown over six generations. The colonies were linked to Britain not only by politics and economics but also by bonds of language, religion, and culture.

Despite the war, there were still many Americans, probably a majority of the population at the beginning of 1776, who hoped for a reconciliation between Britain and the colonies. They would need to be convinced that American interests would best be served by severing their ties with Great Britain.

On January 10, 1776, Robert Bell, a Philadelphia printer, published a pamphlet with a simple title, *Common Sense*. Although published anonymously, the author of *Common Sense* was an obscure English immigrant named Thomas Paine. An unsuccessful tax-collector and stay-maker, Paine emigrated to Philadelphia in late 1774 at the age of thirty-seven. Although a late arrival on the colonial scene, Paine became involved in the radical politics of Philadelphia’s artisans and was an articulate supporter of the resistance to British rule. The radical Philadelphia physician Benjamin Rush recognized Paine’s abilities as a writer, and encouraged him to prepare a pamphlet considering the question of independence. Paine set to work during the autumn of 1775; the result was *Common Sense*, which had the
widest circulation and greatest influence of all the hundreds of pamphlets published during the era of the American Revolution.

Unlike most eighteenth-century pamphlets, which were written in a learned style replete with classical allusions, legal citations, and high-flown elitist language, Paine wrote Common Sense in a forceful, direct vernacular style which was readily accessible to the common people of America’s shops, taverns, and farms. These were the people among whom Paine lived, and whose support he recognized was essential if the colonies were to achieve their independence. Paine eschewed classical imagery and ornate language for biblical allusions and simple language to make his point: the colonies must declare themselves independent. Paine began Common Sense by stressing the Lockean theme that government was a contractual (and regrettable) relationship made necessary by human selfishness.

- For were the impulses of conscience clear, Paine wrote, - uniform and irresistibly obeyed, man would need no other lawgiver; but that not being the case, he finds it necessary to surrender up a part of his property to furnish means of protection of the rest. Government being a necessary evil, Paine was eager to demonstrate to the American colonists that the vaunted British constitution that they had revered as the bulwark of their liberties was deeply flawed. The balance of interests that Americans believed they saw in the British constitution was a sham. The House of Commons was the only republican element in the British system, and it had been corrupted and compromised by the monarchical and aristocratic elements embodied in the crown and the House of Lords.

Since the colonists had made a long-standing case against Parliament’s authority over them, Paine concentrated his attack on the British monarchy. He argued that the hereditary kingship and aristocratic titles were inherently unfair. According to Paine, - Government by kings was first introduced into the world by the heathens, from whom the children of Israel copied the custom. It is the most prosperous invention the Devil ever set on foot for the promotion of idolatry. Hereditary succession compounded the inequity of monarchical government, for not only did kings set themselves up as superior to their subjects but they also
insured that their descendants would enjoy the benefit of the same unfair relationship. – For all men being originally equals, no one by birth could have a right to set up his own family in perpetual preference to all others forever, declared Paine, - and though himself might deserve some decent honors of his contemporaries, yet his descendants might be far too unworthy to inherit them. For his part, Paine was not convinced that many of the kings who initiated dynasties were worthy of their titles. In one of his most famous rhetorical thrusts, Paine assailed the Norman origins of the British monarchy, - A French bastard, landing with an armed banditti and establishing himself king of England against the consent of the natives, is in plain terms a very paltry rascally original. It certainly hath (=has) no divinity in it. Rather than fear independence, Paine demonstrated, Americans should welcome the opportunity to sever their ties with an oppressive, unequal system of government that had no basis in scripture or natural law.

Having demolished the basis for colonial loyalty to the British monarchy, Paine turned his attention to the situation in America. He based his comments on – simple facts, plain arguments and common sense. Paine argued that independence would free America from involvement in European wars. He asserted that free trade would make an independent America the friend of all nations and that American agriculture – will always have a market while eating is the custom in Europe. Freedom in economics would complement the political freedom Paine envisioned in an independent America. In Common Sense, he sketched a plan for a republic based on a broad franchise, annual assemblies, and a rotating presidency. Rather than fear independence, common sense dictated that Americans should welcome it, for national independence would lead to increased prosperity and liberty. More immediately, independence would allow the rebels to seek foreign assistance with which to carry on their struggle. In any event, Paine believed that events made independence a foregone conclusion. The war had made reconciliation impossible: - The blood of the slain, the weeping voice of nature cries, he wrote, - is time to part. Common Sense was an instant success. In 1776, it sold in excess of 100,000 copies. It was reprinted and excerpted in newspapers, and republished
throughout the colonies and in Britain and France. Paine himself brought out revised editions that addressed the inevitable charges of his opponents. Thanks to Paine’s direct writing style, the pamphlet could be read aloud to those who could not read. It inspired both imitators and critics. The pamphlet certainly convinced many wavering colonists that independence was a reasonable course to pursue. If nothing else, *Common Sense* placed the question of independence at the center of American life.

