लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L.B.S National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No. 100468
वर्ग संख्या
Class No. 170
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Mcc

GL 170
MCC
100468
LBSNAA

A HISTORY OF HUMAN MORALS

Volume I

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Morals of the Savage

Weird Moral Ideas and Practices of Man in a State of Mental Childhood

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

Girard, Kansas

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction. The Epic of the Moral Struggle 5

Chapter I. The Drafting of the Law 9
(1) The Non-Moral Stage. (2) The Unconsciously Moral Stage. (3) Where the Idea of Law Begins. (4) The Compulsion of Law.

Chapter II. The Main Clauses of the Decalogue 23
(1) Thou Shalt Not Kill. (2) Thou Shalt Not Steal. (3) Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery.

Chapter III. Positive Virtues of the Savage 34
(1) The Virtue of Justice. (2) Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself. (3) Truthfulness and Honor.

Chapter IV. Perversions of the Moral Sense 43
(1) Effects of Environment. (2) Effects of Superstition.

Chapter V. On the Threshold of Civilization 52
(1) The Savage Equivalent of Cave Man. (2) The Polynesians. (3) The Amerinds and Their Ancestors.

THE MORALS OF THE SAVAGE

INTRODUCTION

THE EPIC OF THE MORAL STRUGGLE

AT THE close of the Key to Culture I explained that the most important and most interesting way in which I could fill in that slender outline of all knowledge would be to "tell how men and women really lived in the marble halls of Corinth or the scented groves of Antioch, in Athens and Rome, in the squalid huts and the barbaric castles of the Middle Ages and in the frankly sensuous and refined world of the Arab and the Persian, in the gloom of periods of Puritanism, with their secret vices, and in the accommodating world of Jesuit confessors." The historical section of the Key is necessarily little more than a general frame for the lives of the nations that have gone before us: a brief and rapid survey of the human family as a whole and a short account of the way in which a hundred different environments had given diversity to the common human features. The reader must have felt, as we swept from country to country and age to age, that it would have been pleasant to linger for a while here and there and look into the hearts and minds of the people: to realize how like and unlike ourselves were these folk who dwelt ages ago by the Nile or the rivers of Babylon, who lived and loved under the shadow of the Parthenon or of some medieval cathedral. I propose in this series of volumes to meet that human interest.

History became attractive to thoughtful people in our time when it ceased to be a series of disconnected chronicles and became the diary of the human family and the science of its molding forces. That, and the high literary skill of the author, explains the remarkable success of Wells's Outline of History. In spite, however, of that distinguished work and the many imitations of it we still require a history that shall put on their common human level the monarch and the artisan, the noble and priest and peasant, and tell us how they thought and felt and behaved. There is still too much in all historical works of the melodramatic posing of kings, the ambitions of statesmen, the tramp and clash of armies, the forms of gods and temples; nor are we entirely captivated by the new learned accounts of the clothes people once wore, the coins they handled, or their vehicles or musical instruments. We want to know how they reacted in those situations of life which are broadly common to them and to us. Drama, fiction and film bear witness that it is just those reactions of daily life which most vividly interest us, and in the chronicles of the past it is the glimpses we get of these reactions which chiefly appeal to us.

Imperfect as is the material that an historian can use for this purpose—for, unfortunately, there is little more than the antics of kings and the plots of statesmen and priests in the old chronicles—it would take many large volumes to tell the story as we know it. I have therefore simplified the task by writing separate and complete works on two of the chief interests that would complicate the story: sex and the religion that has dominated most of the civilized world and still largely shapes its

code of conduct. These works, and the historical section of my Little Blue Books, make it unnecessary here to deviate into controversy or distract the reader with authorities. The great issues of sex and religion will, of course, still mightily interest us; and in fact the ampler record of daily life which I shall here attempt will usefully supplement and strengthen many of the general statements I made. The moral section of history is rarely quite impartial and truthful. Even when the writer is free from prejudice he seems to see on the wall of his study the shadow of the priest or the policeman. . . . In refuting these libels I have already said much about behavior in ancient times, but it was necessarily partial and abstract. I must have left my readers still wondering how the artisan or the merchant or the noble really lived in ancient Thebes or Babylon or Bagdad. For the next six months I expel controversy from my mind and sit down to write as vivid and picturesque an account of the thoughts and lives of men in earlier ages as the available material permits. Perhaps the narrative will at times be tinged with irony or sympathy, but I write on the whole in the mood of one who feels that the infancy of the race, which we are closing, must necessarily have been rather infantile, and that a manhood many times longer than the millions of years of childhood lies before it.

A great mathematician once said that a time will come when a master of his science will trace the entire story of evolution simply by working out the inevitable behavior of a material reality. The first part of that stupendous task has already been achieved. The mathematician takes from the astronomer a thin cloud of cosmic dust and shows how it will necessarily condense into a sun or a solar system. In time he will show how it was equally inevitable that some chemical ooze or slime in the hot primitive waters of a planet should take the form of living units, and that these should pass through just that billion-year transformation which is fragmentarily recorded in the rocks. And I do not doubt that in further time, in the course of centuries, the behavior of the highest animal, man, will be shown with all the rigor of mathematical procedure to have passed necessarily and inexorably through just those social, political and religious phases which are recorded in history or survive in the savage and in ourselves. Mathematics is not usually regarded as inspiring, yet that thought, and the prospect of an indefinite future of real civilization (which prospect also we really owe to the mathematician), make me regard the human story rather as a wonderful epic than as either a comedy or a tragedy.

An epic this story of human behavior surely is in the dramatic conflict in all ages of the codes of conduct which men make for themselves and what they actually do. I am going to assume throughout this work that, as I have shown elsewhere, moral law is simply a code of social behavior. This is not a treatise on ethics, though we shall note, as we proceed, the modifications of men's moral ideas in conformity with this view of the nature of moral law. At first sight, however, the epic of human behavior does not seem to encourage it. If the moral code of a people is its own code of social conduct, why the constant strain to observe it, the perpetual transgression, the half-hostile attitude toward it as if it were an alien tyranny? Why cannot a generation make a code of laws that restricts personal liberty only in the clear interest of the

general good and keep to its code? There would still, of course, be anarchists, since from the nature of the case law involves a coercion of men of strong impulses or weak control, but there ought not to be the quite general bootlegging-attitude toward the social prohibition that we find in every civilization today and shall now find in all earlier civilizations. The law, somehow, seems non-human or superhuman in its despotism.

That is just the peculiar romance of man's moral development. Did you ever cross a range of low grassy hills on which sheep browsed and note the narrow tracks they have worn on the slopes? Watch them when they migrate and see how they blindly follow each other in these paths, head to tail, though at times it would be shorter to cross the grass. The path was worn by the sheep of long ago but it rules the sheep of today. Suppose that we could lift them slightly above their level of purely automatic behavior and give them a faint dawn of intelligence. They would still follow the track, though they would now be faintly conscious that they were following an ancient custom. Raise the intelligence a further degree, and they will begin to speculate on the path and imagine wiser sheep than themselves of earlier days who traced it: perhaps bogies on the grass who will assault them if they wander from the track. Even if they become intelligent enough to make new paths, the old tracks will retain a mystic glamor of other-worldly wisdom.

This is not sheer imagination, for we shall see in a moment that this is how the human family behaved as it rose slowly in intelligence. In almost all savage peoples existing custom is the most formidable of tyrants, and it is quite commonly, even when no vital meaning can be found in it, ascribed to very wise ancestors or superhuman powers. But I must drop my little allegory of the sheep. Human life becomes more complicated as intelligence develops, and the laws of conduct must increase and be modified. But the servility to custom keeps the oldest sheep-tracks in respect. You cannot see any human meaning in them? Then the gods ordained them, and their purposes are inscrutable, so follow the path meekly. At last there arise men too bold or too wise to believe in gods, yet old custom is so tenacious, or public opinion so intimidating, that they find new meanings in the old sheep-tracks and swear that they shall be held as sacred as ever. They belong to the eternal scheme of things; they are copies of a plan hidden in the mystic depths of the universe; they are paths which every right-minded man will follow because he would not be right-minded if he did not follow them.

In one of the volumes of the Key (No. 37) and one of the Little Blue Books (No. 1061) I have sorted out this confusion of the natural, supernatural and mystic views of conduct—of, in learned language, the social or utilitarian, the theological, and the intentionist theories of moral law—and will not return to the subject. But these three tendencies—of the savage to bow without question to custom, of the priest to give it a divine authorship, of the philosopher to find solid foundations for it in the ether—explain why we do not find men changing their codes when their life changes: why in each generation moral law has in it some elements of alien tyranny and unrecognizable origin. They explain the eternal conflict of the law and the actions of those who are supposed to have made it for themselves: the mystic theories of a struggle of god

and devil, spirit and flesh, light and darkness; the groans of temptation and remorse, the blood-stained cell of the true monk, the hermit of the desert, the pale fanatic of the city, and, on the other hand, the fierce reaction of the anti-moralist, the purple rhetoric of the prophet of passion. And above all they explain the less dramatic and more human conflict, which we shall find throughout this picturesque story, of the impulses and the beliefs of the common man, his childlike habit in all ages of sneaking into dark corners to escape the eye of an all-seeing god, his genial hypocrisy in constantly transgressing the law which he holds to be the most sacred on earth.

We shall consider here the whole conduct of man which we call moral or immoral, but there is still much to be said to fill in those little outline-sketches that I have already given of sexual conduct in different ages. It is true that I am not permitted to describe the life, say, in the temple of the Syrian goddess at Byblos or in some mansion on the Pincian Hill at Rome in the day of Martial with the same candor as one is permitted to use in describing the bloody horrors of a modern war or the sordid acts of a wife-poisoner. **Noblesse oblige.** . . . But from the pages of the explorers of the remains of the more ancient civilizations and from the social writings of the last two thousand years we will take such fragments of actual life as we can find and try to realize what the Athenians were like in the days of Pericles, what folk were like in Cairo and Bagdad in the days of the Arabian Nights, or in France in the days of Rabelais or Louis XIV, or in New England in the days of Cotton Mather.

CHAPTER I

THE DRAFTING OF THE LAW

WE RELY on written records for our pictures of man's behavior in the past and we shall therefore mainly confine ourselves to the nations of the last two thousand years, after we have gathered such facts as we can about the life of the older civilizations. But the oldest tomb-inscriptions of Egypt and the prayers and hymns that we have unearthed in the ruins of Mesopotamian temples of five thousand years ago show that the moral law was already drafted, as we have it today, when man first comes into the light of history. We of the twentieth century may be more sensitive in some respects in the application of justice to life but I venture to say that five thousand years ago men had as firm a grasp of the law of justice and were as faithful in applying it to human concerns as they were in any part of the world one hundred years ago. The three main commandments in which that law finds expression—that a man shall respect his neighbor's person, property and wife—were certainly familiar in the very dawn of civilization, and they were put in the mouths of the gods.

We have therefore to look back into the dim prehistoric earlier period for the actual framing of the moral code, and readers of my earlier works will know how we can do this. The lower peoples of the earth are prehistoric men in various stages of development. I have given some account of their general lives, and in the work on sex I have given a more extensive description of their ideas and practices in that most important of moral categories. Here I propose to make a novel experiment. Taking the lowest known peoples as representative of prehistoric man in the early stages of his mental development, I attempt to trace how in actual fact during the hundred or two hundred thousand years before the beginning of civilization men came to accept a code of conduct that restricted individual impulses. My regular readers, whom I do not wish to weary with repetitions, will know that by combining our extensive knowledge of the general life of prehistoric man with our knowledge of the moral ideas and practices of the lower races of today, it is possible to trace this development with fair confidence.

One point only need be repeated here. Recent American works on the lower peoples warn us not to attempt to see in their habits the ways of prehistoric man at one or other stage of his development. It is said that there has been so much borrowing of culture, so much education of the lower by the higher savages, that we cannot expect to find instances of pure or primitive cultural stages. As regards the higher levels of savage life this is a sound warning; though even here we may remind ourselves how stubbornly the savage clings to old customs and resents innovation. But in point of fact we find numbers of the lowest peoples so isolated that they had little chance of borrowing, and so simple and primitive in their ways that they obviously did not borrow. I shall use a few of these low-

est of known peoples in this chapter to trace the earliest development of what we may call a moral code and a moral sense, and in the next three chapters we will follow the erratic development of the three chief clauses of the decalogue from level to level of savage life until we reach the threshold of civilization

§1. THE NON-MORAL STAGE

Although it is, even on the moderate estimate of Mr. W. K. Gregory, at least ten million years since a branch of the ancient ape-world diverged in the direction of humanity, we have no human remains that go back more than a half million years, and there is no existing savage that can be said to represent human life as it was more than quarter of a million years ago. There is thus a stretch of some ten or more million years of semi-human or human development of which not a single positive trace has survived. It might seem, then, that it is quite impossible to reconstruct the earlier evolution of man's ideas: that he emerges from an impenetrable mist with human features if not elementary institutions, of which we can no longer trace the formation. But even the lower savages of today are so lacking in institutions and ideas that we need not regret our ignorance of the earlier period. Behavior was not guided by laws but was as automatic as it is in the case of the apes; or at most this semi-human creature would display what we call his superior intelligence only in some unusual peril of life or acute difficulty in obtaining food, not in the daily conduct of life.

Yet since moral law is at first just a codification of existing habits or customs, it is interesting to try to ascertain what habits this ancestor of ours formed during this long and unprogressive period. To understand them, and indeed to understand some of the most important elements of the moral code, we must firmly set aside what is called the "old-man theory" of primitive society. This supposes that the human savages lived in groups round an elderly male who, as long as he remained strong enough to kill rivals, appropriated all the females of the group as they became mature and drove off or killed the males. In the course of time, it is said, some vigorous young male expelled from the group slew the dictator and took his place, to be in turn dethroned and slain when his strength waned. If this were a true picture of the human family during its long infancy, we should have a primitive character shaped by millions of years of ferocity and selfishness in the male and dependence and submission in the female. Other speculative writers have imagined that the primitive humans lived and hunted in large packs, like wolves, and that the females were, as a rule, communal property. Both these theories would make the man of the Old Stone Age begin his career with a fund of savagery which would be very refractory to any code of conduct.

These theories are purely imaginary, and I have shown (Key to Culture, No. 23) that we have very positive reasons to reject them. It is too often forgotten that the tiger and the wolf are now in the line of man's ancestry—that, in fact, there has not been any carnivorous beast in that line for the last hundred million

years at least— and that the lowest known humans do not exhibit any "savagery" for us to have to explain. There is every ground to believe that the only human group in those primeval ages was the family: the father, mother, and children up to the age of puberty. The extreme crudity of the worked flints of even half a million years ago, the great abundance of every variety of food apart from running animals, the mode of life of the apes and of our lowest savages all confirm this supposition, as we saw.

Thus we can confidently infer the habits which early man developed by imagining a very slow and gradual advance from the habits of the chimpanzee to those of the wild Veddah of Ceylon, in the same region of southern Asia; and when we do this we get a very interesting light on the drafting of the moral code. It may seem a prodigious leap from the anthropoid ape to the Veddah, when we recollect that millions of years were absorbed in that transition, but in point of fact there is so much similarity in the life at each extreme that the apes are regarded by higher natives as "wild men" and the Veddahs are said to "live like apes." Both types live in generally placid and harmonious family groups, the young, as they mature, pairing off to form new families. There is no tyrannical old man, no incest, no promiscuity. The chief difference, apart from the higher intelligence of the human (chiefly seen in more ingenious ways of gathering food), is that the human families form small groups, living in friendly intercourse though without chief or tribal organization, and the young male easily pairs with a young female of a neighboring family.

In other words, the habits of our early human and semi-human ancestor during millions of years did not tend to foster sentiments of brutality, cruelty, domination, or selfishness. They encouraged rather the gentler and more altruistic feelings which, as we see in a very large part of the higher animal world, arise in and are beneficial to the family circle. There is no need to quote animal instances, and it is hardly necessary to say that the very much longer immaturity and helplessness of the human young developed these feelings in a higher degree in the primitive human family. We see the tendency when we pass from the lower monkeys to the ape. We are thus brought to the interesting conclusion that the first sheep-track worn on the hillside by human feet was a path of virtue: an ideal of strict monogamy and mutual attachment and helpfulness of the members of the group.

§2. THE UNCONSCIOUSLY MORAL STAGE

This explains what seems to some the paradoxical condition of the lowest peoples known to the anthropologist: that, as a distinguished authority says, they have no idea of virtue and no practice of vice. We can call them "savages" only with reference to their low mental capacity or in the original and strict meaning of the word: that they are "wild" or not socially organized. It is true that you will occasionally read stories about their ferocity, but in all such cases you will find that they are retaliating for brutal outrages that whites have committed on them or their wives. Let me

illustrate this from the story of one of the very lowest peoples known to science, the Tasmanian race, which is now extinct.

In the eighteenth century, when European travellers began to visit the island, there were at least two thousand of these dark-skinned, woolly-haired, and generally naked creatures wandering in family groups (sometimes slightly polygamous) about the forests. French warships called at Tasmania in 1792 and 1802, and the naturalists who were aboard and tactfully approached the natives have left us remarkably generous descriptions of them. In this case we must make an allowance for prejudice in favor of the natives. These French naturalists were clearly under the spell of Rousseau's theory —that man was entirely virtuous and happy in a state of nature— yet the long account of his experiences left us by Perou almost justifies the flattering character of his verdict. It concludes:

> "This gentle confidence of the people in us, these affectionate evidences of benevolence which they never ceased to manifest towards us, the sincerity of their demonstrations, the frankness of their manners, the touching ingenuousness of their caresses, all concurred to excite within us sentiments of the tenderest interest. The intimate union of the different individuals of a family, the sort of patriarchal life of which we had been spectators, had strongly moved us. I saw with an inexpressible pleasure the realization of those brilliant descriptions of the happiness and simplicity of the state of nature of which I had so many times in reading felt the seductive charm."

Yet within quarter of a century after this the male natives were engaged in a ferocious struggle against the whites, and in the next ten years the Tasmanian race was almost exterminated by British troops. As Bonwick candidly says in his "Lost Tasmanian Race," the anger and cruelty which the natives discovered were provoked entirely by the appalling and callous outrages inflicted on them and their wives by the first British settlers.

It is well known that these Tasmanians were a remnant of a race which had at one time occupied Australia, before the more powerful blacks dislodged them. From the Australians they had clearly borrowed a few points of material culture (fire, etc.), but in their island-home they preserved, and presented to these pioneers of science, the normal character of man as he had been perhaps quarter of a million years earlier. It would be improper to draw such an inference from a single people, but fortunately we have half a dozen other fragments of this primitive race in the same region. I have already mentioned the Veddahs of Ceylon: the pure or wild Veddahs who long sheltered in the remote districts of the island and are now almost, if not quite, extinct. East of Ceylon is the group of the Andaman Islands, where another fragment of this very early race still lingers, protected until modern times from the contamination of higher cultures by the spurious reputation for savagery—they were merry and affectionate creatures like the Tasmanians—which travellers had given them. Further east again, in

the rarely penetrated jungles of the Malay Peninsula, are other survivors (Semang, etc.) of the race, still very little altered, and further east the Aetas of the Philippine Islands represent the extreme limit of the distribution of the race.