Although the Continental Congress, as the only institution that could purport to speak for the colonies as a whole, would have to be the body to formally declare independence, such a momentous step required wide popular support. Because the various delegations within the Continental Congress were bound by instructions from their provincial assemblies, they could not declare their colonies independent without prior authorization. By necessity, therefore, the political momentum for independence originated at the local level in the various colonies, where the issues raised by the war and by *Common Sense* were debated and discussed throughout the early months of 1776. Between April and July 1776, various bodies and institutions – from voluntary associations to provincial congresses – debated the merits and risks of independence.

Over ninety of these organizations issued their own declarations of independence by changing statutes, issuing new instructions to their congressional delegations, or adopting resolutions asserting their independence. These – other declarations of independence preceded and laid the foundation for the formal Declaration of Independence adopted by Congress in July.

North Carolina was the first colony to act. On April 12, 1776, the North Carolina Provincial Assembly authorized the colony’s delegation at the Congress in Philadelphia to concur if the other state delegations voted in favor of declaring independence. Massachusetts provided the most thorough response on the issue of independence. On March 10, the assembly resolved: that the inhabitants of each Town in this Colony ought, in full meeting warned for that purpose, to advise the
person or persons who shall be chosen to represent them in the next General Court, whether that, if the honourable Congress should, for the safety of the said Colony, declare them independent of the Kingdom of Great Britain, they the said inhabitants, will solemnly engage, with their lives and fortunes, to support them in the measure.

The assembly was asking voters to make a personal pledge when they endorsed independence.

Between May and July, special town meetings were convened throughout the colony to debate the issue. Although some communities were deeply divided on the question and a few opposed it, the majority of towns endorsed independence. In so doing, the voters of Massachusetts were putting the principles of republican government vaguely outlined by Thomas Paine into practice.

Massachusetts was not alone. A small cabal of radical congressmen would not foist independence on the American people. Rather, during the spring and early summer of 1776, individuals and groups throughout the colonies would pressure Congress to declare the colonies independent. Between April 22 and 24, conventions in the Virginia counties of Cumberland, Charlotte, and James City endorsed independence. On May 15, 112 members of the Virginia Provincial Convention unanimously resolved: that the delegates appointed to represent this colony in General Congress be instructed to propose to that respectable body to declare the United Colonies free and independent states, absolved from all allegiance to, or dependence upon the crown or parliament of Great Britain; and that they give the assent of this colony to such declaration, and to whatever measures may be thought proper and necessary by the Congress for forming foreign alliances and a confederation of the colonies, at such time, and in such a manner, as to them shall seem best.

On June 7, Richard Henry Lee introduced the Virginia resolution to Congress, and on June 8 the Congress debated the proposal. John Dickinson and James Wilson of Pennsylvania, Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, and Robert R. Livingston of New York led the moderates, who opposed acting — till the voice of
the people drove us into it. They argued that the time was not yet right for a declaration of independence because – the people of the Middle Colonies (Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, the Jersies&N.York) were not yet ripe for bidding adieu to British connection but that they were fast ripening & in short time would join the general voice of America. By June 1776, the moderates had given up hope of achieving reconciliation. They questioned the timing of independence, not the sagacity of it.

Indeed, they endorsed the republican principle that the people of their colonies must support independence before they could act. Their hesitancy is testimony that the initiative for independence came from the American people themselves, not Congress. The radicals, led by the delegations from Virginia and Massachusetts, favored an immediate declaration of independence but recognized that unanimity was necessary for such a momentous decision. Consequently, Congress decided to delay a decision on independence by three weeks. In the meantime, a committee would work on a draft declaration in the event Congress agreed on independence in July.

The proponents of independence put the delay to good use. On June 14, the Connecticut assembly instructed its delegates to support independence. The next day the assemblies of New Hampshire and Delaware followed suit. Also in mid-June, radicals in New Jersey ousted the royal governor William Franklin (the son of Benjamin Franklin). The new government of New Jersey sent a new delegation to Congress on June 22 with instructions to support independence. The Maryland assembly refused to endorse independence as late as May; however, after a series of conventions Frederick, Ann Arundel, Charles, and Talbot counties called for independence, and the assembly instructed its delegates to support independence on June 28. As in New England and Virginia, popular pressure was beginning to tell in the Middle Colonies.

New York and Pennsylvania were the two most important colonies which had yet to give their approval to independence. In Pennsylvania, the colonial assembly elected before the outbreak of the war continued to sit. This body, which was
dominated by the old Quaker proprietary elite, refused to change its instructions, adopted on November 9, 1775, which opposed a declaration of independence despite a growing popular clamor in favor of such a measure. On June 14, the radical Committee of Safety overthrew the assembly. Elections were called for a constitutional convention to reform the government of Pennsylvania. These elections were to be based on a broad franchise, and would result in one of the most radical governments of the revolutionary era. In the meantime the colony was ruled by the Committee of Safety, which authorized Pennsylvania’s delegates to vote for independence. The situation was still more complicated in New York, which faced an imminent British invasion. Despite entreaties from the General Committee of Mechanics in New York City and communities around Albany in favor of independence, the New York Provincial Congress refused to instruct its delegates in Philadelphia to vote for independence. Rather, it argued that it would wait until Congress made a decision on the issue and then issue a response.

When Congress considered the question of independence on July 1, the momentum seemed to favor the radicals. Although, according to John Adams, - The Subject had been in Contemplation for more than a Year and frequent discussions had been had concerning it. At one time and another, all the Arguments for it and against it had been exhausted and were become familiar, John Dickinson rose and gave a lengthy speech against independence which – combined together all that had before been written in Pamphlets and Newspapers and all that had from time to time been said in Congress by himself and others. Adams responded to Dickinson in a lengthy delivery, which repeated the arguments in favor of independence. When the vote was taken on the motion for independence, the radicals were disappointed. Nine colonies voted in favor of the measure but four did not support it. South Carolina and Pennsylvania voted against the measure. The Delaware delegation – two men who could not agree – was split, and the delegates from New York were prohibited by their instructions from participating. Realizing that nine out of thirteen was not sufficient for such an important decision, the congressmen decided to revisit the question the next day. After a night of frantic
lobbying, the radicals got the vote they wanted on July 2. Caesar Rodney, a third
delegate from Delaware, rode all night to change that delegation’s vote in favor of
independence. South Carolina’s delegates changed their minds and their votes.
Pennsylvanians John Dickinson and Robert Morris, who opposed independence,
did not attend the next session, and James Wilson of the same delegation changed
his vote. On July 2, twelve of thirteen colonies voted in favor of independence,
while New York abstained. (The New York Provincial Congress subsequently
endorsed Congress’s decision on July 9.) Having decided to declare the colonies
independent, Congress turned its attention to the declaration itself.

When Congress voted to postpone consideration of the question of
independence on June 10, it created a committee to draft a declaration of
independence. The members of the committee, Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, John
Adams of Massachusetts, Benjamin Franklin representing Pennsylvania, Roger
Sherman of Connecticut, and Robert Livingston of New York, represented a broad
geographical and political spectrum with respect to the question of independence.
The committee in turn delegated the task of preparing the draft declaration to
Thomas Jefferson. A wealthy Virginian planter, Jefferson was a thirty-three-year-
old member of Congress who had previous experience as a penman of the colonial
cause. In 1774, he had written *A Summary View of the Rights of British America,*
which was an articulate and influential statement of the American case. As a
member of Congress, Jefferson had drafted the official response to Lord North’s
reconciliation plan in 1775, and he had contributed to its later Declaration of the
Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms. Jefferson worked on the draft
declaration of independence for two weeks while consulting informally with
Adams and Franklin on its content. His draft was then discussed by the full
committee, which suggested some changes. The result was a work that, although
the product of group effort, was largely the work of Jefferson. The committee
submitted the draft declaration to Congress on June 28.