For the physical features, the origin, and the place in the evolution of man of this primeval race I refer the reader to the Key to Culture (No. 11). For the reasons I have given there we assume that this race, which at one time covered southern Asia and is much older than any other race now living, represented in its day the high-water mark of human development. The period one cannot attempt to name without serious hesitation, but we shall probably not be far astray if we say that this was the human race between quarter and half a million years ago; and there is so much consistency in the moral features of the isolated groups of survivors that we can confidently trace its stage of unconscious moral development. Some have borrowed the bow and arrow—some have even learned from their neighbors to tip the arrows with iron or poison—but in those habits which concern us here the survivors are still remarkably agreed.

At this stage the race was clearly monogamous. Apart from some amount—it is disputed but seems proved—of polygamy and divorce in Tasmania, the uniform feature, in fact the only institution, is the union of two parents until death. Since it would be outrageous, or at least entirely arbitrary, to suppose that man's ancestors had started as monogamous, since that is the normal ape-life, then passed on to polygamy or promiscuity, and for some obscure reason got back to monogamy quarter of a million years ago, we safely assume that throughout the long period of the infancy of the race monogamy remained. That one of a dozen branches of the family should become more or less polygamous is not surprising, as the gorilla, according to most writers, shows the same departure in the ape-family. We have thus to regard the monogamous family as the chief fact which controlled the habits of early man, and once more we find the survivors of this early race confirming us in our estimate of the kind of qualities which this mode of life would engender. One of the best psychological descriptions of these lowest peoples is the account of the Andaman Islanders by Sir R. C. Temple in Hastings' "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics." Temple was for many years Chief Commissioner of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and he unites to the carefulness of a high official a warm sympathy with the people.

The Andamanese is, he says, a merry, affectionate, careless, and quite attractive child throughout life. He cannot count; he is so improvident that he may forget to store water for a voyage; his memory is vivid but very short. Like all savages he believes that there are evil spirits everywhere, but he is "too happy to be affected by his superstitions." He is selfish and impetuous and often ungrateful, yet he is generous and chivalrous, soon forgets his wrongs, and has some sense of honor. Except when his hasty temper breaks out, he is pleasant and playful, fond of practical jokes, kindly to all his fellows, considerate to the sick and aged, indulgent to his wife

and children. He is, like the child, unstable and liable to gusts of passion, when he may become cruel and treacherous. He is "not lustful, indecent, or obscenely abusive." In later life he becomes quarrelsome, but some of the older women are respected for their superior wisdom. He is obstinately conservative, and no attempt to "civilize" him has succeeded: obviously from mental incapacity. Custom is law and religion to him. There are chiefs of a sort, but they are without authority; people obey when it suits their interest. There is no social distinction except such as the individual wins by merit: no private ownership of land and only a vague feeling of private ownership of other objects.

Temple holds that this is uncontaminated primitive life. The Andaman Islands are mountain-tops, and the natives have a tradition of a great flood: a reference, apparently, to the subsidence of land in the Indian Ocean which scattered this primitive family. This branch of the family took refuge in the mountain-summits, and it has, Temple says, remained unadulterated because ignorant mariners spread the report that they killed all intruders. For seventy years, however, they have been under British rule, and one is tempted to think that there has been some deterioration. We shall see later that contact with whites almost invariably leads to a worsening of character in some respects. Mr. Man, the other leading authority on the Andamanese, makes this point:

> "It has been remarked with regret by all interested in the race that intercourse with the alien population has, generally speaking, prejudicially affected their morals: that the candor and veracity and self-reliance they manifest in their savage and untutored state are, when they become associated with foreigners, to a great extent lost, and habits of untruthfulness, dependence and sloth are engendered."

A nice commentary on our Christian civilization that the first contact with it leads to a corruption of the character of "the lowest savages on earth"! We shall, unfortunately, see many instances of this. Man confirms the best virtues of the little Andamanese. One point will suffice:

> "Every care and consideration are paid by all classes to the very young, the weak, the aged, and the helpless, and these, being made special objects of interest and attention, invariably fare better in regard to the comforts and necessaries of daily life than any of the otherwise more fortunate members of the community."

Such facts must seem so strange to those who imagine that early prehistoric man was the embodiment of millions of years of ruthless ferocity and selfishness, and had gradually to be tamed as a moral law broke upon his mind, that I will add a few words about the other surviving fragments of this early race. They are all (with the slight exception I gave) monogamous and united for life, and all of them of whom we have satisfactory knowledge have excellent practices. Murder is almost unknown amongst them, quarreling is

rare, stealing is (as a general rule) still rarer, and most of them are strictly truthful in their relations with each other. Not only do they observe more faithfully than civilized folk the grosser commands of the decalogue, though they have no knowledge of a decalogue, but they positively excel in the finer features of character which we imagine to be much later growths.

In his large and authoritative work, "The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas," Professor Westermarck studies the distribution of all virtues and vices in the savage world. The careful reader will notice a singular fact of which Professor Westermarck himself does not perceive the significance, because he makes no attempt to separate savage tribes according to their degrees of culture. This fact is that, not only in regard to the major commandments, but in connection with the more refined virtues of benevolence, charity, and truthfulness—love of wives and children and support of the aged, widows, and helpless generally—he has to give honorable mention much more frequently to these lowest specimens of the human race than to higher savages. Amongst these we never find either infanticide or parricide, very rarely murder, never incest and rarely adultery, never the killing of the aged or ill, the neglect of widows, war, cannibalism, slavery, or human sacrifices. Whatever moral test he applies to the savage world Professor Westermarck has to give full, or nearly full, marks to the Veddahs, Andamanese, Tasmanians, and Bushmen, the best known fragments of this primitive race which I am reconstructing; and I may add that peoples at the second lowest level of culture like the Hottentots and Australians generally come next in the award of virtue. One suspects that it is the perverse theory of the origin of the moral sentiments which he has adopted that prevents so learned an anthropologist from noti.ing and speculating on this interesting fact.

We examine each of these virtues and vices separately in the following chapters. Here I put together the consistent features of all these survivors of a very primitive race of dark, dwarfish, woolly-haired men, and we see the condition at which our race had arrived some quarter of a million years ago. At the attainment of puberty the boy or girl wandered from their families and, without anything in the nature of a ceremony, began to found a new family. They may not have wandered far and, as we find today, two or three or four families might remain in friendly contact. With no human enemies, no property to steal or lose—for the only weapon was a flint so crudely worked that any man could make one in a few minutes—no poisonous superstitions about sacrifice to the gods, no large body of young women to awaken the desire of variety, no scarcity of food to suggest infanticide or parricide (for the geologist gives a very genial aspect even to southern Europe in those days), the qualities I have described are the natural and spontaneous reactions to the simple conditions. Ages of animal development had determined the fundamental emotions: the mutual attachment and helpfulness of the family-group. Numbers of the birds and mammals show us just such virtues, and in the case of these primitive humans the benevolent emotions have extended to the related fami-

lies which live near each other. There is no clothing, no hut (though possibly a rock-shelter in the bad season), no retirement for natural functions, no sex-stimulation apart from the normal life of the organs, and, as all the sexually mature are paired, the impulse is satisfied at once and content with the same monotony as in the case of the monogamous apes or other mammals.

In a sense Rousseau was right about the virtuousness of savages in a state of nature, if we confine our attention to this very small group of the lowest peoples. I do not think that any modern anthropologist would hesitate to say that there is far less transgression of the moral code amongst them than at any higher level of life. But the anthropologist would just as promptly agree that they have no moral code. They go by instinct or custom, but, whereas the higher savage often sees no meaning whatever in the acts which custom compels him to perform, and feels some constraint or "duty," the habits of these lowly peoples are spontaneous reactions to their environment and need no learning or enforcement. They are peaceful because that quality within the family circle was the necessary outcome of the natural evolution of the family, strengthened by the long infancy of the human individual. They are virtuous because they lack the opportunity or the incentive to be otherwise.

§3. WHERE THE IDEA OF LAW BEGINS

There used to be a controversy in anthropology over the question whether there are or are not savages without a moral sense. It depends, naturally, what we mean. As custom regulates the entire life of the savage, he certainly has a feeling of "ought": he must observe the tribal custom. It is said that a traveler once endeavored to ascertain this in the case of the Australians, who are only a degree above the savages I have described, by asking a youth whether he would eat certain forbidden food if there were no native to see him eat it. He is said to have hesitated and then replied: "No, that would not be right." There is really no Australian word for "right," but we may take it that he was expressing a feeling of compulsion, and that the stern lessons of obedience he had learned in boyhood—the close association of the ideas of disobedience and the unpleasantness of punishment, either by men or the spirits—sufficiently explain his reply. In the case of the Australian and at all higher levels of savage life there is a vivid belief in spirits which can see and resent one's conduct when no mortal eye is near, so that we have a good reason for a feeling of compulsion in all circumstances. The elders told youths of frightful evils they incurred if they ate forbidden food. We need not object to calling this moral feeling. Some writers decline to do so on the ground that the feeling is specifically different from the American or European conscience, but in so far as it is a sense of duty under dread of spirit-punishers there is a clear analogy. It is enough if we realize that the lower savage has nothing like the feeling of a specific law or conscience apart from tribal custom and the coercion of his fellows to observe it.

Even amongst the lowest peoples there are today, whether they

have been originally developed or borrowed, certain practices (ceremonious dances, disposal of the dead, at childbirth, etc.) which custom dictates. This is in a rudimentary sense law, but we can scarcely speak here of moral law and moral sentiment. I prefer to call these peoples unconsciously moral because it is not in obedience to any sort of compulsion that the Veddah avoids murder, adultery, lying, and stealing, or bestows his affection on his young and helps the widow and infirm. These things are due to instinctive emotional reactions which, in one or other degree, we find in the animal world. There is no need for law in that sphere of elementary simplicity.

The Bushmen and Hottentots of South Africa show us a next phase in the human development, though they may now be survivors of a higher race than that of the Veddahs. The Hottentots are, in fact, a bastard race; the Bushmen are generally regarded as of the same primitive race as the Veddahs but they are much higher in culture (hunting, artistic faculty, mythology, etc.). Whether this higher culture is native or borrowed, however, it illustrates the human development. There is no paradox in saying that as man rises in intelligence and begins to be conscious of a law of conduct he deteriorates morally. It is a simple fact that the primitive virtues are disturbed, and we begin to find much more theft, lying, violence, and adultery. Amongst the Bushmen, for instance, a dusky, merry little people like the Andamanese, chastity is very poorly observed. The "married" women commonly have lovers, and the entire kraal takes a lively interest in a love-affair and even conspires to conceal it from the husband and enjoy it. Seduction is a joke. The chief sexual law is that you shall not be found out. Naturally this state of things leads to a great deal of quarrelling, and on this account, and because of many quarrels about hunting rights, the primitive peacefulness, or at least infrequency of violence, disappears. There is a good deal of polygamy, and couples may separate by mutual consent. There is still no ceremony of marriage. The young folk decide themselves to live together, but there is a sort of marriage-feast, with more lively and skillful dancing and music than we find amongst the lowest peoples. Yet this publicity of the act of union does not in the least strengthen it. The strict monogamy of the Negrito folk, which I described, is replaced by a considerable degree of looseness.

This is, whether the Bushmen have borrowed higher culture or no, an interesting illustration of the evolution of behavior. The plain clue to it is the formation of larger communities and the multiplication of property. This would obviously be the next step in social evolution. The Bushmen, who are very skillful hunters, form hut-villages or kraals. The hut is built with some ingenuity, though the life inside it is primitive. The bed of each member of the family is his or her particular hollow scooped out of the earth-floor, in which they curl up to sleep. There is not the least reserve or retirement in regard to any natural functions, the numerous children being quite familiar with the relations of the father to his two or three wives. But the nudity indoors and scanty clothing without

are not provocative to savages. I suggest that it is the large number of young women in one community which stirs the primitive human from his original strict monogamy and gives him a desire of variety. As the woman is fairly equal to the man, this is not much checked by a male ownership of wives. Possibly the higher artistic development—for they proudly and richly decorate themselves with ostrich feathers and paint, have very elaborate dances, and fair musical implements—assist this development: unless we choose to think that the freer amorousness has promoted the artistic development. As I have said elsewhere, the Bushmen can draw and paint on rocks so skillfully that it has recently been suggested that they are the descendants of the cave-artists of Europe; an idea which we may confidently reject.

This association in larger groups and the multiplication of private property—clothes, feathers, instruments, bows and arrows, mats, pots—which it takes considerable time to make, similarly explain the increase of quarreling, as compared with the lowest peoples. There is, however, still in most respects the feeling that all in the kraal are members of one family. At night when the man returns with his game—and the women's tongues cut mercilessly if he has brought none—it is cooked, and the whole family gathers round the large pot. When they have emptied it, they go round the other huts to see if any pots are still not emptied and they naively join the meal. They think little of the morrow. The man who has made a big kill simply provides a feast. Even strangers were hospitably received until the Bushmen learned that a stranger, particularly a white, meant a man who had designs on their hunting grounds or their women. They will, like even lower animals, fight fiercely for their wives and children. It is just as natural a reaction as is kindliness within the family group. But the Veddah or Tasmanian had rarely needed to do this, while Africa filled with superior tribes, constantly exploiting or displacing the little Bushmen, and the primitive peacefulness was more and more disturbed, the fighting faculty more developed.

Thus the Bushmen, though (in my opinion) a fragment of the Veddah-Andaman race, illustrate the long stage of development between the Veddah and the Australian black. It does not in this case matter whether they borrowed from their superior neighbors, for their continental home, as compared with the island-refuges of their poorer cousins, gave them the conditions of progress, as I explained these in earlier works. The Australians, on the other hand, are a well-defined section of a race which shows a later stage of human development: the taller black race which in its turn developed in southern Asia and drove the Negritos to the forests and islands. Again we must hesitate to use any sort of chronology, but we may provisionally say that these blacks represent the human race of a hundred thousand years ago. They spread into Europe (Neanderthal man) and were extinguished there: into Africa, where some found the conditions of progress: and into Australia, where complete isolation during tens of thousands of years, probably over a hundred

thousand years, has kept their primitive culture relatively pure and therefore very interesting from our present viewpoint.

§4. THE COMPULSION OF THE LAW

As a rule, references to the Australians in works on human development are so contradictory and bewildering that you will wonder how we can gather from them any clear information about early moral evolution. The same learned writer will tell you on one page that the blacks regard murder as a "sin" and that the murderer feels "remorse," and on another page that an Australian will kill even his friend for a trifling cause: on one page that they are very loose in sexual morals, and on another that they burn alive a pregnant unmarried girl and her baby. All these statements are true, but the authorities who make them are referring to totally different peoples within the Australian family; or, in some cases, one refers to the natives before their demoralization by the whites and another to their condition today or recently. Either because the blacks came into Australia in successive waves, as is probable, or because contact gave some the conditions of progress and isolation left others in their primitive state, there is a very considerable diversity in the different branches of the Australian race. Here I shall, as far as possible, select moral or social features which are common to all.

The fundamental common feature, from our present point of view, is the social grouping. They live in camps of, on the average, about fifty members, but each tribe is elaborately organized, and the marriage-regulations are so peculiar that they alone would suffice to maintain a constant communication between the various members of the tribe. This closer grouping leads, as we saw on a smaller scale in the case of the Bushmen, to higher mental development and in some respects further moral deterioration. But we also find society beginning to protect itself against this loss of qualities which are clearly of advantage in the social group, and this is a very interesting phase of moral development. Customs are now very numerous and, as they are rigorously enforced by physical punishment or the terrors of superstitious belief, we may call them laws. Many of the experts still deny that there is any moral sentiment, for the black has the same feeling of compulsion in regard to murder or incest as in regard to numbers of weird practices which have nothing to do with what we call morals. It does not matter, except to the kind of writer who is determined to find conscience and belief in god in all men, whether or no we call their feeling of compulsion to do or to avoid certain acts moral. What matters is that, in spite of the obscurity of much of their life, they exhibit an important stage in the formulation of the moral code and the investing of that code with an authority which is in part mystic, or the formation of what is called conscience.

This is particularly interesting in connection with sexual life. Monogamy remains the ideal. The very peculiar features of their marriage-system led early travelers to think that they were promiscuous, but the system is now understood. The basis of it is that the mature youth, after the weird ceremonies of initiation to

manhood, which include circumcision and often subincision (cutting underneath the organ), shall have a mature girl selected for him, on a certain schedule of relationship, as mate, and they shall live together in mutual fidelity and rear a family. If we realize the tyranny of old custom, we understand why monogamy is retained, but one can suggest other reasons. On the one hand, the social group, which we shall find constantly trying to prevent or restrict disturbances of its life, will have less murderous wrangling about women under a system of marriage than under one of promiscuity: on the other hand, there is, as we find even in civilized society, a natural desire of a youth to possess, as he puts it, a woman of his own.

But there are interesting alleviations of the monotony. There is nothing like the cynical looseness of the Bushmen. Presumably this led, as men became more pugnacious, to constant trouble: though we might regard the Australian development as an alternative to the Bushman. One thing is certain and admitted by all: once we rise above the very lowest level of human life we never again find a loyally monogamous and divorceless people. The Australians keep monogamy and almost always punish adultery, generally with death or exposure to mortal danger. In some tribes the injured husband is free to avenge himself, but the tribes generally have risen above that chaotic and dangerous arrangement and administer justice socially. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" generally means to the Australian aborigine that if he does commit it, the injured husband will denounce him to the camp or the council of older men, and presently he will be set, perhaps painted white, to defend himself with his small wooden shield alone while all the men try, from some distance, to kill him with spear and boomerang. Intercourse with the unmarried is in most cases prevented by marrying the mature girl early. She is taken to the bush by a group of the older men, laid across the nude bodies of three of them, and her body is opened with a stone knife. These men have then a sort of "right of the first night" (or first few days) before they bring her back, decorated with foliage, for the selected husband. If young couples flout the authority of the elders and elope, an expedition is sent after them and, if they are caught before they reach the youth's tribe, they are killed. Chastity begins to have an accent of imperiousness.