After it voted on independence Congress carefully considered the draft
declaration on the afternoon of the second, third, and part of the fourth of July.
While Jefferson fumed, the members of Congress made a series of stylistic and substantive changes to the text of the declaration. As a result, Congress eliminated a quarter of Jefferson’s original draft. The most important change made by the Congress was the elimination of a clause in which Jefferson indicted George III for the trans-Atlantic slave trade. Given the willing participation of so many Americans, especially many members of Congress – including Jefferson – in the system of chattel slavery, such an accusation was not only historically untenable but also hypocritical in the extreme. As a result of Congressional editing, the draft declaration, while no longer solely Jefferson’s handiwork, was greatly improved. Congress formally adopted the revised Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. It was not formally signed until August 2, after New York had approved the document.

The Declaration of Independence as adopted by Congress began with an eloquent assertion of the right of revolution: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their power from the consent of the governed, That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect Safety and Happiness.

Congress asserted a notion of universal rights in this statement. In order to secure their rights, people voluntarily created governments. If their governments violated their rights, then the people had a right to overthrow their governments and create new ones better suited to their needs.

Having asserted that the American people had a right to change their government if it violated their rights, Congress proceeded in the body of the Declaration of Independence to demonstrate that: - The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct
object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. The declaration presented a list of eighteen charges ranging from interfering in colonial government and justice to waging war against the colonies as proof that the revolution against royal authority was justified. Although to the modern reader many of the charges against George III seem specious, the focus on the monarch was crucial to legitimate the rebel cause. By 1776, few Americans accepted Parliament’s right to govern the colonies. The tie that bound the colonies to Britain was the monarchy. In order to sever that tie, Congress had to demonstrate the king’s culpability in subverting American rights. Even though George III sought to impose tyranny on the colonies, Congress continued in the declaration, the colonists sought redress by peaceful means through repeated petitions to the king, Parliament, and the British people, all of which were rejected. As a result, the Americans were but reluctant revolutionaries driven to take up arms as a last resort and to declare – that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be Free and Independent States. In a few eloquent sentences, Congress articulated the principles of revolution and republican self-government for which Americans had been searching for more than a decade. These words transformed what had been a narrow dispute over taxation and authority into a revolutionary struggle over principles of self-determination, rights, and equality.

In adopting the Declaration of Independence, Congress adopted a manifesto that presaged revolutionary changes in American life that would extend far beyond the question of the relationship between the self-proclaimed states and Britain.

The list of words and word combinations under study:

daring – brave and taking risks
enduring – existing for a long time
ultimate – most extreme or important because either the original or final, or the best or worst
to spawn – start suddenly
moderate – not extreme and are therefore acceptable to a large number of people
ordinance – a law or rule made by a government or authority
vein – a style or a temporary mood
reconciliation – a situation in which two people or groups of people become friendly again after they have argued
unrestrained – not limited or controlled
severing – end
obscure – not known to many people
articulate – able to express thoughts and feelings easily and clearly, or showing this quality
replete – full
elitist – of elite
to eschew /ɪsˈtʃuː/ – to avoid something intentionally, or to give something up
to revere – to very much respect and admire someone or something
bulwark – something that protects you from dangerous or unpleasant situations
sham – something that is not what it seems to be
hereditary – passed from the genes of a parent to a child, or (of titles and positions in society) passed from parent to a child as a right
heathen /ˈhiː.ðən/ – having no religion, or belonging to a religion that is not Christianity, Judaism, or Islam
perpetual /pəˈpetʃ.u.əl/ – often repeated
to assail – to attack someone violently or criticize someone strongly
paltry /ˈpɔːl.tri/ – very small and of little or no value
rascally – dishonest
excerpted /ˈek.sɔːpt/ – a short part taken from a speech, book
to purport – to pretend to be or do something
momentous – very important because of effects on future events
to assert – to do something to show that you have power
to concur – to agree or have the same opinion
solemnly – serious and without any humour
to endorse – to make a public statement of your approval or support for something or someone

to convene – to bring together a group of people for a meeting, or to meet for a meeting
cabal /ˈkæbəl/ – a small group of people who plan secretly to take action, especially political action
to foist – to force someone to have or experience something they do not want
to absolve – (especially in religion or law) to free someone from guilt, blame, or responsibility for something

allegiance /ˈlɪ.jəlɪːdʒiː/ – loyalty and support for a ruler, country, group, or belief
assent – official agreement to or approval of an idea, plan, or request
moderate – not extreme and therefore acceptable to a large number of people
ripe – completely developed and ready to be collected or eaten

sagacity /ˈsæɡəs.ti/ – having or showing understanding and the ability to make good judgments
suit – a problem taken to a law court by an ordinary person or an organization
to oust /ˈaʊst/ – to force someone to leave a position of power, job, place, or competition

proprietary /ˈprɒprətri/ – relating to owning something, or relating to or like an owner

clamor – a loud complaint or demand
franchise – a right to sell a company's products in a particular area using the company’s name
imminent – coming or likely to happen very soon
entreaty – an attempt to persuade someone to do something
frantic – done or arranged in a hurry and a state of excitement or confusion
to abstain – to decide not to use your vote
to fume – to be very angry, sometimes without expressing it

substantive – important, serious, or related to real facts
to indict /ɪnˈdaɪt/ – accuses them officially of a crime
**untenable /ʌnˈten.ə.bl/ – cannot be supported or defended against criticism**

*eloquent* – giving a clear, strong message

*to endow /ɪnˈdæʊ/* – to give a large amount of money to pay for creating a college, hospital, etc. or to provide an income for it

*unalienable /ʌnˈeɪ.li.ə.nə.bl/ – unable to be removed*

*specious* – seeming to be right or true, but really wrong or false

*culpability* – deserving to be blamed or considered responsible for something bad

*to subvert* – to try to destroy or damage something, especially an established political system

*to redress* – to put right a wrong or give payment for a wrong that has been done

*manifesto* – a written statement of the beliefs, aims, and policies of an organization, especially a political party

*to presage /ˈpres.idʒ/ /prɪˈseɪdʒ/ – to show or suggest that something, often something unpleasant, will happen*

---

**Answer the following questions:**

1. What decisions did they make in 1776?
2. Why were they significant?
3. “Popular input was to be limited to white men with property”. – what do you understand by this?
4. How could the war both complicate and simplify the situation in America?
5. What was meant by “engage in armed self-defense of colonial rights”?
6. Why did sentiment in favor of independence begin to grow in America?
7. What was the opponents’ view on independence?
8. How were the colonies linked to Britain?
9. How do you think why almost the majority of Americans hoped for a reconciliation?
10. What do we know about Thomas Paine?
11. Why did he become popular?
12. How did Paine’s Common Sense differ from other pamphlets?
13. Why were common people essential for independence?
14. What was Paine’s point that he wanted to make with the help of Common Sense?
15. What was his attitude towards government, especially British one?
16. How did he see Government by kings?
17. Did hereditary succession present the equity of monarchical government? Why?
18. How did he assail the Norman origins of the British monarchy?
19. What reasons did he give for independence?
20. Was Common Sense successful? Why?
21. What was the purpose of the Continental Congress?
22. Why were the various delegations within the Continental Congress unable to declare their colonies independent?
23. What was the foundation for the formal Declaration of Independence?
24. What colony was the first to ask for independence?
25. What was the response of Massachusetts?
26. What is meant by ‘making a personal pledge’?
27. What counties supported Massachusetts?
28. What was resolved in the Virginia Provincial Convention?
29. Who were the moderates? Why did they oppose the independence?
30. Why did the moderates give up hope?
31. What was their final decision?
32. Why did Congress decide to delay a decision on independence?
33. How did the proponents of independence use the delay?
34. Why was it decided to reform the government of Pennsylvania?
35. Why did the New York Provincial Congress refuse to instruct its delegates in Philadelphia to vote for independence?
36. Why did the congressmen decide to revisit the question of independence the next day?
37. What was said about Thomas Jefferson?
38. When did the committee submit the draft declaration to Congress?
39. What was the most important change made by the Congress? Why?
40. When was the Declaration of Independence formally adopted and then signed?
41. What do you think about the text of the assertion?
42. What did Congress proceed in the body of the Declaration of Independence to demonstrate?
43. Why were the charges against George III brought?

II. Listening:

*The Enlightenment and the Public Sphere* (Prof. John Merriman’s lecture)

Summarize the following chapters:

Chapter 1. Six Ways That the Enlightenment Mattered [00:00:00]
Chapter 2. The Spread of Enlightenment Thinking through the Public Sphere: Academies, Masonic Lodges, and Salons [00:05:52]
Chapter 3. The Enlightenment among the Grub Street Hacks [00:12:58]
Chapter 4. Desacralization of the French Monarchy [00:23:05]
Chapter 6. Sensational Royal Affairs: The Erosion of Monarchical Prestige [00:36:41]

III. Supplementary Reading

*The Sugar Act*

George Grenville had a problem. In 1763, the fifty-one-year-old left his post as first lord of the admiralty to become prime minister. Grenville discovered that the recent victory over France had not only been glorious but costly. Britain’s budget deficit, which stood at £73 million before the war, had ballooned to £137 million by 1763. The annual interest on the debt alone was £5 million, at a time when the government’s income was £8 million per year. The acquisition of new territory in America would only increase the financial pressures on the government. Addressing the government’s financial problems would be one of the foremost
concerns of the Grenville ministry. As a result, Grenville would undertake a program of reform with an eye towards raising revenue in America. This program was intended fundamentally to alter the relationship between the colonies and the metropolis. Thus, at the outset of the sequence of events which would result in American independence, it was not the future revolutionaries who advocated change but their imperial masters.