There are, however, departures from the strict ideal. The older men of a camp have an authority which is in some respects despotic, and it seems to be tolerated mainly because they hold the secrets of dealing with the spirits and averting evil from the tribe. They thus show us the germs of both kingship and priestship, and in both respects they exploit their position. They frighten women and children with admittedly fictitious stories of spirit-activity, secure a large share of little luxuries for themselves by telling the youths what horrible diseases (sent by the spirits) will plague them if they eat certain parts of the game, and, as I said, claim the first right to a mature girl. Often they keep these girls for a considerable time, and there is a good deal of polygamy. There are also other departures,

even where the law of sexual conduct is generally strict. A visitor or a messenger going on tribal business will often be accommodated with a temporary wife, and for superstitious reasons a man sometimes sends his wife into the bush with another man to collect some of the material of his magic.

Inevitably this kind of life and the increase of personal belongings and larger range of hunting grounds lead to much quarreling. It is sometimes represented that the tribes are constantly at war with each other, but, though war naturally begins (mainly owing to quarrels about women or hunting or murder) now that a people is split up into different tribes, the amount of warfare is much exaggerated. Normally the different tribes are friendly to and often visit each other. Within the tribe or camp the society now seeks to defend itself by the formal laws, thou shalt not steal, kill, or commit incest or adultery; and irregular witchcraft is put on the same footing, as it is believed that they can kill each other by magic. Some of the more backward tribes leave it to the injured person to retaliate. Some, on the other hand, expel a troublesome man from the camp, and a woman who makes a general nuisance of herself is often taken in hand by the other women and severely beaten. As a rule, the council of older men receives a complaint, renders a verdict, and either appoints executioners, to kill or cripple the guilty, or exposes him, as I explained, to the ordeal. If he escapes harm, justice is satisfied and good humor prevails once more.

One other mark of deterioration at this higher level is the prevalence of infanticide. It must be remembered that they have, or had before the whites came, no idea that the man was the father of the child. A spirit had entered the woman, they thought: being only about the size of a seed, it could make its way through her navel. Possibly this ignorance of the father's share had something to do with his callousness in exposing new-born children when food was not plentiful; but we shall see later that there are several reasons for infanticide. Otherwise even the male parent is affectionate with his children and less brutal to his wife than is sometimes represented. The account one reads sometimes of the black hiding near a water-hole, clubbing the lubra (young woman) when she comes and dragging her off by the hair, is not in the least typical of Australian life. The black is not at all the fearsome savage that many imagine, but in dealing with the virtues and vices separately I will return to these matters.

I might follow this development a stage further by considering the moral ideas and practices of the Melanesians, who are a few degrees in culture above the Australians and represent a later phase of life in southern Asia, but it is enough here to say that the tendencies I have traced continue to manifest themselves. Monogamy remains the ideal, but in most islands there is considerable latitude, in some cases considerable license; and at the same time there are old traditions which claim that they were at one time much stricter. Violence also increases, and a real ferocity or "savagery" in fighting is developed. There is, as we shall see, the same recognition of law and the same repeated breach of it in other connections. We return

to them later. What I have said suffices for the purpose of this chapter.

At the primitive human level there is no moral law because there is no need of one. Life is so simple that a man may follow his impulses without, normally, injuring any other person and the millions of years of development in family life alone have made those impulses, in so far as they affect a man's wife, children, or neighbors (who are always related), sympathetic. The change comes with greater complexity of life and concentration in villages. The need of defense now does lead in time to a certain savagery in fighting, since this becomes a social virtue, a quality of use to the community. In other respects there is not a deterioration of a man's impulses but a new environment (women and property) which creates new desires. In the interest of its own peace and stability the group formulates laws or commandments, and, as superstition is now the strongest force in a man's life, the laws are quite early put under the protection of the spirits. We thus see moral law rising quite naturally out of the developing social life instead of being either an arbitrary code imposed upon men from another world or some mystic law that existed from eternity and was gradually perceived by the mind as it evolved.

CHAPTER II

THE MAIN CLAUSES OF THE DECALOGUE

THE point to which I have traced the development of a social code in the last chapter may be taken, provisionally, to represent the stage which the race had reached about a hundred thousand years ago, though possibly less. It would be fascinating to trace the evolution step by step from this level until the moral code takes the form in which we find it in the earliest Egyptian remains. Unfortunately from this point onward the human family is so scattered and diversified, yet so much subject to mutual interference of peoples, that it would be very difficult to follow the course of development of the moral sense or of the moral code as a whole. It does not seem to be quite impossible, but it would be a formidable task and require several large volumes; and few experts who have written on the subject, from Spencer and Tylor to Westermarck and Hobhouse, give us any material assistance except in their diligent collection of facts from the pages of travelers. Some of the American sociological writers, such as Lowie and Goldenweiser, are very helpful and scientific in tracing the growth of social and political institutions, but writers on ethical evolution invariably mingle together peoples at every conceivable phase of development, and they thus offer us merely an interesting collection of different savage ideas and practices.

All that I can do here, therefore, is to take the chief clauses of the moral law and show by illustration from the ways of savages how in each case the prehistoric mind seems to have made its way in applying a sense of justice to the conduct of life. After that we must realize that the savage, and therefore also the prehistoric mind, not only created these major and negative commandments, but to a surprising extent cultivated virtues that we consider more refined and unselfish. We shall find in the savage world considerably more altruism, benevolence, truthfulness, and sense of honor than is usually supposed. But we find also the savages of what I may call the middle level, or even the highest level, resorting to practices which seem repulsive not only to us, but, when they have occasionally been explained to them, to the lower savages. We have to see how under the influence of superstition or of certain changes of environment and new social needs the savage develops new practices—slavery, cannibalism, human sacrifices, killing the sick, parricide, etc.—which were unknown in the earlier ages of the race. In the end I will give general pictures of the life of certain barbaric peoples who fairly represent to us the life of the race in the period which immediately preceded civilization.

§1. THOU SHALT NOT KILL

Professor Westermarck traces moral distinctions ultimately to two fundamental emotions of primitive man: the pleasure which he experienced at the sight of certain acts, which were accordingly

classed as good, and the anger lit in his mind by the sight of other acts, which he accordingly called bad. But, although the learned anthropologist makes this the ground of a strange attack on the social or utilitarian theory of morals—he is probably the only scientist and agnostic who has ever professed to reject it—his analysis is clearly incomplete. There is, if we study savages of the simplest type as we have now done, always some plain objective reason why one act is approved and another resented by them, and it is always the harmfulness of acts that provokes resentment. It is at the later or higher levels of savage life, when the origin of customs has long been forgotten, that we find approvals and resentments which seem to us quite unreasonable. The first prohibitions of what we call a moral nature are clearly related to the welfare of the social group. Thus when Professor Westermarck himself asks why primitive man resented murder and called it a wicked act, he finds that it was because the spirit of the murdered man was believed to be soured, and therefore vindictive to the living, by its violent severance from the body, and because the killing of a man was an injury to his widow and children.

These are definite social viewpoints, but they are beyond the mind of the really primitive savage. We understand the rareness of murder at this lowest level and the resentment of it when it occurred rather by reminding ourselves that the primitive social group consists merely of two or three related families. Professor Hobhouse has (with two sociological colleagues) written a small book ("The Material Culture and Social Institutions of the Simpler Peoples," 1915) which represents a small beginning of the work for which I have pleaded since I first took up the study of the evolution of morals twenty years ago—I gave an illustrated series of lectures on it in 1909—namely, the proper classification of the peoples of the world according to their degree of culture. Professor Hobhouse arranges the lowest peoples as I have done, and in the few social or moral respects in which he examines them he comes to the same conclusions. Some of his points will be reproduced presently. I need say here only that at the lowest level (Veddah, etc.) he finds social groups of only two to six families, and at the Australian level groups about twice as large, averaging about fifty members.

At the lowest level therefore we have merely an enlarged family, and with so simple a life that there are not the disturbing elements one may find in family life at a higher level. Even the tiger and tigress, we may remember, are quite benevolent in their own family circle; while, on the other hand, even the mildest vegetarian mammal will fight for mate and young. Even the placid cow must often be approached tactfully when there is a calf. In early man, therefore, the murderous inclination (against enemies of the family) was quite consistent with benevolence. With the enlargement of the social group the conditions were changed. One might almost put it that the material structure of society grew too quickly for the emotional reactions. The perfect and final moral adjustment in this respect will be the extension of the family-feeling to all members of the race. All higher philosophies and creeds have aimed at this real

brotherhood of the entire human family, which will one day put an end to all violence and murder. It is too abstract an idea for the savage, and we simply find the social sentiment very slowly growing through the ages and trying, as it were, to catch up with the increasing size of the human groups.

Hence it is that we find murder increasing as we rise in the scale of savagery, but we have a number of circumstances to take into account which check or promote the increase. Amongst some of the Australian tribes murder is very rare. Amongst some of the Eskimo peoples also it is very rare or even unknown. In Greenland it is considered an almost unthinkable crime. Several of the Amerind peoples were little troubled by it. The Omahas are said to have been entirely free from it until the whites introduced them to alcohol. The Dacotahs very rarely murdered, regarding it as a monstrous crime except in case of revenge. In one of the islands of the Samoa group there was only one murder in twenty years. Even amongst the Basutos and a few other African peoples murder was extremely rare; while the Bedouins of the Euphrates district so disliked bloodshed that if one killed an enemy in war he concealed the fact instead of boasting about it. The early Chinese similarly disliked bloodshed and regarded soldiers as necessary evils. Amongst some of these peoples war is unknown, and the natives hardly understand it when travelers try to explain it.

Thus in four continents we find peoples, completely and widely separated from each other, which have either maintained the primitive peacefulness of the race or returned to it. Some day social writers will work out for us the different circumstances which have determined these different developments, but already we see the general truth. It is not the dawn of a moral law upon a savage and ruthless world but the creation of new desires and impulses by closer social contacts and the growth of property, and the consequent creation of laws and executives to meet the new developments. At first, as I said, a relative of the murdered man or a group of indignant folk may kill the murderer. Amongst some of the Fuegian tribes there is a general hue and cry when a murder is known, and the man is pursued and killed. In Greenland, where murder is very rare, the relatives of the deceased may avenge it, but if it is particularly brutal all the men go after the murderer. Amongst the Central Eskimos any man may kill a murderer but he usually talks the matter over first with his fellows. In many parts of the world the murderer is caught by tribal authority and then handed over to the relatives of the deceased.

This practice, however, led to the appalling evil of blood-feuds. These have been known so recently in American life and have been so common in civilized nations until modern times that I need not quote many instances. The Greenland Eskimos kill a large number of the relatives of their few murderers, and in Tierra del Fuego all the relatives of the murdered man attack the relatives of the murderer. Amongst the Maoris of New Zealand revenge may be taken on any relative of the murderer, and sometimes the friends of the dead kill the first man they meet: apparently as a sacrifice to the

spirit of the victim. In some places a man was chosen by lot to expiate the crime. But as a rule the punishment falls upon the relatives, and some tribes (Amerinds, Bedouins, etc.) think it a more effective punishment to kill the murderer's nearest relative or best friend than to kill himself. We find the range of the feud growing in every part of the world until some tribes (Bedouins and others) extend the guilt to four generations from the murderer. So universal and persistent became the idea that one could kill the children (and other relatives) for the sins of the father that nearly every nation which is now civilized entertained it in its prehistoric days, and it is found in nearly all early laws (Hebrew, Chinese, Babylonian, Mexican, Greek, and medieval European). Some of the Hebrew prophets, Kung-fu-tse in China, Plato and the Stoics in Greece, had to protest against the idea.

In another way also men became more and more accustomed to the shedding of blood. The multiplication of the race and its organization in rival tribes and peoples, the increase and improvement of weapons for the chase and continual quarrels about good hunting grounds, led to killing on the large scale of war. During this development, as I have elsewhere explained, men in Europe and some other regions were compelled by an Ice Age to live entirely on flesh and become skillful hunters, which increased the familiarity with bloodshed. A stranger in many places meant an enemy, and the law against murder was understood to be restricted to members of the tribe. It became, in fact, a virtue to kill strangers. In Fiji, where there was a most callous disregard of the value of life, the man who had never killed a stranger was compelled to beat dirt with his club: the most ignominious of punishments in that land of warriors. In many other places a man was supposed to secure slaves for himself in the next world by killing strangers, as we shall see later; and to a later chapter I reserve also the increase of war for the purpose of making captives whom the priests could have for human sacrifices. There were so many developments legitimating murder, or even making it necessary and obligatory, that some tribes became extraordinarily callous. In some parts of Africa a native will kill a friend if a quarrel arises and not exhibit the slightest regret. Amongst some of the hill-tribes north of India there was, not many years ago, hardly a man who had not committed a murder.

It was thus from no original sin or primeval taint of savagery that men came to redden the planet with human blood. It was an inevitable outcome of progress in other directions; and what it is more interesting and pleasant to note here is that even in the savage world the idea of restrictive law spontaneously arose to check the profound disturbance of society. Within the tribe tribunals and executives arose, as we saw beginning in Australia, to try and punish criminals. From the start "Thou shalt not kill" was a purely civil law, not the enforcement of a moral law by society. Superstition in some places helped a little by suggesting that the spirit of the murdered man might be more malicious and dangerous than a live enemy. So we get the practice, as in the Old Testament (**Numbers, xxxi, 19**), of compelling soldiers to purify themselves before they

joined the community. Some of the Amerind warriors had to fast three days after a kill. A Basuto warrior had to enter a stream while a sorcerer higher up the stream threw some purifying stuff into the water. Some African warriors after a fight had their heads shaved or goat-dung rubbed on to prevent the spirit of the slain from entering. In some tribes of Morocco a murderer was held to be so unclean that poison oozed from under his nails. The idea grew out of this primitive fear of the spirit of the dead that blood was unclean, and temples in many parts of the world became sanctuaries and priests were forbidden military service.

These effects of superstition were unfortunately, as we shall see, not enough to outweigh the appalling extent to which it aggravated the evil in other directions. But law slowly prevailed, at least in theory. Within the tribe it was just civil law in the same sense as the law that forbade sacrilege or treason. The state became the official avenger, and in many places it shed blood lavishly. The Aztec law was so free with the death-sentence that it "might have been written in blood," says Bancroft, and most old laws—in fact English law until the nineteenth century—were terribly sanguinary. There were, however, savage tribes (in Korea, South Africa, Sumatra, Celebes, etc.) that never inflicted a death-sentence, and many peoples that confined it to murder or adultery. Large numbers of savage peoples were far more humane than Europe in the Middle Ages. As late as the last century the Maori, who are not very peaceful, expressed disgust at the British procedure. If they judged a man worthy of death, they said, they would not keep him brooding over it in jail for weeks but surprise him and chop off his head.

It was a long conflict between the feeling of brotherhood that was extending from the family to the whole tribe and the supposed tribal need to be very drastic with criminals. There was no fixed moral ideal dictating what men ought to do, and in attempting to adjust these two impulses the various sections of the human family fell into the weirdest practices. Most of the higher savages discovered that fines were effective enough in the intimidation of criminals. The next step was for the tribe to discover that the savagery of war might safely be mitigated. Here and there a certain chivalry grew out of the warrior's pride in his strength and his work. Some of the Amerinds and of the Polynesians disdained to make a surprise attack and always gave the enemy notice. Others met the enemy after the battle or war and made solemn peace-treaties. In Samoa it was thought cowardly to kill a woman, and the idea spread to Fiji, where there was an "enlightened party" amongst the natives. The Guanches of the Canary Islands, the Basutos, Masai, and other African peoples took pride in sparing the women and children. Sparing male captives was a different matter, but with the development of agriculture it was found safe and even profitable to spare their lives and find work for them. The Masai and the Tuareg in Africa, the Omahas and Wyandots in America, and several other peoples did not kill their captives. The savage began to humanize war, and, seeing the little we have done in that direction during five thousand

years of civilization, we ought not to boast too loudly of our superiority.

§2. THOU SHALT NOT STEAL

In the preceding section I have not attempted to arrange the various peoples I have quoted according to their grade of culture or development because their ideas and practices do not depend on this. The Greenland Eskimo who does not know what war is until missionaries explain, and very rarely murders, is not more virtuous than the head-hunter of Borneo or the ferocious warrior of the Pacific Islands. It is a matter of circumstances and of different interests of the tribe. I have merely tried to show that in all this chaotic and contradictory development of ideas in the savage world, or in the stretch of time between man of the Old Stone Age and civilization, we quite plainly see the human mind trying, amidst profound ignorance and in most difficult circumstances, to create an effective social or civic law. In all the vagaries we see a blundering attempt to discover a code of conduct which is in the best interest of the community, as a society of living mortals and spirits of dead men. We must never forget that the savage is overwhelmingly concerned with spirits.

It is so obvious that the next main clause of the decalogue was formulated in exactly the same circumstances and for the same reasons that I need not here give many instances of the savage's slow and fumbling progress toward a just code of behavior. Writers quarrel over the question whether the savage had a sense of justice as they wrangle over his moral sense generally. There does not seem to be much point in such controversies. The sparrow pecking a bit of bread on the street or the dog gnawing a bone reacts to a rival which would share the bread or take away the bone just as if it had a keen sense of ownership and resentment of injustice. When primitive man began to own something more than a flint instrument that anybody could make in quarter of an hour he had the same feeling of ownership or right, and justice is simply a recognition of rights. In this sense there is a strong feeling of justice even at the Australian level, and we can discern it at even lower levels when a man is allowed to kill another for taking away his wife.

There is another point that we are apt to forget when we discuss these questions. A tribe of people may have a general low level of intelligence but a number of individuals in each generation high above that level, and it is these that do the thinking of the tribe. I have met in London a number of these more intelligent representatives (not half-breeds) of several African peoples, and some would be surprised to hear them discuss modern problems. Today they have, of course, American or European ideas, but one sees that, apart from their borrowed culture, many of them have considerable intelligence. At all periods of savage life these men led the group and became chiefs and priests. It was the slightly higher wisdom of these men, not the revelation of a mystic moral law, that slowly and blunderingly changed the right to retaliate of a wronged man into a system of tribal justice to which he could appeal.

Hobhouse examines a few hundred peoples, carefully arranged

according to their cultural status, in this connection. Of twenty-eight of the lowest twenty-three have no "law" and let the individual retaliate; these live in very small communities of rarely more than fifty individuals, or about a dozen adult males. At the next level, when a community generally counts two or three hundred members, private justice (often after communal sanction) is still more frequently found than public justice. At the highest savage level, private justice is generally forbidden. This coincides with the growth of individual ownership and multiplication of laboriously produced commodities. At the lowest level there is often no property in land, though there is always private ownership if, for instance, the people has adopted the bow and arrow. There may still, as amongst many of the Eskimos, be very little jealousy of ownership, one freely using the property of the other. With the growth in size and culture of the community the sense of private ownership hardens, and the community protects itself against continual disturbance by recognizing the right of the individual, the duty of other individuals to refrain from infringing that right, and the punishment of disturbers of the peace. The creation of the principle of justice was an elementary condition of the development of social life.