Soon after he entered office, Grenville asked the Treasury to estimate the cost of maintaining a garrison force in North America. The Treasury reported that it would cost £225,000 per year to maintain 7,500 troops in North America. (This was a low estimate. The actual cost of the troops was £384,000 per year between 1763 and 1775.) The prime minister, who had had little previous experience with the colonies, looked to America to bear some of this burden. The Americans, after all, had benefited from the defeat of the French; hence it was only just, he felt, that they should pay something towards their own defense. Ordinary Britons, moreover, were overtaxed by comparison with their American counterparts. One source of potential revenue was to tax imports and exports via the Navigation Acts, which stipulated that Americans could send their goods only to British ports and only on British vessels. The purpose of these acts, first adopted in the seventeenth century, was to compel the colonies to send their unfinished staple products – tobacco, wheat, furs, and so on – to Britain in exchange for finished products. Under the system, taxation in the form of customs duties was used to compel the colonies to comply. If made more efficient, then the same duties could also be used to raise revenue.

In 1763 the British government undertook a series of measures that laid the foundation for a more aggressive policy of taxation in America. In March, Grenville, who was then first lord of the admiralty, sponsored a bill approving the use of the Navy on peacetime duty to collect customs revenue and suppress smuggling. The bill was enacted by Parliament in April. In May, Prime Minister Grenville wrote to the Board of Customs Commissioners asking for advice on how increased revenue could be collected in America. In July, the Customs Board
recommended that customs collectors be required to go to their American posts (rather than remaining in Britain and collecting their salaries, which was a common practice), and that they should be paid a commission on the duties they collected. These measures addressed the major problems with a revenue plan based on customs duties: inefficiency and corruption. The Customs Board estimated that the total duties obtained from America in 1763 would be a paltry £1,800, which would cost more than £7,000 to collect. The reason that customs revenues were so low was because smuggling was rife and the customs officers were frequently lax or corrupt. For example, under the terms of the Sugar Act of 1733, Americans should have paid approximately £200,000 annually in duties on imported sugar and molasses. The actual total was £700. If George Grenville hoped to use the Navigation Acts to raise revenue in America, he would have to see that they were properly enforced. The actions taken by the government in 1763 signaled a new determination to extract revenue from the colonies.

When the Customs Board made its recommendations to the prime minister during the summer of 1763, it suggested that the duty on molasses be collected more rigorously. Under the terms of the Sugar Act of 1733, Americans should pay a duty of 6d per gallon on molasses and sugar imported from non-British colonies in the West Indies. American merchants and British customs officials had largely ignored this duty, which was due to expire. The Board advised the government that a revised duty of 3d per gallon, rigorously collected, would yield £78,000 per annum while protecting the interests of British West Indian planters. Grenville introduced this revised duty in the Sugar Act, which he presented as part of his budget in March of 1764. As part of the legislation associated with the Sugar Act, Grenville added products to the list of enumerated items – including wine, silk, calico, and coffee – which, according to the Navigation Acts, would be subject to increased duties if not traded via Britain. Grenville also proposed that the customs service be strengthened and that acts be enforced not by local colonial civil courts but by an admiralty court to sit at Halifax, Nova Scotia, far from local interference. Simultaneously, under the terms of the 1764 Currency Act, Grenville forbade the
colonies from issuing paper money, thereby making it more difficult for Americans to pay the new customs duties. The whole program was adopted by Parliament over little opposition. In so doing, Parliament had taken the hitherto unprecedented step of taxing the American colonies to raise revenue. This step represented a fundamental revision in the relationship between Britain and the colonies. Spurred on by a legitimate desire to raise revenue in America, George Grenville had undertaken a policy that, if fully implemented, would severely curtail the autonomy previously enjoyed in the colonies.

The Sugar Act would have its greatest immediate impact in southern New England. Of the 113 rum distilleries in British North America that used molasses as their main raw material, sixty-four were in Massachusetts and forty were in Rhode Island and Connecticut. There were no molasses distilleries south of Pennsylvania. Nonetheless, rum was of immense importance in eighteenth-century America. It was a favored spirit of many Americans, as well as a significant article of trade in the Atlantic trade and in relations between British Americans and Indians. The extension of the list of enumerated items and stricter customs enforcement could severely curtail the coasting trade, which was vital to colonies lacking sufficient roads. Moreover, the enforcement of the new legislation by admiralty courts represented a challenge to the colonial legal system and the common law tradition in America. As a consequence, when word of the act reached America in May 1764, some of the more perspicacious colonists saw ominous tidings in the legislation.

The colonial reaction to the Sugar Act was inchoate and largely ineffective. As would happen so often over the next decade, the people of Massachusetts took the initiative in formulating a colonial response. On May 24, 1764, the Boston Town Meeting instructed its representatives in the Massachusetts assembly, known as the Great and General Court, to request that the colony’s agent in London should defend the right of the Massachusetts assembly to levy its own taxes. The assembly took the course of action suggested by the Town Meeting at the end of May. A month later, the assembly issued a circular letter to the other colonial assemblies.
calling for a united response to the Sugar Act. At the end of October a special session of the assembly asserted its right to levy taxes within the colony – internal taxes – implying that Parliament had the right to levy customs duties such as the Sugar Act. Throughout the summer and autumn of 1764 other colonial assemblies voiced their own protests against the Sugar Act. Connecticut, for example, condemned internal taxes but accepted the propriety of Parliament’s levying customs duties for the purpose of raising revenue. The New York assembly, by contrast, petitioned Parliament and the king asserting that duties intended to raise revenue were unjust. Virginia’s House of Burgesses endorsed the Massachusetts circular letter in October and claimed freedom from both internal taxation and taxation intended to raise revenue. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and South Carolina each instructed their agents in London to protest against the act. Rhode Island, which would be especially hard hit by the Sugar Act, called for an inter-colonial conference on the subject and complained about the impact of the act on colonial trade and the use of admiralty courts to enforce the act, and condemned internal taxes. Only North Carolina, with little direct interest in the Sugar Act, took the position that would become the standard colonial reaction to British taxation within a few years. The Carolinians petitioned George III asserting that the colonies were not subject to taxes to which their representatives had not given their consent.

Americans did not only object to the Sugar Act through their assemblies. Many also took up their pens to object to Parliament’s high-handed treatment of the colonies. Among them was James Otis of Barnstable, Massachusetts. Otis was an outspoken and idiosyncratic member of a prominent Massachusetts family. Elected to the Great and General Court in 1762, he was a prominent critic of royal government in Massachusetts. In 1761, he achieved notoriety when he challenged the Writs of Assistance – general warrants which enabled British customs officials to search the homes of colonists for contraband – arguing unsuccessfully before the Massachusetts Supreme Court that illegal acts of Parliament need not be obeyed. In the wake of the Sugar Act, Otis published the most famous of the early pamphlets, *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved*, which criticized
Parliament’s new aggressiveness towards the colonies. The confusion and contradiction of the colonial response to the Sugar Act is reflected in Otis’s pamphlet. On the one hand, Otis asserted, along with North Carolina’s lawmakers, that, “Taxes are not to be laid on the people but by their consent in person or by deputation.” Despite the revolutionary implications of such an assertion, Otis also proclaimed that Americans must obey Parliament. For, he wrote:

The power of Parliament is uncontrollable but by themselves, and we must obey. They only can repeal their own acts. There would be an end of all government if one or a number of subjects or subordinate provinces should take upon them so far as to judge of the justice of an act of Parliament as to refuse obedience to it.

Otis’s response, that Parliament could not tax Americans without their consent and that Parliament must be obeyed, epitomized the confusion and contradiction that bedeviled the colonial reaction to the Sugar Act. Despite their ineffective protests, the Sugar Act and its corollary measures sharpened colonial awareness with respect to taxation and parliamentary intentions vis-à-vis the colonies. The determination of some colonies to declare, despite the Sugar Act – an external customs duty – that Parliament had no authority to levy internal taxes, indicates that some colonial politicians feared that the Sugar Act would be the first of several taxation measures designed to raise money from and exert control over the colonies. They were correct.
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