This simple social principle is in regard to property so clear that many savage peoples are very little troubled with theft. I have explained that at the lowest level it is almost unknown from lack of temptation, and it is generally rare in Australia. But there are higher tribes which maintain a very strong social feeling. Amongst many of the peoples of South America "theft and robbery are extremely rare," we are told. "Thief" is the most insulting epithet in their languages, and a woman is less angry if she is called a prostitute. One authority maliciously says that when the Caribs missed any article they would say: "The Christians must have been here." Another tells of a group of Danish missionaries who went to convert some of the Eskimo tribes, and after a time they returned to Denmark saying candidly that their services were more needed in Copenhagen. In North America also most of the tribes were much more honest in dealing with each other than civilized folk are. Many of the Siberian peoples, though low in culture, rarely steal from each other. Even some of the lowly hill-tribes of India are little troubled with theft, and it is said to be unknown in large regions of Malaysia. I need not daze the reader with names of tribes and authorities, all of which he will find in Westermarck's learned work. In this chapter I take all facts from that very sound authority, and I may therefore speak in general terms.

It is more interesting to explain here how, in spite of this very widely distributed honesty amongst lower or middle-level savages, they are so commonly regarded as creatures of perverse impulse that has to be corrected by the white man's superior moral law; and the explanation brings out still more clearly the human and social meaning of the law. We generally find that where there is marked honesty the penalty is very severe. In several places the thief must pay his victim several times (amongst the Kirghiz nine times) the value

of the stolen object. The Karens sell incorrigible thieves as slaves, and the Chukchi (another extremely low Asiatic people) banish them. Others put thefts under the ban of the spirits (gods of justice), and it may be just as effective. The Melanesians commonly do this, holding that the souls of thieves go at death to a dark prison under the earth forever. In Africa the gods are often guardians of property. The Bechuana sky-god punished thieves, and, whenever it thundered, the natives would look at each other and ask who had been stealing. The etiquette was to spit on the ground and say, "Not I." On the Gold Coast the priests had arranged matters much as the priests of Spain have done with their "thieves' bula"; the victim had to make an offering to the priest of fowl, rum, and eggs, and he would induce the god to punish the thief.

On the other hand, this widespread honesty of savages has been denied because they so constantly steal the property of whites, who return home and denounce them as terrible thieves. In the case of some of the simpler peoples (Eskimos, Fuegians, etc.) this was due to the easy-going feeling of ownership, and in other cases no doubt the very superior tools and weapons of the white created an unusual temptation. But the general explanation is more instructive. Their law is that they shall not steal from each other, not from strangers. The "neighbor" even of the Old Testament, whose life and property the Hebrew must respect, meant a member of the chosen people only. Where the Eskimos have a decided sense of private ownership, the law sometimes runs that you must not steal from men of your own village, or at the most of your tribe. In some cases they expressly say that you may steal from others as long as it does not bring trouble on the community. Very large numbers of tribes which have a high standard of honesty within the tribe deliberately steal all they can from "strangers." It is absurd to call this a perversion of the moral sense. They have, on the contrary, a clearer perception of the meaning of the law than many civilized folk: it is a law to prevent disturbance of the life of the community. They had to learn by a painful experience that stealing from white strangers might bring even greater trouble than stealing in one's own village. Now they begin to have a genuine "sense of justice"—to all men.

This plain development is, of course, complicated by different circumstances. The Bedouin of the desert, who has no community, will rob his friends and neighbors, but there must be no stealing in his own tent; the Bedouin of the pasture plains has the wider law that you must not steal from a member of your own tribe. The isolated Siberian peoples who make their own folk very "honest" by means of heavy penalties encourage them to steal from strangers. Success in this lawful pastime gives proof of ability. On Danger Island, where food is scarce, there is a dire penalty for stealing it; while in many parts of Africa it is not theft to take such trifles as milk, meat, and bananas. There are even countries (as there are in backward parts of Europe today, if not in more advanced regions) where only the ability displayed by the thief is regarded, and he may be quite a hero. But again I could fill many chapters with quotations, and we must be content with the general development.

This clause of the moral ideal of which we find man possessed when he reaches the threshold of civilization is just civil or social law. As the social group grows larger and its life more complex, the individuals composing it get more and more contacts with each other, all of which have to be regulated. A general idea of justice is formed, and, where the religious belief in divine punishment is effective, it is ascribed to the gods. Men lose sight entirely of the actual origin and meaning of the law and begin to talk about a mystic "conscience" or moral sense. They must think it a remarkable coincidence that its dictates correspond so closely with the elementary requirements of an organized society.

§3. THOU SHALT NOT COMMIT ADULTERY

As I have recently written a large work on the sex-question which includes a careful study of the real origin and development of the ethic of sexual relations, this section may be very short. It will probably be convenient for the reader if I just summarize here my conclusions and bring this clause of the decalogue into line with the others or explain why in some respects it differs materially from the others. I have in the last chapter shown that sex-relations at the lowest level of savage life are settled by a custom that goes back to animal days and is a natural consequence of the life of non-gregarious animals; that "law" begins just in the same practical way as any other tribal law; and that the concentration of people in social groups leads to new desires and impulses. But from the Australian level upward the social law in regard to sex begins to differ from all other sections of the social code. The social interest in sex tends over and over again to disappear, and the law is left with no material basis and lends itself particularly on that account to mystic theories of morality. I propose briefly to sketch this development.

What I have to explain in this volume is how the nations are found, when they come into the light of history, to be in possession of a moral code substantially identical with our own. But there is not the same consistency or agreement in the sex-clause of that code as in the application of justice to personal relations and questions of property, and this is the chief point we have to consider. The Egyptian-Babylonian conception is fairly consistent, and the early Chinese ideal agrees; but it is still to be settled if all three have not drawn from a common source. There were, however, other civilizations of the region, such as the Hittite and the Aramaean—we are not sure about the Cretan—which seem to have had very different ideas and phallic cults, and just below the level of civilization we find many peoples, survivors of the New Stone Age, that differed in one or other way very considerably from the general civilized ideal. In fact, though adultery was generally and incest always condemned and punished amongst the higher savages and barbarians, there was no consistency whatever in any other line of the sex ethic. There is not at any stage of human development. Some think little of rape (if not of a married woman), and large numbers lay no restriction whatever on unmarried girls. So sober and humanitarian an authority as Sir Harry Johnston, one of the ablest of British Com-

missioners in Africa, tells us that in most parts of Central Africa few girls remain virgins after the age of five, and in many other regions there is no law whatever for the unmarried. In other places, to quote an official report on some of the Eskimos published by the Bureau of Ethnology, "promiscuous sexual intercourse between married or unmarried people, or even among children, appears to be looked upon simply as a matter of amusement." In still more numerous tribes all restrictions are suspended on the eve of a festival. I have given the facts elsewhere.

This extraordinary inconsistency, right up to the level of civilization, puts the law regulating sexual intercourse on an entirely different footing from the prohibitions of theft, violence, lying, or murder. In these latter respects the entire race, with a very few exceptions in peculiar circumstances, has come to agree upon the law. It has developed what we call a moral sense. If the moral code were something not made by man, why should we have this complete agreement on five clauses out of six and complete disagreement on the sixth? It is useless to speak of "strong passions," for these people with what we call immoral practices—and an analysis of the facts collected by Westermarck shows that they are the large majority of existing savages—do not rebel against a law but do not admit the law. Moreover, this same analysis of Westermarck's facts which I have made shows that what we call strict ideas of sexual morals are more common at the lower end of the scale and loose ideas more common among the higher savages. Westermarck expresses some astonishment that when he comes to draw up a list of the peoples which forbid fornication as well as adultery, or demand chastity in the unmarried girl, he can find very few above the level of the Veddahs, Igorrotes (of the Philippines), some of the Australian groups, and the lower peoples of southern Asia. On my theory that is just what we expect.

We cannot expect to understand everything in savage life, for the reason of much that they do lies in a forgotten past, in some region possibly entirely different from that in which we find them today, but these conflicting developments and apparently curious facts are broadly explained if we take moral law to be social law and quite unintelligible otherwise. Of the universal prohibition and horror of incest I have spoken elsewhere. Even here there is no question of a specific moral sense for some of the Melanesians, who are only just above the level of the Australians and very loose, reprobate it so intensely that a mature boy is put out of the home and must not look in the face of his sister or mother. Further, we quite understand the stricter chastity at the lower level on the lines of the last chapter. We fully understand that the growth in size of the community—and we may add the improvement of the female form by sexual selection—arouse the desire of variety in the higher savage, and in different places he meets it by permitting polygamy, adultery, prostitution, or freedom to the unmarried. We clearly understand why the law against adultery generally remains, because it so easily leads to grave disturbance of the community, and because the wife comes more and more to be regarded as property, bought

from the father; and this further explains why there may be no law against adultery where there is no buying of wives (perhaps the opposite) and why, where the bride does mean a profit to her father, men discover that pre-nuptial chastity is a virtue. When we add those mystic considerations which naturally arise—the mystery and unpleasantness in some ways of woman's sex, the idea of sacrificing to the gods what is most precious to win their favor, and so on—we can, as I showed in detail in the volumes on sex, explain almost every vagary in the evolution of man's ideas.

Here I draw the reader's attention only to this phenomenon, which puts a final seal on the view of savage ideas of codes of conduct which I hold: while with the progress of wisdom and civilization men get clearer, firmer, and more extensive conceptions of justice in regard to person and property, they tend more and more, and have so tended at the height of every civilization, to discard the idea of law in regard to sexual matters and leave conduct to the individual. In other words, we now in practice take the whole range of conduct in so far as it affects the rights of person or property into the category of civil law, and it was civil law from the first. But we are not in the least agreed upon the extent to which law should concern itself with sexual conduct, beyond certain considerations of public decency, breach of contract, or material injury. Our very hesitations and controversies confirm what I have said: that in all this survey of savage and barbaric peoples, which is in effect a glance at the life of the race between the Cave Man period and civilization, we see only the hesitating formulation of a code of social conduct, but in the case of sex-relations the thoughts of men were particularly liable to be influenced by mystic considerations.

CHAPTER III

POSITIVE VIRTUES OF THE SAVAGE

IT IS difficult to see how any person who studies the facts of savage life can question the conclusions at which I arrived in the last two chapters. It is rather philosophers and theologians, who ignore the facts and start from first principles, who take a different view of moral evolution. It is, however, not necessary to have any large acquaintance with the facts. I am here, as I said, not concerned to prove any theory of moral law: I have given the proof elsewhere. Here I refer to the social theory only because it alone introduces order into what seems usually a chaos of conflicting facts about the morals of savages, and because this volume chiefly aims to show whence man derived the moral idea with which he opens the historical period or what was the development of thought and conduct in the hundred thousand years before civilization began. As to the truth of the social theory itself most people will at once perceive how today the main clauses of the decalogue are embodied in civil law precisely on the ground of social interests, and the development in the savage world logically leads to this culmination.

There are, however, two further considerations which I have not discussed elsewhere. The first is why or how we get an abstract idea of justice as a universal virtue or law, as something that coerces us when our conduct is unseen or does not concern the police: why, under the stress of this law of justice, we turn upon our laws and institutions themselves and fiercely demand alterations of them. Is there not here a specific moral ideal, apart from civic or social law, which is peculiar to the highest mind and not utilitarian in its origin? In the next place we are often told that, while it is clear that moral precepts about respecting our neighbor's person, property, or wife are social, we have today refinements of the moral code which were unknown to the savage and do not seem to have developed out of any of his experiences. His code, it is said, is negative and has the police behind it. But we have a positive code of truthfulness, honor, charity, benevolence, courteousness, brotherly love, even love of enemies. These things can be said today only by people who will not take the trouble to read the facts about savage life, which I will give, but it may be useful first to say a few words in answer to the first question.

§1. THE VIRTUE OF JUSTICE

Notoriously we have a feeling of justice which does not coincide with our feeling of compulsion to observe the laws of the civil code. Most of us regard many laws even of a modern civilization as unjust, and we have a sentiment of justice regulating our conduct in hundreds of matters which do not fall under the law. No law compels me to return to the girl cashier the excess dollar which, in a busy hour, she has given me in my change, yet I could not com-

fortably spend that dollar on a new tie and think of the poorly paid girl who must deprive herself of something. There is no need to multiply illustrations. Most of us have a feeling or idea of "virtue," a standard of character, which seems at first glance to go beyond savage ideas or any combination of them.

We shall see presently that people who imagine they have fine feelings that are not shared by "the savage" are really misled by their own idea of what a savage is. He is capable of great generosity and disinterestedness, as we shall see. I have known an Australian black, a murderer, to save the life of the policeman who was bringing him in from the bush for trial when he might with impunity have let the man drown and make his escape. It was an impulsive unreasoning act, and, if you remember that man started from the savage level, not with a fund of selfish ferocity, but with age-old impulses to help those about him, you will not be altogether surprised. But I am here considering deliberate, not impulsive, acts of justice or generosity, and the illustration may not seem to help us. It does, however. It shows how natural selection during ages of family life alone made it natural to react benevolently even when reason might have interfered, and this reminds us that we can deliberately form a character which will express itself consistently in all circumstances.

But the chief truth to bear in mind is that all our modern idealism aims at creating a society in which the best emotions of the normal family-life shall be extended to the entire race. The conditions of modern civilization have done much to poison family-life but let us take it at its best. You do not whisper a slander of your sister or pocket the five-dollar bill that your brother has left in the hall. Most of us do not feel the impulse to act thus even to our friends. Few would not recognize that the extension of that feeling until every man could implicitly trust every other man would be a great gain to the race. We need not here raise the question of practicability, for we are frankly considering whether a hypothetical condition is desirable. We need not ask how many idealists are merely professional ideal-mongers, selling plans of reform as other men sell soap. All that we need ask is whether it would be a healthier and happier state of things if there were perfect justice in all relations of life. I assume there will be no difference of opinion about the answer, and it at once puts the virtue of justice, in the broadest and most refined sense, on a utilitarian basis. The savage seems at times to understand utilitarianism better than the philosophers. They take intellectual measuring rods and look for material consequences of actions. They forget that the ultimate aim of every utilitarian ethic is to create emotions. So the savage knows the value in his home or village of, not merely strict fairness, but generosity, helpfulness, good-fellowship.

In this sense there is no virtue of our moral code today which is not part of the clearer formulation by a clearer-headed generation of the savage's attempt to make a social code. It is unfortunate that we have so very generally soured the character of the savage in our first contacts with him that we do not see the continuity without

careful study. It was, of course, inevitable that higher races should take over the vast regions, with unlimited resources, which savages wanted to keep as mere hunting grounds. It was inevitable that a large proportion of those who crossed seas to deal with them should be greedy adventurers, or men who thought savages had no rights, or stupid missionaries who dangerously and tactlessly confused their minds and lives. For much of it, of course—the tragic ruin of Polynesian life, for instance—we ought to blush. However, a good deal of hostile conflict was in those early days inevitable, and the stories of the early fighting have given most people, who prefer romances to scientific works, the idea that a "savage" is a human tiger. How deeply this tradition of popular literature is rooted is curiously illustrated by a novel—a good story in itself—published this year and in part dealing with life in Yucatan. An American in the story who is said to "know Yucatan from A to Z" (he makes his hero and heroine stay in a hotel in Progreso and seems never to have heard of the fine city of Merida a few miles off) warns the visitors that the natives are frightfully savage and it is dangerous to move from the port. I have traveled from end to end of Yucatan and found the Maya Indians as mild and courteous as the farm-workers of Missouri.

§2. THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF

The starting-point of the human evolution is, as I said, the family, and we find affection for children general in the savage world. At the lowest level it may be taken for granted, as it is a continuation of what we find in the higher animal world. Australian parents are generally affectionate, and in some tribes the man will beat his wife if she beats the children. Some of the Kafir tribes of South Africa fine a mother if she does a permanent injury (such as knocking teeth out) to her children. Some of the Melanesian tribes also will not allow the mother to beat her child, while the Eskimos generally indulge their children with excessive affection. In some Eskimo regions, Westermarck says—I leave the responsibility to him—the mother never corrects the child when it is in a temper; she waits until the storm is over and then talks quietly to the child. The Chukchi of Siberia, who are brutal in some ways, have great affection for their children. The African mother is notoriously indulgent, but the father also, even when he was a truculent warrior, loved his children. Tribes (like the Bangola of the Congo region) would come home from ferocious fighting full of the greatest eagerness for the caresses of wives and children. The Fijians, also fierce fighters, were notably gentle with their children.

The wife has in many cases a hard life that has led many travelers to exaggerate the position of woman in savage tribes. At the lowest level (Veddahs, Andamanese, Bushmen, etc.) the wife is well treated, and recent writers claim that the stories about the cruelty to wives of the Australian blacks are not reliable. Above that level woman's condition varies infinitely. There are regions where she rules her husband and other regions where she is a slave. Savage law generally, though not always, allows the husband to beat

her. Most of the North American Indians thought it a disgrace to beat a squaw, and in parts of central Asia the wife has a very good position. It is well known, however, that even where the husband is freely permitted by public opinion or law to beat his wife (as he was less than a century ago in America and England) there may be a great deal of affection. Feminist writers often point out that in some countries a woman concludes that her husband has ceased to love her if he beats her no longer. On the whole woman has not a worse position amongst savages than she has had during the greater part of the Christian Era. I give the facts elsewhere.

The broad trend of moral evolution is the extension of family feeling to the tribe and ultimately to the race. In the first stage this is easy, since the primitive communities are simply compound families or groups of related families, and accordingly we find that the lowest savage observes the Golden Rule, as he observes other rules, much better than civilized folk. Here again Westermarck has to give the highest marks to the lowest peoples. The Bushmen "exercise the virtues of hospitality and generosity often in an extraordinary degree," while the authority on the Yahgans (the lowest in America) says that "a disposition for generosity is characteristic of them." I have earlier shown that this is true also of the Veddahs, Tasmanians, and Andamanese. An expert on the Australians says of them generally: "To the savage the whole gens is the individual and he is full of regard for it," and the other experts agree. Carr says: "Between the males of a camp there always exists a strong feeling of brotherhood so that, come weal come woe, a man can always calculate on the aid, in danger, of every man of his tribe." The Melanesians are not behind the Australians. A writer on the cannibals of the Marquesas Islands says: "With them there hardly appeared to be any difference of opinion on any subject whatever"; and Westermarck calls this "typical." These are the lowest levels of savage life, not a few selected cases.

At higher levels one might expect tribal warfare and other evils which, as we saw, accompany social development to interfere with this primitive benevolence, but it is almost the most persistent of savage virtues. The Fijians, who in some ways despised compassion as a weakness, showed great humanity to each other. The Tongans were remarkably brotherly. The Dyaks, who murder men of neighboring tribes for their heads, are within their own tribes hospitable, kindly, and humane "to a degree which might well shame ourselves." The lowest peoples of America (after the Yahgans, of whom I have spoken) have the same primitive virtue. Captain Hall said of the Greenland Eskimos that "no people exceed them in kindness of heart," and brotherliness is characteristic of all the tribes. The Indians of Guiana, the Caribs, and others are described as "generous to a fault." The Amerinds generally are praised for mutual benevolence. Morgan, the authority on the Iroquois, says of them that "kindness to the orphan, hospitality to all, and a common brotherhood, were among the doctrines held up for their acceptance by their religious instructors," and that an Iroquois would "surrender his dinner to feed the hungry, vacate his bed to refresh

the weary, and give up his apparel to clothe the naked." In Africa we find the lowly Hottentots praised as "the most friendly, the most liberal, the most benevolent people to one another that ever appeared on earth," and the Bechuana as holding it "a sacred duty to care for the poor, widows and orphans."

In short, Westermarck quotes such tributes to savages in every part of the world and distrusts or rejects the few reports to the contrary. These are, he says, cases of deterioration after contact with whites. He approvingly quotes Boyle: "Search modern history, and in the north and south and east and west the story is ever the same—we come, we civilize, and we corrupt or exterminate." The Golden Rule and the command to "love thy neighbor as thyself" are very far from being higher refinements of virtue which are peculiar to ourselves. They were, on the contrary, more conspicuous in the life of savages: they were scandalously ignored and transgressed by the whites who were supposed to bring a higher gospel to the heathen: and the very common result of contact was a deterioration of the savage himself. And since this brotherliness is carried on from the lower to the higher levels of savagery and barbarism more effectively and consistently than any other primitive virtue, we see plainly that our race was trained in it right up to the level of civilization. One sees how stupid is the controversy one reads at times as to whether Christ was the original preacher of the Golden Rule, but the more important point that I press on the thoughtful reader is this: the oldest, most persistent, most widespread virtue of the race is an emotional and disinterested quality, yet the very fact that it is so, that it goes back to semi-conscious animal days, implies that it is a social quality ultimately based upon utility to the individual.

The moral problem of the race is to extend this quality until a universal brotherliness puts an end of itself to injustice, cruelty, and violence. Even of this extension we find the beginning in the savage world, but the development was checked by two things: the growth of crime, leading to revenge, within the tribe, and the rise of inter-tribal or inter-national warfare. Most savages, it is true, regard hatred of and revenge on an enemy as legitimate, and some make a duty of revenge (as I illustrated in the case of the blood-feud). The earlier part of the Old Testament regards it as quite normal, and it is in the books written by the priests after the Babylonian Captivity (Exodus xxiii, 4, Leviticus xix, 7) that the Jew is forbidden to hate his brother (though he may still cherish his hate of the dog of a Gentile). Long before this Lao-tse in China had bade men "recompense injury with kindness," and the teachings of Kung-fu-tse and Buddha was opposed to hatred. There are few anticipations of this heroic precept (one of the least observed of all moral counsels) in savagery, naturally, but we find a few instances like that of the Caroline Islanders, who have a ceremony of reconciliation of enemies and think it nobler to be reconciled than to take revenge.

Of extensions of benevolent feeling beyond the tribe we have far more instances than is generally supposed. Hospitality to and benevolence toward strangers are, where ill-treatment has not soured them, quite characteristic of the lowest peoples. In an earlier chap-

ter I told of the benevolence with which the Tasmanians welcomed the first whites. Westermarck shows that the first impressions of travelers record the same benevolence of savages all over the world: Veddahs, Bushmen, Andamanese, Australians, Papuans, Melanesians, Maoris, Kalmucks, Arabs, Amerinds, Berbers, etc. This was not the universal attitude even at first. Many tribes concluded from experience that every stranger was an enemy, and there was always the difficulty, from imperfect knowledge of the language, of being sure of a stranger's intentions. Sometimes superstition complicated matters by suggesting that the stranger met the need for collecting heads or victims for human sacrifices. But the names of peoples, spread over four continents, which I have given suggest that there was, before we began to antagonize or corrupt the lower races, a very general disposition to extend the tribal benevolence to all humans.

Cruelty to animals has been so general in civilized lands until recent times, and is so little noticed even in religious codes of morals (except the Buddhist), that we shall scarcely look amongst savages for the refinement of kindness to animals. In many places, of course, certain animals have received princely treatment, or at least been spared, for spiritistic or fetishistic reasons, but we need not regard this. Westermarck quotes an African people, the For, who hold that it is wicked to be cruel to animals. Australian women have great affection for the dogs of the camp, and it is not uncommon for the natives to have a sort of affection for the useful domestic animals: the Kafir for his cattle, the Indian woman for her fowl, and so on. To the sick and the aged of their tribe, on the other hand, savages are often most humane. We shall see in the next chapter that even when they kill them there may be deep mutual affection. Very low peoples like the Fuegians, Botocudos (a literally savage group), and Australians are praised for their care of the aged, and the Iroquois and some other Indian peoples regarded it as a sacred duty. Man, in a word, began his career with a very long tradition or a deep-rooted impulse of benevolence and maintained very much of it in spite of the hostilities of the higher social life.

§3. TRUTHFULNESS AND HONOR

As veracity is claimed to be a peculiarly religious virtue, and the savage is thought by most people to have no idea of it until we truthful people educate him, many will be surprised to learn that even this is one of the primitive virtues of the race and has been retained by many savages of the higher levels so faithfully that they would put Americans or Europeans to shame. The various authorities on the Veddahs agree that they were "models of veracity" and "proverbially truthful and honest." The higher natives of Ceylon, who lie with the fluency of civilized folk, reported that the wild Veddahs never lied. The Andamanese considered it the greatest insult to be called a liar. In Africa the two lowest peoples, the Bushmen and Hottentots, are the most truthful: and they are, in fact, very truthful and hate lying. Several other lower peoples of

Africa are very truthful, while the higher tribes generally, except in the north (Berbers and Tuaregs), lie fluently and make a job of it.

In Asia, again, most of the lowest peoples are the most truthful. The very primitive Ainu of Korea have as their three supreme commandments to honor old age and never to steal or lie. Most of the highland peoples of India, many of whom think little of theft and murder, regard lying as a disgraceful practice. Westermarck quotes twenty such peoples who very rarely or never lie. Many of the rough tribes of eastern Asia and in the frozen north or on the tropical islands of the south are very truthful. The Australian tribes vary a good deal, but a man who had known certain tribes of New South Wales for thirty years testified that in all that time he had never known a native to lie. The Polynesians, also, though often said by travelers to be all liars, were mixed. The Tonga Islanders strongly resented lying; and I can confirm this on the authority of an Australian captain who had years of intimate acquaintance with them. Many Polynesians, in fact many natives in all continents, think it clever to deceive whites and give an exaggerated impression of their fluency; while others have learned the art from the whites. It is the same in America, both amongst the Eskimos and the Indians. We find every degree of truthfulness and untruthfulness. Morgan says in his classical work on the Iroquois that they never lied and cheated, and had "a sacred regard for public faith." "This inborn sentiment," he says, "flourished in the period of their highest prosperity in all the freshness of its primeval purity."

On the whole we may say that in at least half the lower peoples there is, or was until they became demoralized, less lying than among civilized folk, and that one can name forty or fifty savage or barbaric peoples who had a higher standard and practice of veracity than any nation of the modern civilized world. The more consistent purity at the primitive level and the degeneration of many of the higher savages are easily understood after what I have said. These lowest peoples have the family-atmosphere of mutual trust and benevolence, and, as lying is not, in most cases, so serious a social evil as theft or violence, the change from family to village and tribe complicated the primitive customs in this as in other respects. Civil law enforced the rights of person and property but only in rare cases took account of lying. But moral philosophers would do well to study carefully the ideas of these fifty peoples, mostly at low levels of culture, often profoundly "immoral" in one or other respect, who were far more serious and consistent than we are in their regard for truthfulness.

What is called the sense of honor is largely a blend of justice and truthfulness, and, though in its full sense it belongs to the most refined type of character, it is found in the savage world. Man describes the Andamanese as "not altogether lacking in the sense of honor," and Kolben, a high authority on the Hottentots, says: "The strictness and celerity of Hottentot justice are things in which they outshine all Christendom." Much of the injustice to savages has been done by missionaries who felt compelled to emphasize the need of conversion, but one could fill a volume with tributes from honest

missionaries. One finds in the Zulus "so much regard for truth and justice in their daily intercourse with each other," and another finds the sense of justice "particularly strongly developed" in the Masai. The same tributes come from all parts of Africa. The Maori of New Zealand are said to have a "high natural sense of justice," the Bedouins so acute a sense of justice that "injustice on the part of those in power is almost impossible," and so on.

Even cleanliness and politeness, which are next to virtues, are much more generally cultivated in the savage world than is generally supposed. The Veddahs washed their bodies every few days, and the Australians and Africans who are near water generally bathe. On the Gold Coast the blacks bathe at least once a day. Some African tribes wash two or three times a day, and some are so keen that they will brave the crocodiles in the river for a bath. The Tehuelches of Patagonia, a very low Indian people, are scrupulously clean, both in person and in their food-vessels. Other peoples, like the hill-tribes of India, are filthy because rivers or lakes are not available; some, like the Eskimos, are obviously fixed in their dirty habits by the intense cold. But even where there is plenty of water and the temperature is suitable we find great diversities of habits. Some tribes are clean in person yet have filthy food-vessels, some the reverse. Cleanliness is not a virtue with any great social pressure behind it; and I may recall that medieval Europe was filthy in its habits until the Mohammedans taught it cleanliness.

Courtesy is much more cultivated in the savage world. Westermarck says that there is "probably no people on earth which does not recognize some rules of politeness." He found some of the tribes of Morocco, amongst whom he lived for several years, "much more civil in their general behavior than the majority of Europeans." The Maoris and most of the Polynesians had numerous rules of politeness which were strictly observed. The inhabitants of Samoa have been described as "a nation of gentlemen"; and my Australian friend who knew the Tongans well, and a New Zealand scientist who was very friendly with the Maori, told me that these were scarcely behind the Samoans. Even such lowly peoples as the Eskimos and the Kafirs have their courtesy-rules and observe them as we do. The courteous ways of the greater Indian tribes of America are well known.

I need not again point out that the large development of these qualities in the savage world, particularly at the lower levels of the savage world—an important point which is generally obscured by the practice of sociologists in not distinguishing and indicating (for the general public) different levels of culture—confirms us in our belief that these rules of life are made by men themselves, or are codifications of the spontaneous customs which natural development had brought about in their ancestors. When we claim that the negative moral law, the prohibition of injustice in regard to person, property, or wife, is identical with civil law, as it is or one day will be, we may seem to leave the positive virtues as refinements which do not arise from experience of life but are due to a moral intuition

or revelation. We have now seen how lamentably astray this opinion is. The natural and social origin of these positive qualities of character is even more conspicuous than that of the negative virtues. Brotherliness and truthfulness are more consistent at the lower end of the human scale than at the higher, where the more refined mind might be supposed to have finer moral intuitions, if there were such things. If we could divide the peoples of the world, setting aside for the moment the civilized nations, into two groups, the higher and the lower, we should find these positive qualities of character more abundant in the lower half. Such facts are fatal to any theory of morals except the social.

CHAPTER IV

PERVERSIONS OF THE MORAL SENSE

THE chief distinctive note of this book is, as I said, that I am considering that wonderful assemblage of the peoples of the world with the eye of what Lester Ward calls dynamic sociology. I am trying to show how the human race moved on from the level of the Australian or of Neanderthal man to the first level of civilization. Had the race remained united in the region of southern Asia and Europe, as it may be said to have done in the main until about a hundred thousand years ago, it would be much easier to retrace this advance. But overpopulation and then the revolution of climate in Europe sent the race wandering over the earth, and in a hundred different environments, in frozen wastes or on monotonous steppes, in tropical islands or forests with abundant food, on rugged mountains or by the shores of warm oceans, the mind as well as the body of men contracted a hundred diversities. That is what makes it so difficult to retrace the steps of the race. Instead of a broad road we have a hundred tortuous paths along which the race moved to the higher level.

In this small work I can only trace a few general principles. One, which the reader may find novel yet very illuminating, is that the increasing social concentration itself led to a deterioration of what we may call the primitive virtues; if we remember that the virtue did not consist in restraining impulses but in the lack of them. I have fully illustrated the action of that principle. The larger social groups gave a man impulses which he had not known in the simple domestic atmosphere in which he had lived for millions of years; and at the same time the multiplication of commodities which it required prolonged labor to produce, and some were more skillful in producing than others, led to the new impulses of greed, deceit and theft. The new ideas of men added to the evils of this development. The Melanesian, for instance, believes that there is **mana** (something like the "medicine" or magical quality which an Indian ascribed to an object) in a simple object like a stick or a stone that his fellow has, and, since he cannot put this mystic quality into objects, he is tempted to steal. From individual strife men went on to collective strife, or war, and, although a soldier may be a lion in war and gentle in his home, there was a very general tendency for the new social virtue—ferocity in defense of the tribe—to contaminate the older benevolent qualities.

Apart from this universal influence of social concentration and multiplication of wealth we have to take into account the local effects of different environments and the general effects of superstitious ideas. How material conditions may affect character we see plainly enough even in our own time. One nation boasts of its love of peace and its detestation of war, and complains of the militarism of other nations, whereas, in many such cases, the map will at once show you that the pacifist nation has no probable enemies and the

warlike nation many. One people boasts of its superior energy and initiative and despises the laziness of others, whereas climate often lies at the root of the difference. We have to see how such environmental influences explain some of the moral perversions, as we call them, of the life of the savage. The influence of superstitions or religious ideas is still better known. The homicidal religious fanatic is today—it is only a few centuries since the whole of society accepted religious homicide—merely an extreme example. In both these respects again a large volume would be needed to trace in full, or as fully as possible, the distortions of the moral development of the race by these influences, and I must confine myself to indicating a few leading examples.

§1. EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENT

We have already seen many particular illustrations of the effect of environment. The Bedouin of the desert who has no settled neighbors is apt to confine his virtues to the area of his own tent, while the Bedouin who lives in villages and cultivates the soil is much more apt to live in peace, honesty, and helpfulness with his neighbors. The Indian of Central America is stimulated to develop the rich resources of his region until he creates a wealthy civilization, while the Indian of the Brazilian forests remains a combative individualist, and the Indian of the bleak coast of Tierra del Fuego sinks to the lowest level of culture. History is today very largely a study of developments under the influence of, or directed by, material conditions.

Some of the worst moral aberrations of the savage, such as parricide and infanticide, are very plainly connected with material conditions. The killing of parents has in all ages been regarded by men as a particularly abhorrent crime. Even the lowest peoples affectionately tend their aged parents, and the older laws of most of the nations that became civilized show that still at the barbaric stage parricide was especially repugnant. Ancient Roman law imposed its most terrible sentence for this crime: the parricide was sewn up in a leather sack with a dog, a cock, a viper, and an ape, and thrown into the river or the sea. Ancient China and Egypt also passed drastic sentences on such offenders, and the ancient Persians held the crime to be so loathsome that they could boast that it was unknown in their chronicles. We need not here look for utilities except in the broad sense that anything that fosters the benevolent emotions of the family circle is humanly helpful.

Savages, as we saw, generally maintain or enforce this respect for aged parents, but, as is well known, there are many peoples, high and low, which systematically killed off the old people. Let us understand at once that parricide in these cases does not mean that the natural affection of sons for their parents has ceased. In almost every case the sons take an affectionate farewell of their parents, and they generally say that the aged folk are quite resigned to, and sometimes demand, the execution. In most cases, we do well to remember, the savages believe in a happy future life for the dead, and they point out that to prolong life on this earth when vigor has

departed is to invite disease, misery, or humiliating dependence on others. There is a seventeenth-century English writer, Aubrey, who says that there was in his time a tradition that parricide was practiced in medieval England under the official sanction of the Church. He speaks of a "Holy Mawle" (maul or mallet) which hung behind the church-door and was used by a son to despatch his father when he passed the three-score years and ten. Aubrey tells the story without a shudder, and more recent writers who have copied this passage are not very convincing when they try to explain that the story must be founded on a misunderstanding. It is curious to think that our word "mauling" may be a reminiscence of a time when British peasants or artisans knocked their aged fathers on the head with a mallet consecrated by the church!

We cannot in every case tell the origin of a savage custom, as it may have arisen in an environment quite distinct from that in which the tribe is today, but we can assign two general reasons for parricide. One, though probably not the principal, reason is shortage of food. This operates, or did at one time operate, clearly enough in the harsh environment of the Eskimos and some of the tribes of northern Siberia. There are some of the latter who have periodically to shoot off a number of members of the tribe, chosen by lot, because the population constantly outruns the food-supply. Other peoples may have been at one time in a similarly stringent environment. The American Indians, for instance, filtered into the continent through the frozen north-west, and the Melanesians and Polynesians almost certainly migrated to their islands—and in some of these food is by no means plentiful—from southern Asia. These are the chief groups of peoples which practiced parricide.

But another obvious reason, which would operate in very different environments, was the need, especially in the hunting stage of human development, to move quickly. Hostile tribes constantly threatened, and the women and children, sick and aged, had often to be moved before a superior force of unencumbered warriors arrived. It was by no means the universal practice to spare these non-combatants. Tribes like the Iroquois with large settled villages could rely on their defense, and they never killed the aged, but it was the practice of many other less fortunate tribes to leave the aged to die when they could no longer walk or to dispatch them. Indians explained that they could not leave their parents to be tortured, and that often the old folk pressed them to send them to a better world now that they were useless. Amongst the Hottentots only the poorer used to kill their parents: to spare them the miseries of old age, they said, though we may suspect that it was the survival of an older custom inspired by different circumstances. Some of the Australian tribes killed the aged, and on the Pacific Islands parricide was sometimes almost a festive ceremony. The Melanesians asked their sons to put them away, and it is said to have been thought a disgrace if a chief had not been buried alive by his sons. In Fiji the reason was given that the aged were exposed to insults, and they were a very sensitive race; and there was a belief that a

man had in the next world the mental powers which he had when he left the earth, so that no one wanted to wait for senile decay.

The same reasons explain the great prevalence of infanticide, though this was by no means confined to savages. The Romans maintained well into historic times the practice of exposing (putting in some solitary place to die) unwanted children and the Chinese kept the custom to our own time. In the savage world the practice was appallingly general. Westermarck can, in fact, quote few peoples above the level of the Veddahs and Andamanese, who did not practice it, that did not permit or encourage it. That this does not imply the extreme callousness that some suppose is proved by their general kindliness, which I have described, and by the fact that savages rarely allowed the father the right to kill his grown sons. That the main reasons are shortage of food and need for rapid movement is clear enough when we see that, as Hobhouse shows, the practice is most common amongst nomadic and hunting people and falls off amongst agricultural people. In some places it was due to the fear of the mother to add to her heavy work or to her encumbrances if she became a widow: in other places to the reluctance of both parents to go without sexual relations during the long period of suckling, as savage custom sometimes requires.

But it was "in the main due to the harshness of savage life," says Westermarck; and the way in which it was very commonly regulated and enforced by the tribe confirms this. Amongst many of the American Indians all children after the second or third had to be destroyed; amongst others most of the female children were destroyed and the males reared. It depended on food-conditions and the interests of the tribe. In Australia and the Pacific Islands also the practice was generally regulated by custom or law. All children after the second, third, or fourth, according to tribal custom, had to be destroyed. It is one of the worst ways in which an apparent advance toward civilization brought about a deterioration of the primitive benevolence. We must not, however, be tempted to read our refined feelings into the life of the savage. The fact that he was generally affectionate to the children he reared shows that he did not feel that he was cruel in discarding such very immature human forms. In any case, there is no difficulty in understanding it on social principles. In the interest of the society itself the general precept of benevolence was restricted, as in the case of war, the other chief evil arising out of tribal advance.

But there is another aspect of the matter which I recommend to moralists. Infanticide and abortion (which also savage women commonly practice, by pressure or vegetable drugs) saved the earth from premature overpopulation. They probably did more than disease and war to prevent a growth of population which the resources of savage life could never have met, and which would have resulted in more appalling wars than there were. Any reader who cares to try this simple sum in arithmetic will find an amazing and significant result: assume that the population of the earth was a hundred thousand persons fifty thousand years ago, which I believe to be a modest figure, and that it doubled once in four centuries, as it did

in Europe during the barbaric early half of the Middle Ages. You easily get the remarkable result that in three thousand years, or by the year 45,000 B. C., the population of the earth would already have been two billions, as it now is. If you assume that the population doubled in a thousand years—in proper hygienic conditions it doubles in thirty years—it would by 40,000 B. C. have reached a figure beyond our resources today to feed. I recommend these simple arithmetical exercises to transcendental moralists and opponents of birth-control.

In fine, let me recall that by its general action on the course of human development environment has had an incalculable influence on the evolution of the higher idealism that would in time correct the blunders and solve the problems of the savage. My historical works have fully illustrated this, and the chief point will probably be in the mind of every reader. I will return to it at the beginning of the next book, as progress in explaining the origin of civilization has been made even since I wrote Vol. 15 of the Key to Culture two years ago. Happily the recent discoveries confirm what I have thought for years: that the Ice Age had the effect of concentrating closer crowds of men between the Sahara Desert and frozen Europe. The only new ideas I find are that this more populated region extended (some recent discoveries suggest) as far as India, and that not only was this strip of earth from Morocco to Persia (or India) warmer than Europe and more temperate than it is today, but the arctic air-pressure in Europe diverted the moist winds of the Atlantic along it. When the ice disappeared from Europe, and this area began to suffer from drought, there was a still closer concentration on the fertile areas (Egypt, Mesopotamia, etc.). Out of this concentration came civilization, with a city-life that imposed higher social problems and a higher mental capacity to solve them. We will return to the point, but it is impossible to raise the question of the effect of environment on man's social or moral ideals without mentioning it. Economic conditions, in the broad sense, not religion or "conscience," directed moral evolution.

§2. EFFECTS OF SUPERSTITION

This civilization that began about five thousand years ago gradually corrected the moral distortions that were due to pressure of environment; or, perhaps it would be better to say, gradually found, and is still seeking (in the problems of war and poverty), ways of preserving man's primitive benevolence while meeting the problems of society as a whole. But the perversions of the social code that were due to superstition were real distortions, and were both more lasting and more calamitous than the departures from primitive virtue due to the pressure of material conditions. They not only led to such horrors as human sacrifices and cannibalism—some types of cannibalism—but they were, more or less transformed, carried on into civilization and embodied in schemes of theology and philosophy, and in these forms they still injuriously affect a great deal of the life and thought of the world.

There is so deep-rooted a tradition in literature that the support

of religion greatly helped moral development that this may seem to some a novel view. The question is now often asked whether religion did more good than harm in human development, though the majority of folk still seem to regard the very question as fantastic. As far as the historical period is concerned I have given some material for use in the answer in previous books. Here I am concerned with the prehistoric period: that stretch of some quarter million years of human evolution which we study when we survey our lower races in their proper cultural order. And in regard to this there can hardly be any hesitation about the answer. Many refined people now imagine that, while civilized folk might dispense with religious motives of conduct, the fear of punishment by the spirits must have been a very weighty factor in the life of the savage. I do not entirely agree with those experts who would meet this with a statement that religious and moral ideas were not blended until late in human evolution. In Little Blue Book No. 1061 I have given a number of instances in which conduct has no connection with religious ideas, and we shall presently consider some of the highest peoples who maintain that their gods are interested only in offenses against themselves (which generally means against their priests); but I have shown also that in large numbers of tribes, from the Australian level upward, the rules of conduct were ascribed to ancestral spirits or gods.

The best answer is that in so far as conduct really affected society it was either severely controlled by civil law or tribal justice, or it was inspired by that general benevolence, generosity, and mutual aid which any group, even of animals, instinctively finds to be useful. In few cases in the entire savage world is the dissuasion from crime left to the indignation of the spirits or is the religious motive more than a feeble supplement of the code of tribal punishment. The general experience shows plainly that society would protect itself from disturbance whether or no there were religious beliefs. This is all that we can put to the credit of superstition in the long prehistoric age. To its discredit we have an appalling list of perversions of which I may enumerate a few.

One that occurs to the mind at once is human sacrifice. No man can estimate the millions of human beings, from babies to grown men, who were slain, often very barbarously, on the altars of gods during the ten or twenty thousand years before the beginning of civilization. This, the period of barbarism rather than savagery, was the great era of carnage. Human sacrifices are entirely unknown at the lowest levels of savage life. There is either no belief in spirits or no practical concern with them. Even at a higher level, where sacrifice begins, it usually takes the form of food, particularly animal food. It is when men have risen to the mental level of realizing that spirits do not eat that they generally begin to drench their altars with human blood. In parts of Africa alone I find that the gods are said to eat the flesh of the human sacrifices offered, and probably this is a new version of the original idea that when a chief died he must have slaves and women in the spirit world, and they are slain in large numbers to accompany him.

However that may be, it is chiefly amongst the highest savages and the semi-civilized peoples that we find human sacrifices on a large scale. In Africa itself "the more powerful the nation the grander the sacrifice." It was in the kingdoms of Ashanti, Dahomi, and Benin, the highest developments in Africa, that "hecatombs of human beings were immolated," as Dr. Keane says, while human sacrifice was unknown to scores of lower African peoples. The gods of most of these lower peoples were good-natured, lazy, somnolent beings: they led the ideal life of the native. In America the practice of human sacrifice reached its culmination in the latest native civilization, that of the Aztecs. The Spaniards calculated that they slew from twenty to fifty thousand human victims every year; and the grim insistence of their priests for victims made the generally amiable people terribly warlike and ready to pick a quarrel at any time with a neighbor. But at every site in the central region of America where the remains of civilization linger, from Teotihuacan to Peru, human sacrifice was practiced. The Peruvians had advanced far enough to bleed without killing, but no one who has seen the parapet of the sacred pool at the Chichen-Itza can doubt that even the enlightened Mayans sacrificed their maids almost in the heart of their impressive cities.

In almost every part of the world we find traces of it, and we find it growing worse, at least as far as the threshold of civilization, with the advance of religion. The story of Abraham and Isaac sufficiently indicates the pre-civilized practices by Semitic peoples like the Hebrews; and long after they became civilized the furnaces of Melkarth yawned for their holocausts on the Phoenician coasts and in the colonies as far as Spain. The dolls which the Romans tied to their "Christmas" trees were souvenirs of a time when human beings had been sacrificed at midwinter. Celts and Aryans alike had human sacrifice in the millenium before they were civilized at least. There are traces of it in prehistoric Japan, and the ancient Chinese were so long accustomed to slay human victims at the death of a chief or prince that some horrible cases occur even during their historical period. The wax images offered by the ancient Egyptians and the dough models offered to the spirits by the Malays have the same significance as the Roman dolls and the Chinese paper figures. Man had grown too humane to obey his religion. And even in the happy islands of the Pacific, both Melanesian and Polynesian, this most repulsive of human practices was found nearly everywhere.

It may seem incongruous after glancing at this horrible page of late prehistoric times—for there is little doubt that this constant practice of barbaric peoples means a long phase of human development—to complain of a mere sacrifice of food and animals, but, since these are virtually universal, we get a total of waste of human effort, a prolonged parasitic levy on human industry, that cannot be ignored. But let us continue to study the perversion of man's moral ideas by their association with religious beliefs. I have said that to a certain extent, in some places, the spirit-belief must have influenced the lives of men, but let us trace a few general consequences.

Quite primitive man has, as I said, no sense of moral or spirit law. Eskimos tell a man who inquires why they do certain things: "The old Innuits did so and therefore we must." The Kafir replies that "it has always been done by our forefathers." In this, of course, we recognize the germ of a religious ethic, the pressure of the dead (spirits), but the idea that gods made the law or supervise the observance of it comes much later. An expert says of the Indians of British Guiana: "Their moral code of good and evil is entirely regulated by the customs and practices inherited from their forefathers." The Rejangs of Sumatra had no word for law, but replied simply: "Such is the custom." When the first missionaries tried to convey a "sense of sin" to the Greenlanders, the natives concluded that they meant a violation of the customs of the white man. To most of the Africans an offense is "a transgression of the laws and customs of the country." To make a larger door than was customary to his hut, to make a new departure in clothing or ornamentation, was as bad as stealing.

When at length a transgression was conceived as an offense against the spirits or gods, as a "sin," there may or may not have been less thieving, but there was an unfortunate development which is still incorporated in modern civilization. Sin began to be conceived as a sort of contaminatic • that could spread from the individual sinner to others and bring punishment on them. There was to some extent, as we saw, the same idea in civil law, but ascribing the idea to the gods gave it a longer life and more formidable consequences. Many of the practices to which the idea gave rise are simply interesting or amusing. Some of the Maori tribes got rid annually of this communal taint by tying a fern-leaf to a man who jumped into the river, loosened it, and let their sins float on it out to sea. In Tahiti a corpse was laid upon a bier in a little corpse-house and a hole was dug underneath it; and the priest then prayed day and night to the god to make the sins fall into the hole. In parts of Turkestan certain old men specialize in taking upon themselves the sins of the people and atoning for them in endless prayer. The Hebrews (Leviticus, xvi) put their sins on a goat which they drove into the wilderness. The Iroquois (Morgan questions this but later writers confirm it) had an expiatory White Dog Feast in late winter. Two white dogs, without blemish, were strangled and hung near the door of the council house. After a few days a group of ten to twenty-five men was instructed to take upon themselves all the sins of the community. They pooled the offensive material in one man of the group, and he, by magical means, injected it into the dogs, which were burned. In parts of India the priest transfers the sins of the people to a calf, and it is driven into the jungle.

An African tribe on the Niger, the Onitsha, have a less pleasant way of doing it. A young woman is roughly dragged, face downward, from the king's house to the river. The men who haul her cry out "Wickedness, wickedness" (or its savage equivalent), and the people they meet must run away. The young woman, with the sins of the people on her, is then thrown into the river. Among the same people a man was killed occasionally to atone for the sins of

the king, and in other places those who had been guilty of the major sins (theft, adultery, murder, incest, witchcraft) were fined about ten dollars each, and with the fund two ailing persons were purchased to sacrifice to the god. In parts of East Central Africa a man was sacrificed to the god to atone for sacrilege, or one of his slaves atoned for him. It is related that, when the Ojibways were once visited by an epidemic, they put a beautiful girl in a canoe and sent it down over the rapids; and it is recorded in ancient Greek history that when the Boeotians were once afflicted with an epidemic, and they asked the Delphic oracle how they were to appease the gods, they were told to sacrifice a handsome boy. Philo of Byblos seems to throw light on the legend of Abraham when he says that it was not uncommon amongst the ancient Hebrews to sacrifice a loved one to atone for sins.

Sin or guilt thus came to be regarded as a half-material taint that could spread to others and be inherited by one's descendants. I have said that we have in the blood-feud something analogous to this apart from religious ideas, but when the same attitude was ascribed to the gods it reacted on the human feeling in the course of time and gave vindictiveness a divine sanction. Many peoples, it is true, chose the more humane way of washing away the taint by water. Some got the quaint idea that filth must be cleared away by filth: the sinner had to cleanse himself with urine or dung. But bathing in the river, or having the water of the river poured over one, was the chief practice adopted in many parts of the world. The practice is still familiar in India, where today sinners will travel hundreds of miles to bathe away their guilt in the Ganges, but it was known in many parts of the world. The Incas of Peru as they bathed prayed that the river might take their sins out to sea.

It is merely interesting to find this very ancient human idea, which occurred to men in their prehistoric simplicity, preserved in the baptismal ceremony of modern churches, but the alternative development in the savage world, atonement by suffering or blood, has wrought profound harm. It is one of the reasons why even civilization has, on the whole, taken five thousand years to discover that the only justifiable aim of punitive law is correction or intimidation, not sheer punishment or vindictiveness. Most of the higher religions, of the ancient empires as well as Mohammedanism and Christianity, accepted this moral aberration of the savage world and embodied it in their doctrinal schemes, thus consecrating and prolonging the idea itself. From this sprang, in the course of time, the idea of persecuting for religion or putting to death those who refused to worship the gods in the communal way, and we know what a trail of blood and passion that has left in the history of Europe.

Apart from this evil influence in connection with the major spirits, or gods, the savage world suffered incalculably from its belief in the anonymous lower spirits or in a vague general supernatural power that men might use for the purpose of hurting each other. Witchcraft is one of the direst crimes in the code of the savage, and this is an expression of the terror which brooded night and day over savage life. Winwood Reade's famous work, "The Martyrdom of

Man," is mainly a picture of suffering from the belief in spirits; and here again the savage idea was maintained in the historical period and only a few centuries ago counted its human victims by the hundred thousand. To this we must add, in some regions, the murders of the head-hunters, the thugs, the savages who believed that any man they killed became their slave in the next world, and those who killed the sick because they believed that if they died of illness they would live in the next world in the same condition. We must add also cannibalism wherever the idea that inspired it was that the eaters shared the spirit of the victim.

A large and very terrible volume could be written on the extent to which the belief in spirits and gods helped to pervert the primitive benevolence and mutual good feeling of the human family. The right and proper way to answer the question whether religion did more harm than good in that long stretch of human development which we are considering here is to try to estimate what would have happened if men had never come to believe in spirits. There would still, as we have seen, have been very tragic and prolonged perversions of the primitive good feeling. Concentration would inevitably of itself have caused more theft and violence, and would have given rise to inter-tribal violence and war. But if human conduct, as far as it affected others, had been considered simply as a social matter for the community to regulate, it seems clear that a sound code of social behavior would have been evolved more speedily; and it is at least clear that the attempt of men to readjust their primitive social impulses to the new forms of social life would never have been darkened and impeded by the ghastly developments which I have briefly described.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE THRESHOLD OF CIVILIZATION

IT has not been possible in the present book to give broad pictures of the actual life of earlier peoples such as it is the general aim of this history of morals to present to the reader. I have been trying to suggest how man developed during the hundred thousand years before the beginning of civilization so that when history opens we find him in possession of a moral code to which, until our own time, only a few refinements were added in the course of five thousand years. In other words, before we examine the behavior of ancient nations in the light of their moral code we ought to have some idea of the origin of the code itself. It developed, roundly, during that hundred thousand years of prehistoric savagery, and the real fossils by means of which we may reconstruct the story are the savage races of today, or these races as they were when the white man first came in contact with them.

They are so numerous and so diverse in their ideas and practices that it is not possible here to do more than collect a number of the general statements about their ways which anthropologists distil from the narratives of early travelers. Even in one race or

family we find the most pronounced variations. There is almost nothing in common between the ethic and psychology of the Yahgans of Tierra del Fuego or the savage Botendos and Sampana of Brazil and those of the Iroquois Indians, the Aztecs, or the Mayans and Peruvians, yet it seems that their ancestors began on a common level less than ten thousand years ago. It would be a magnificent contribution to sound scientific thought if some American sociologist would work out the effect of environment in shaping this extraordinary diversity of the various branches of the Amerind family. A similar work might be written on the Bantu race in Africa with its very great diversities. Even in the case of so pure and isolated a race as the Australian blacks there are very considerable variations, and a careful study of environmental influences, of contacts and isolation and material conditions, from the genial coast life of the tropical north to the fringe of the interior desert and the colder climate of Victoria, would put out of consideration such mysticisms as differences in moral intuition or superior and inferior germ-plasm.

This immense diversity has, as the reader would understand, compelled me to confine myself to abstract statements about the innumerable local developments through which we attempt to trace the main current of the evolution of moral ideas. In conclusion, however, it will be interesting to select a few peoples and give a broader and more concrete picture of their life. Mainly I shall select peoples at what we call the barbaric stage, the stage above savagery but just below the level of civilization. These roughly correspond to man of the New Stone Age, and therefore they give us some idea what was happening in the very important ten thousand years before the dawn of civilization. But, since I left the general development of the race at the Australian level, a few intermediate peoples may be added to illustrate those transitions which I have sketched in the last three chapters.

§1. THE SAVAGE EQUIVALENT OF CAVE MAN

The almost universal use of the phrase Cave Man, which suggests that our ancestor was at one time a savage of fierce and uncontrolled passions, reveals one of the defects of general education. In telling, as far as it does tell, the story of our race as a whole, it either leaves pupils free to adopt the fantastic version given in Genesis or it curtly says that man rose from a state of animalism to one of savagery, and leaves an impression that our development has been an advance from unredeemed brutality to at least an ideal of social harmony and brotherly love. The inevitable specialism of scientific work is in part to blame for this. The anthropologist confuses all sorts of tribes together and the general impression he gives is certainly one of "savagery." The archaeologist, who has only the bones and stones of early man to study, then takes his idea of the savage from these works and represents evolution as a gradual taming of the race. I have shown that Rousseau was really nearer to the truth when he spoke of a primitive freedom from crime which was lost in the creation of social organization and the multiplication of property. The evolution of man is less melodramatic and more interesting than is usually supposed.

It is very doubtful today if the Cave Man of Europe during the Ice Age counts in the line of our ancestry at all. He seems to have been extinguished, though no doubt some of the women were kept, by the higher races from the south or east when the demoralizing climate at the end of the Ice Age enfeebled him. The branch of the race which gave Europe the population that we may regard as ancestral lived in very different conditions south or east of the Mediterranean. But it would be interesting to select one of our savage peoples at something like the cultural level of Cave Man and examine its character. It is not easy, for, as people often forget, the Cave period lasted at least fifty thousand years—probably much more—and saw a great deal of progress. In effect, there were several very different races of Cave Men: so much so that, as some of my readers will remember, a few professors have, for mystic purposes, tried to represent that Cave Man was equal in intelligence to ourselves. Let us take the matter broadly and just distinguish between Early and Late Cave Man. I should then take the Australian black as a fair living representative of the former and the Melanesian as a fair representative of the latter: if we leave out of consideration the art-work of Cave Man, which was due to his special conditions, and compare the rest of his culture with that of the Melanesians.

The Melanesians ("Black Islanders") occupy those groups of the Pacific Islands (Solomons, Santa Cruz, Fiji, New Hebrides, New Caledonia, etc.) which are nearer to Asia. They probably streamed out from southern Asia or the islands of the Indian Ocean and settled in these nearer islands. The Polynesians swept past them, but must have influenced them in passing to some extent, long afterwards to the more distant islands. We shall therefore not look for a pure primitive culture in the Melanesians, but it is fairly possible to identify and eliminate Polynesian borrowings. Then for the last hundred years we have the influences of the white man. We have to remember these things, but we have an extensive description of the life of the Melanesians as it was nearly half a century ago by a missionary, Dr. R. H. Codrington, who spent twenty years amongst them and made valuable notes of his experiences.

We find them in so many respects intermediate between the Australians and the Polynesians that they usefully illustrate the human development. The tribes have chiefs, but as a rule these have no firm authority, and they generally have to win prestige by their supposed superior power of communicating with or reconciling the spirits. They live in large villages and have stout houses of wood and laced palm leaves, and often quite large temples and club-houses. Land is generally common, but a man has a strict personal right to whatever soil he has won from the bush by his own labor and to the weapons and other articles which he makes. I have a spear-head which it must have taken one of them weeks of patient labor to make, and such things would harden the sense of individual ownership, for they are by no means all industrious.

Although there was much cannibalism, probably of a mystic origin, though it degenerated until a man would kill a plump wife for the pleasure of eating her—some who remembered cannibal days

on the islands told me that "long pig" is not really very palatable—and wars were waged with great ferocity, the people were amongst themselves very light-hearted and friendly, and in many ways attractive. Even on Bougainville Island, one of the most backward, where the men were treacherous and cruel in seeking a body for a cannibal feast or a head to lay up merit in heaven, and so far from bravery that nearly every warrior's wounds were in the rear, the atmosphere of the hut or the village remained generally good. The gods were held to be in the main indifferent to conduct, and the future life (underground or on islands over the sea) was the same for all; though on some islands public opinion had developed the religious belief that a man who had been particularly generous in sacrificing pigs to the gods would have more merit in the next life. It is a little human touch in religious development, since, of course, the whole village fed on roast pig after a sacrifice. In general character, in fact, the Melanesians were so much like the colored folk of the southern States—thoughtless, merry, and mutually helpful—that there is no need to say more. Great flaunting tropical flowers grow in profusion on the islands, and they were very fond of decorating themselves with these and with brightly colored shells. Their games and feasts were particularly gay and boisterous.

A peculiar development, which we cannot regard as a common phase of man's advance at this stage, though there is something corresponding to it in African life, was the growth of what we might call secret societies. In a few places the women had societies, but they were always excluded from those of the men, who had a "club house" in the bush and dressed in weird masks and cloaks for their dances and ceremonies. Boys were not circumcised or in any other way initiated to manhood, and they were often admitted with the men before they were mature. One suspects secret practices, but Codrington says that he was informed that there was "little obscenity" at the meetings, and the societies were just clubs protecting their own members: something like the Chinese tong, I gather. A missionary, however, might not know all that occurred.

In regard to sex-morals there was much variation, but it is quite clear from all the authorities that the primitive strict monogamy had completely broken down before the Melanesian stage was reached. The men were generally polygamous—wealth was the only check—divorce was by mutual consent, and occasionally one widow would live with several widowers. Harlots (sometimes widows, sometimes women condemned to this condition by the chiefs) were common in most islands, in spite of the plurality of wives, and unmarried girls often made money in that way, or the men compelled their daughters to earn it or bought wives specially for the purpose. There was, in fact, as Codrington says, "considerable laxity of intercourse between boys and girls, and unchastity was not very seriously regarded." We really read between his lines that in most islands sex was a joke. The men and children were generally nude and very far from reticent about sex. The young children were encouraged to play at sex, while the elders looked on laughing. They were betrothed in childhood, and the girl was elaborately tatooed

at puberty, but, as the husband had to pay heavily for her, the period before marriage was prolonged, and, except in the case of chiefs' daughters (who might in some cases be put to death if they became pregnant before marriage), a great deal of liberty was allowed. On the night of the feasts (marriages, etc.) sexual rules were virtually suspended, and a man often lent or hired his wife. The old men told of a time when ways were stricter: when the adulterer was killed and the adulteress made a harlot. A few islands were more stringent but the general condition was considerable laxity, and there was a very great deal of abortion and infanticide. Often, in quite modern style, a woman merely wanted to keep her figure or have a good time or spite her husband, and she drank the juice of certain plants or got other women to apply pressure.

It is interesting to notice that amidst all this laxity the primitive horror of incest was fully maintained. Very commonly the mature boys had to leave the home and sleep in the club-house. They had now to avoid their sisters as if they were lepers. If one met a tatooed sister in the village, she had to bolt; and they could not even mention each other's names. The boy must not approach his home if his sister is in. If she is not, his mother may put a dish of food outside the door for him, but if she wants to talk to him, she must stand some distance away and not look. In some of the islands the men and women did not mingle in crowds or at work. It is a very interesting phase in the evolution of the idea of chastity, for this horror of incest would in the savage mind react on the general sentiment about sex, helping to maintain the vague feeling of law against which impulse rebelled.

§2. THE POLYNESIANS

The Melanesians may be taken as later in cultural development than the Australians though earlier than the higher Africans—their religious ideas and poverty in myths go to show that—and the race I take next is in its best branches higher than the Amerinds and at the barbaric stage. There is, in fact, good ground to regard the Polynesians as a branch, which went eastward across the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, of the race which furnished the ancestors of most of the European nations. Hence the approach to Europeans in face and physique, which are often extremely handsome, though one catches or suspects at times a Mongoloid feature, as if, before leaving Asia, they mingled to some extent with the Asiatics. In the Pacific Islands and New Zealand they found a superb home after their wanderings, and the natural bountifulness of the soil, the superfluousness of clothing in that beautiful climate, and the slight need of building homes or of exerting themselves except in play and sport, have made them graceful, merry, languorous, and very free in their ways. They had probably learned in their original home to wear clothing, and the women generally wore petticoats or loincloths made from the bark of the mulberry tree, but they bathed incessantly, nude, or lay about the beach of the innumerable islands dressed only in wreaths of the large and brilliant flowers of the bush or strings of pearly shells. There was probably, in the eighteenth

century, when Cook discovered them, no happier race in the world than the one or two million Polynesians who were scattered over the islands; and, while the change of conditions must have greatly modified their character, the isolation must have kept their barbaric culture fairly pure.

The innumerable chiefs—there is one almost to every village—are reflected in the innumerable gods of their religion. In Samoa, which we may select as typical of the higher Polynesians, especially as we have a good description of it before civilized settlers ruined it (G. Turner's "Samoa a Hundred Years Ago"), there were a hundred and ten gods, and the service of them was hard and was enforced by a powerful caste of "cunning and greedy priests" (it is a rival priest, a missionary, who says so, but we will take his word). With their very advanced mythology we need not here concern ourselves, but an interesting light is thrown on some of the questions we have discussed when we learn that the religion was quite divorced from morality. Turner says of the Samoan gods that they punished only offenses against themselves or their priests, and an authority on Polynesia generally adds that in most islands the belief in a future life did not affect a man's conduct in this, except as regarded regularity of worship and generosity in offerings to the temple. "It may be said generally," this author assures us, "that a man's conduct as between himself and his fellow-men had no influence on his life on earth [in the way of punishment for sin] or upon the future of his soul." In many islands men just lived on in a shadow-world after death, without rewards or punishments, but in some of the more advanced islands the chiefs were said to go at death to certain blessed islands across the sea while commoners (a few thought these had no souls) passed to a very vague world under the earth. Snobbery was creating the distinction between the heaven above and the hell below: but it was not a moral snobbery, and there was no place of torment.

The result of this retention of the moral code in its original meaning, as a social code of conduct, is very much what one would forecast from the contents of the last chapter: apart from a certain practice of cannibalism at one time, in which we may see the influence of superstition. Respect for the individual's rights in regard to person and property was enforced by law, and it was as successfully enforced as in barbaric peoples who put the law under the care of their gods. Further, that instinctive benevolence which was a general heritage of the race was, within each community, not in the least impaired by the terrible militariness to which the circumstances led. Ferocious as the men might seem when the war-canoes were out, they were considered by visitors in time of peace, as I have already quoted, "a nation of gentlemen." In Samoa the friendly feeling toward inoffensive strangers was such that a special large house was built to entertain them in each village, and a chief's daughter was appointed as permanent hostess, with girl-assistants to serve and entertain the guests.

As daughters were not sold, rich presents being given on both sides at a wedding, we are not surprised to learn that there was a

good deal of pre-nuptial liberty. Even a single writer and extremely well-informed man like Turner (whose ideas as a missionary, however, complicate his narrative) gives us a confused account on this point. Chastity was "ostensibly cultivated," he says, but was "more a name than a reality," and few girls who did not belong to families of rank (chiefs or richer men) were virgins at marriage; yet he says later that at a wedding the virginity of the bride was publicly investigated before the guests, and friends would beat the bride afterwards if she did not pass the test. The confusion really confirms what I have said. The law against adultery naturally stood, as it does almost everywhere, unless the women are the dominant sex, but it was not solemnly enforced. If a man cared to resent it and kill the seducer, he might do so. As to the chastity of the unmarried girl, it was theoretically required, probably from an early custom of exacting a price for her, but not pressed except in the case of daughters of the more wealthy. All sex laws, however, were felt to be little more than ancient customs in which the pleasure-loving folk found little social substance, and they were continuously set aside; for there was not the least distaste for, or reticence about, sex. From infancy the children heard sex treated as a joke and were quite familiar, Turner says, with obscene conversation and gestures.

At about the age of sixteen the boys, generally in a batch, were tatooed. This painful and elaborate operation took several months, and the men during that period had riotous feasts and joked very candidly with the youths about their new condition. When the girl reached maturity, the women feasted and were not more reticent. The youth then chose his mate but he must not approach her. He sent a present of food by a friend to her father. The girl was supposed to have the right of refusing, but the parents generally had their way. If the parents did not consent and the young folk were agreed, they eloped, and a band of friends of the youth let the parents know by singing ribald songs about it in the street. There was, apparently, no punishment. If the youth was accepted, both families collected presents for each other and food for the feast during several months, and the feast that followed the wedding was an orgy. There was no infanticide, though much abortion, and a few days after the birth of the child the mother was about, and there was another feast. In fact there was a series of feasts, marking the successive announcements that the child could sit up or had begun to creep, then to walk, and so on. These constant festivals colored the entire life of the people, for after a gorge of bread-fruit, yams, bananas, fish, and perhaps fowl, pigs, and turtle, the dancing continued all night, and the sexual clause of the decalogue was virtually suspended. Sexual speech and gestures were the order of the night, and our missionary-informer draws a dark veil over the closing hours.

The wedding feasts of the chiefs were still more numerous and enlivened. They were, of course, polygamous, and they had peculiar incentives to marry often. When a girl married a chief, her brother (or, failing him, some relative of his mother) had to send his daugh-

ter to live with the bride and attend her. She was really added to the harem, though, as it was mainly the dowry she brought that the chief wanted, she was allowed to decline this and presently go away if she wished. Even the wives, when they quarreled, were easily released, and the chief cast about for another wealthy family to contribute to his store of pigs or fowl and to his harem. The only difficulty about divorce was property, and it was generally met by an equitable arrangement. If you realize that most of the work of the men was play (swimming, boating, etc.), and that the women worked little, had not large families, and were most shapely of form and often beautiful, you realize what the prehistoric life of man was like under the most favorable conditions.

The horrible blight that the shadow of Europe and America has brought upon the Pacific Islands has not the extenuating circumstances that one may plead elsewhere; for here there were no broad prairies waiting for the plow that were wasted as hunting grounds. There were no animals in the Pacific Islands—no mammals even in New Zealand—except the domestic fowl and pig which man had introduced. Yet the interference with the life of the natives, partly at the dictation of missionaries, partly to meet the greed of traders, will one day be regarded as second only to the enslavement of the Africans. When Captain Cook visited Hawaii, it was estimated that the island nourished, with very little labor, about 300,000 happy natives: by the end of the nineteenth century there were only about 30,000, generally ailing and unattractive, ridiculously dressed in shoddy American or European clothes, decimated by tuberculosis and degraded by bad alcohol. All the large islands were similarly populated, and each has now only its twenty to thirty thousand survivors. And lest any be tempted to say, with a sigh, that at least we have initiated them into the ways of virtue, let me quote the words of a popular but authoritative work, Keane's "Living Races of Mankind," in which you will find beautiful photographs of the people:

> "It seems to be admitted on all hands that Christianity and civilization, in ensuring peace, have not tended to the formation of habits of industry and enterprise, but on the contrary have led to a decided increase of dissipation."

§3. THE AMERINDS AND THEIR ANCESTORS

Some might dispute my statement that the Polynesians were culturally higher than the American Indians. What I mean is that the Polynesians as a body were higher than the Indians as a body; but, while the scattering of the Polynesians over the Pacific Islands left them without stimulation to make further progress, the Indians in certain parts of America found, as I have elsewhere explained, the conditions of progress, and some of them rose high above the highest Samoan or Maori level and reached the plane of civilization. It will therefore be interesting to glance at a few phases of the development of this branch of the human family.

That these first settlers in America came from Asia no one now questions, and we should expect to find in north-eastern Asia the

level of life from which they started. Unfortunately, that corner of Asia offers men such bleak and inhospitable conditions that we often suspect that the lowly peoples on the fringe of the Arctic may have actually degenerated or had their ideas and ways singularly distorted by the material conditions. Some writers are slow to admit the influence of material surroundings in this fashion, but it is found in every region of the earth. Indeed only an hour ago, as I read my morning paper, I found, in an interview with a missionary, Dr. Stewart, who has spent thirty years amongst the Eskimos of Labrador, a very interesting illustration. Over most of the earth savage speculation on the home of the dead has tended, wherever it made a distinction between the home of the good and of the wicked spirits, to put the former in the sky and the latter under the earth. We can trace this localization of heaven and hell at the level of the lower African peoples, and it is quite natural. It would be a punishment, apart from any particular torture, to be imprisoned in the land of darkness underground away from the gladdening sunlight. But suppose a people which had once lived in the more genial conditions of southern, or at least central Asia moved into the Arctic Circle, where one was glad to burrow in the warm snow, where the heavens pitilessly lashed men with blizzards. We find just what we should expect: a complete reversal of the geography of the next world. Dr. Stewart says:

> "The Eskimos [of North Labrador] believed in twin souls of men: one for good and one for evil. The good went to the regions below, and the evil to the regions above; so that all injury came from above, in the snows and blizzards, and all good fortune from below."

Probably the very missionary who reports this naive and perfect illustration of the naturalist development of man's ideas under the influence of his environment would nevertheless talk, like others, about his religious and moral intuitions. So completely had the religion of the Eskimo become colored by the material conditions into which his fathers had wandered that the one great spirit which stood out in the crowd of spirits, the god Tongak, "lived in the midst of the snow and ice in the shape of a great walrus and conversed with his people through his priest, the Angekok."

The moral ideas and habits of this fringe of strange and lowly peoples round the polar sheet are, naturally, less tinctured by the environment than the religious ideas, because the latter are speculations on the forces at work in the environment, but they sufficiently reflect the isolated condition. The spirit of the enlarged family is well preserved, as I have illustrated by many statements in the preceding chapters. There is, as a rule, so general a benevolence that some travelers speak of a communion of ownership—it is really a simple belief that one may use one's brother's axe, etc., at any time—the wars of higher tribes are almost unintelligible to them, and a man will lend a stranger his wife as readily as his knife. It goes so far, in fact, that a favorite way of settling quarrels is to set the litigants to compete in composing scurrilous poetry about each other,

to the entertainment of the village, until one runs dry. But I have said a good deal about the Eskimo and will turn rather to the group of strange peoples in the north-eastern corner of Asia who probably fairly represent the condition of the Amerind tribes when they set out from that region for Alaska, as the pressure of population in Asia increased.

A well-known English traveler, Harry De Windt, was once held up for a few weeks on the shores of Behring Straits amongst one of the lowest of these peoples, the Chukchi, and has described his experiences in his book, "Through the Goldfields of Alaska." They live in villages of about fifty huts (stout structures of whale-bone over which is laid a double thickness of walrus-hide) each, and their life well confirms the principles I have deduced in the preceding chapters, except that it is obvious that the introduction of the cheapest and worst kinds of alcohol by traders and the example of dishonesty have not improved the character. De Windt found most of them not unattractive in character, if filthy and repulsive in body, except after a feast which included much trade-whisky. They were "the filthiest people in creation," he says. Peoples living in the frozen north are generally dirty but one can imagine the feelings of a European shut in a hut with a dozen of them when one learns that they did indeed wash themselves and their food-vessels occasionally but the only fluid available was one drawn from their own bodies. This filthiness and their violence (and, as he privately told me, sexual orgies) when they were drunk after a feast prevent the traveler from being enthusiastic, but he describes them as kind to their wives—they are polygamous—and children and quite benevolently disposed to each other and strangers.

They particularly illustrate how a quite kindly feeling is consistent with killing the aged, which is common amongst them; though, curiously enough, Mr. De Windt says that they do not kill women. They hold death lightly, having a vivid belief in survival, but they dread disease, because they believe that a man who dies slowly of disease has an unhappy time in the next world. Possibly this is a gloss on the simple original practice of killing the sick to spare them pain and spare their fellows an encumbrance: remember that the death to them was a transfer, not a deprivation, of life. A sick man will often ask his friend to dispatch him as an act of kindness. Usually the man is ceremoniously and festively sped on his way to the next world. The victim "takes a lively interest in the proceedings and often assists in the preparations for his own death." There is a great feast of walrus and seal meat and trade-whisky, and then, after a roll on the drums and with the entire village looking on, the man is strangled. He has, they think, merely passed into a shadowy duplicate of their land of frozen marsh and sea, and the feast is resumed.

In this bleak region are many other peoples who present small variations on the general character of the group. The Samoyeds, for instance, are reindeer and salmon people, and conceive god as a being who will severely punish them unless he (that is, the shaman) is constantly fed on raw flesh. They are described as "the lowest

of the group," yet the experts go on to tell us how they were peaceful, industrious, kind to their wives, and so well disposed to each other that a man would travel many leagues to talk to a fellow, until the white man came. The Russian missionaries actually bribed them with vodka and tobacco to join the Church and, to swell the lists of conversions published in Moscow and Petrograd, bribed the same man over and over again. It is amusing to find the same European traveler who puts the Samoyeds amongst the lowest of the peoples telling us in the end that the practices of the missionaries and traders have made an end of their original "idyllic condition."

Further south are more purely Mongolian peoples, of whom perhaps the Kalmucks are the best representatives, but owing to the invasion of all these peoples by Buddhist and Christian missionaries, Chinese and Russian travelers, and more recently travelers of all nations, it is difficult to find an unadulterated primitive culture. What we do find here, as in the Pacific Islands and so many other regions, is that degeneration and death on an appalling scale have followed the white interference with their primitive ways. The great Tatar Empire of the Middle Ages shows for all time that peoples at this level are fully capable of civilization. The ferocity of many of them as warriors is, as it were, merely the face they show to those whom they regard as enemies. Everywhere we read of the same benevolent feeling, good-fellowship, affectionate family life, effective social laws for restraining the violent or predatory impulses of the individual, and friendly hospitality to all who are not believed to be enemies. The Kalmucks for instance made the wife equal to the husband, held all in common except a man's horse, saddle, clothes, and weapons, had an ample and grave code of courtesy, and were notably hospitable to all strangers. In most cases our modern scientific civilization could, with patient and scientific effort, have been built upon this promising basis, but the authorites on these Asiatic peoples all speak of rapid decay and deterioration. The "peace-loving and gentle" Kalmucks, once a mighty nation and even at the end of the eighteenth century counting their 200,000 tents, now number less than 10,000 men, women, and children; and the men are described as generally sullen, indolent, and drunken. It is enough for our purpose to note that as long as the old order lasted, each nomadic family lived affectionately and peacefully in its large tent far away from others on the great prairies, though most courteous and hospitable to others, and the primitive virtue of the race was finely maintained. The inevitable concentration of these folk in towns would have brought moral problems, but what has actually been done by the people who came with a boast of superior religion or moral intuition is degradation and ruin.

One or other of these eastern Asiatic peoples in its primitive culture—perhaps something between the Chukchi and the Kalmucks—represents the life of the tribes who, some thousands of years ago, crossed Behring Straits and began the great epic of the peopling of America. No other continent more beautifully illustrates the influence of environment on men's moral ideas. There can have been

little difference in point of culture between the tribes which crossed from Asia, even if we suppose that there were a thousand years between the first and the last arrivals. I should, in fact, imagine that, as they certainly all come from the north-east of Siberia, where we find the lowest Asiatic peoples, and as all must have spent ages in the same bleak environment, even when they landed in America, no tribe brought into America a culture higher than that of the best Eskimos or the Chukchi. From this level some—the Yahgans, who remain nude and miserable in the hard conditions of the extreme south, the ferocious nude savages of the Brazilian forests, the Caribs of the islands, or the Indians of North Labrador—seem to have degenerated, while others, in regions where they had more stimulating contact with other tribes, rose high above the original level and at last produced a genuine, entirely native, and in many respects high civilization.

In Key to Culture No. 22 I have given a short study of this spread and differential development and eventual civilization of the American peoples, of which some day—let me admit that our knowledge is still scanty and at some points baffling—a great American university will give us, I hope, an account worthy of America. Here I must be content to say a few words about the Indian character at what we may call the middle level or just below the level of civilization. So much has been done to remove the impression of savagery, in the moral sense, which stories of the inevitable clash with the whites have given everybody that we now often find writers going to the extreme of suggesting that the Sioux or the Iroquois were morally or spiritually superior to their successors. I have seen a congress of cultivated ladies in the city of London listen with profound respect to an Amerind speaker, of pure blood, who claimed this superiority in moral and religious intuition for his race. We need not go so far, but we have at least penetrated beyond the screen of fire and hate, the temporary world of scalping and treachery and ferocity to women and captives, and got some glimpse of the primitive Indian character.

Perhaps Morgan's study of the Iroquois ("The League of the Ho-de-No-San-Neei") is, though more enthusiastic than a scientific work usually is, the best work available. It deals, however, mainly with a political organization which does not of itself concern us: I mean it concerns us only in so far as the tribal organization has taken over the regulation of social conduct and secured a high degree of immunity from crime. It is more important to observe how splendidly the Iroquois maintained amongst themselves the spirit of brotherhood, the kindness to children, the mutual aid, the generosity even to the stranger. They excelled in "the seven works of mercy": until those who boasted that they alone cultivated these works of mercy lit the prairies with passion. However, that is, as I said, a complex and difficult problem. I have in the preceding chapters given several quotations from Morgan's book and made clear the excellent social qualities of the Indians. We have seen how their economic condition enabled them to discard even the practice of killing the ailing and aged which is so common in Amerind, Eskimo,

and North Asiatic peoples. We have seen also, it is true, that the Iroquois ascribed their good practices to their fulfillment of the will of the Great Spirit; but the Great Spirit of the Iroquois is, like the Great Walrus of the Chukchi, a projection upon the clouds of the spirit of the race itself. The people had, in their spacious area of western America, worked out their human salvation. They followed a social code which, because it was good, was enforced by tribal authority, and was then declared by the priests to be under the tutelage of the Great Spirit.

So we should find in every part of the earth, and it would be fascinating to connect all the peoples of the earth, with all the vagaries which a particular environment or superstition gave them, in a vast evolutionary scheme. Here I have, I trust, selected from the vast collection of the anthropologist sufficient instances to show how the moral code with which man appears at the threshold of civilization was compiled. I have shown that the race began with a family-code of conduct. At one time I considered that the harmony of life in the lowest peoples was due to a natural selection which has weeded out the peoples with inharmonious life. Now I see that we must put back the action of natural selection into the purely instinctive world of the lower mammals and birds. Even there we find the family group united by something like affection and mutual aid. Man came of a long line of these peaceful, non-gregarious, monogamous animals, and the longer infancy and helpfulness of the human young accentuated the emotions. The gradual formation of larger groups and the increasing complexity of life gave birth to new impulses and desires, to a refractory individualism, to social rules and social coercion. We saw how the task of man—a task still far from completely accomplished—during the last hundred thousand years has been to extend the family-harmony to the whole race until coercive rules are no longer necessary. We saw how priests ever eager to enhance their importance, ascribed these coercive rules, when their real origin was forgotten, to the gods whom they were supposed to represent, and thus greatly enlarged the sphere and the urgency of their services. We saw how, through all these complications of old custom, superstition, and new changes, men slowly shaped the code of social conduct until the higher barbarians of the earth, on the threshold of civilization, had practically the same rules everywhere for conduct that was genuinely social; and we shall see in the next book how much they differed in regard to moral conduct that cannot be shown to have social consequences.

A HISTORY OF HUMAN MORALS

Volume II

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Morals in the Ancient World

Ideas and Practices in Ancient Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria and Judea

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

Girard, Kansas

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Page

Chapter I. Egypt in Earlier Times..... 5
(1) The Divine King. (2) The Royal Court. (3) The Mass of the People.

Chapter II. Egypt in the Second and Final Stages.....16
(1) The Religious Revolution. (2) Life in the New Kingdom. (3) Vice and Virtue in the Last Days.

Chapter III. The Life of the Peoples of Babylonia.....29
(1) The Primitive Level. (2) The Lesson of Recent Exploration. (3) Social Life in Babylon.

Chapter IV. The Character of the Assyrians.....41
(1) The Royal House of Nineveh. (2) The People of Nineveh.

Chapter V. The Babylon of the Chaldaeans.....46
(1) The Wonderful City. (2) Was There a Deterioration of Morals?

Chapter VI. The Position of the Hebrews in Moral Development..55
(1) The Life of the Primitive Hebrews. (2) The Phallic Religion of the Hebrews. (3) City-Life and the Prophets.

MORALS IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

CHAPTER I

EGYPT IN EARLIER TIMES

BETWEEN the life of the highest savages, which I described in the previous volume, and the first forms of civilized life upon which the light of history falls the differences are as great as those which separate the higher savages from the lower. The contrast between a Polynesian community at its best and the vast and fully organized population of Egypt in the days when the first pyramid was built is almost as pronounced as that between an Iroquois village and one of the smaller western towns that now covers the site. It was thought by all men until modern times that there could be only one explanation of this rise of civilization here and there in a world of savagery. Some deity had chosen a particular people to receive his favors and had taught it the arts of agriculture and metal-work, of letters and political government. Not only in Mexico and China, but in Egypt and Babylonia also, it was believed that the chief god had communicated these higher arts to men.

But what King Hammurabi of Babylon did not know, when he thanked Shamash for his benevolence to his people, was that not many leagues away there was evidence, buried under a shapeless mound of clay and sand, that a thousand years earlier the folk of that region were slowly rising out of barbarism. Deep under ground were the tombs of early Mesopotamian queens, and a few pitiful bones told us, when we opened them, that when their subjects had borne their bodies to its last home, they had killed and buried with them, not only the oxen and drivers, that they might still be at their disposal in the land of shades, but a group of their fair young maids, their musicians, and their guards, to make sure that they should still have their court. Deeper still were the scanty relics of an age when even this barbaric splendor had been unknown. In every land where civilization appeared the traces of its evolution were buried in the soil, awaiting the spirit of curiosity and the constructive genius of our time. Already we have traced in outline the slow growth of every art of civilization.

I told the story in the Key to Culture. But archaeology still makes such progress that we can now throw a little more light on the origin of civilization than we could three years ago, and a short account of recent discoveries may serve as preface to this account of the life of the ancient peoples. I told how when Europe bore four million square miles of snow and ice, summer and winter, when even the higher lands of Spain and Greece were as bleak as Alaska is today, men concentrated in the temperate and animated region that stretched, between the Sahara Desert and frozen Europe, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Indian Ocean: how, since Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the larger islands of the Mediterranean Sea were the most

desirable areas in this green strip of earth, men gathered together in them and by their contacts stimulated each other to advance.

What can we add to this? Some writers would have us believe that recent discoveries have been "revolutionary," as startling as was the discovery of the Cretan civilization nearly thirty years ago. The best general work in which they are summarized is V. Childe's "The Most Ancient East" (1928). They have, he says, revealed "a hoary antiquity of civilization" that must profoundly modify our ideas. Since, however, he later speaks of the culture of these newly-discovered sites as a "higher barbarism," and claims only that what we strictly call civilization was fully developed by about 3000 B. C., those who learned the story from my Key will scarcely feel the need of a mental revolution. I, in fact, included two of the three chief discoveries: the Badarian civilization (or higher barbarism) of at least 5000 B. C. which has been unearthed in Egypt and the elementary civilization of Ur and other Mesopotamian cities of about 3000 B. C. The third, which was under discussion at the time I wrote and is now fully established, is that in northern India at the same time there were cities as large and advanced as those of Mesopotamia. This, although I warned my readers that Babylonian navigators were believed by many to have reached India long before the Aryan invaders, may be said to revolutionize our early history of India, but for the general story of civilization it means only that the strip of progressive territory that lay between the barren sands of Africa and the barren snows of Europe stretched far beyond Persia. It is a very interesting extension. Whether there was a common center from which the pioneers of civilization radiated to these different regions—Mr. Childe favors southern Arabia—is as yet a matter of sheer speculation.

Another new idea which the reader will find interesting is that the high pressure of the arctic atmosphere over Europe during the Ice Age sent further south the moist winds from the Atlantic Ocean, which strike England today, and they swept over and plentifully watered the green corridor from Morocco to India: and that, when the ice melted, the moist winds shifted once more to central Europe, desert areas grew in their old path, and men concentrated on the fertile and watered valleys of the Nile, the Euphrates, and the Indus. It is a fascinating speculation, but one must regard it with some reserve because, as I said, the desert area between the Mediterranean and India was still well watered until a few centuries before the Christian Era. Civilization throve in it in the days of the Romans. Except, therefore, for the extension to India, where we have now found the remains of large cities, going back to about 3000 B. C., with temples and baths, cotton textiles and beautiful goldwork and pottery, our ideas are merely confirmed. New discoveries generally lead to some exaggeration, as when Mr. Childe asks us to believe that "by the end of the fourth millenium B. C. the material culture of Abydos, Ur, and Mohenjo Daro [India] would stand comparison with that of **Periclean Athens** or of any medieval town."

When I read some of these claims that we have within the last few years revolutionized our ideas of the origin of civilization, I am

tempted to recall that nearly twenty years ago, in my "Story of Evolution" (1912), I spoke of "the temperate zone into which men had been pressed by the northern ice-sheet, which from Egypt to the Indian Ocean remained a fertile breeding-ground of the nations" (p. 324). In my "Ice Ages" (1923) I fully developed the idea and gave a map to illustrate it, and for years I have expressed a hope that exploration would be made between Mesopotamia and India. Many sites are now explored in this area, and we see that the progressive race which stretched along the green corridor actually entered North India. Some blight seems to have fallen upon this early Indian civilization, and it was left to the Egyptians and to the Sumerians, who settled on the Mesopotamian plain, to develop the culture until it reached the forms we find at the beginning of history. How the Egyptian section of the race, with other tribes that invaded the valley, became one powerful monarchy with a most distinctive civilization I told in the Key, and I will here give pictures of the life of the people, first in their oldest and most characteristic days, then at a time when internal development and foreign influences have brought about significant changes of character.

§1. THE DIVINE KING

The great pyramids, which go back nearly to 3000 B. C., show that Egypt already had a very large, skillful, and well-organized population, since they tell of a king directing, through a vast hierarchy of officials, perhaps a hundred thousand men during twenty years (as Herodotus says) to raise this colossal monument to his vanity. According to some of the best recent experts the pyramid has another and very interesting significance. The king alone, they say, was in those early days believed to have gone at death to the home of the gods, to enjoy their companionship forever. He was the son of the great god Ra, the representative of the gods on earth, the most vital element of the nation. It is thought that we may infer from one of the religious ceremonies he performed that at an earlier date it had been the custom to kill and replace kings when they fell ill, as Sir J. G. Frazer describes in "The Golden Bough." His vitality was so closely connected with the supernatural power that wrought up the black earth into fields of grain and richly-laden vines and date-palms that, if he fell ill or weak, the earth could bear only feeble crops. However that may be, even in historic times he was the real center of the magical and religious power that made the sun shine, the river fertilize their fields, the trees bear fruit. He was the supreme priest, the supreme judge, the supreme commander. Whatever equivalent of "God Save the King" Egyptians sang in those simpler days, they sang it with profound meaning and earnestness.

Hence the center of the old city of Memphis which sprawled about the feet of the pyramid—a city of mud-bricks and timber that fell into dust ages ago—was the spacious palace, surrounded by beautiful gardens, where the son of Ra, monarch of the universe, lived. When he went abroad, to render worship in some famous temple or to hunt the lion in the desert, runners preceded him to see

that every mortal was prostrate as he passed. When he donned his golden emblems and robes of finest linen and his false beard, and sat to give judgment near the door of the palace or on the inner throne every man who approached must "nose the ground." In token of special favor, if he were, for instance, a mighty magician or warrior, he might be permitted to "nose" the royal foot itself. But the king was a son of the sun, and people must be dazed by his majesty.

There are hardly any papyri of those older days, but it seems that even the king took this superstition seriously and with dignity When he left his ebony or ivory bed, inlaid with gold, in the morning, the women of his harem greeted him as the risen sun. He was bathed and massaged and clad, and, after a simple morning meal, he turned to the business of his kingdom. A staff of scribes, with sheets of papyri and writing palettes, reed pens and little cups of red and black ink, supplied the reports of the higher officers and took down his instructions. Taxation was paid in grain and cattle and flax, and there were immense royal granaries into which the stores streamed and from which supplies were drawn daily. In return the king must see that the irrigation trenches and water-lifters were in proper order all over the land; that the worship of the gods was rightly conducted so that their favor be retained and the myriads of devils kept in check; that there be no abuse of justice in the hierarchy of simple courts that overspread the land.

One of the old stories that passed from mouth to mouth shows that it was no idle formula that Pharaoh, or "the Great House"—for the king's personal name was too sacred for common folk to utter—was a last court of appeal for everybody. A peasant had been cheated of his ass by the wicked machinations of a local official. He appealed to a high steward, and in due time even this matter of an ass came before the king. At once the king directed that, pending the inquiry, the peasant and his family must be supported out of the royal stores. The poor man had, when he set out in quest of justice, told his wife to make the little store of grain in the domestic bin into loaves that he might take his share with him, but the case dragged and they got the royal bounty. It seems to have been the custom—there was as yet no written law—for another story makes the king tell a foreigner, who has appealed to him against a thief, that if he were an Egyptian he would be supported out of the royal granaries until the thief was found. Justice was slow, for scribes had to travel far along the Nile valley with their writing palettes and rolls of papyri, but it seems to have been sure. The unjust official was in the end condemned to hand over all of his possessions to the poor peasant.

Another story shows that, when all business was over and justice rendered and the cult of the gods discharged, the semi-divine kings were very human. This is the story of a king who was very, very bored, and he summoned his staff of magicians to find for him a new entertainment besides the singing and dancing, the harps and lutes and pipes, of the dainty women in the pavilions of the royal garden or the conjuring tricks in the dining hall. "Let your majesty,"

said one of the magicians (some of whom were reputed to be so clever that if you cut off a duck's head they could replace it), "deign to have a barge manned by all the fair girls of the royal harem." So they brought out "twenty oars of ebony inlaid with gold" and "twenty women of them who have a fair body, fair breasts, and beautiful hair, and have not yet had a child," and "twenty hair-nets to give to the women as [sole] clothing." And with this pretty spectacle on the royal lake, and all the small adventures that befell, the tired king was diverted and returned fresh for the evening banquet and the flowing wine. Much bathing and anointing with perfumed oils preceded the meal. In the end the son of the sun retired to his ivory bed, inlaid with gold, and laid his head on the cushion-covered wooden head-rest (a sort of small trestle), which was loaded with amulets to scare the demons from the sleeper.

For many centuries the kings ruled Egypt thus, placidly and gravely, content with the pleasures of the harem, the musicians and magicians, and the hunt. They sometimes married their sisters—recent authorities insist that this was only occasional, and that kings alone in Egypt could marry their sisters, as Osiris had married Isis in the womb—and in any case a sister had a right to the throne, and sometimes reached it, when brothers failed. Justice, about which all were so concerned, was consistent, and women were, class for class, on the same level as men. The feudal system, under which the king's officers could summon all the men of a village to assemble and pick out the strongest for military service or forced labor on a pyramid, is to our mind gravely unjust, but this was the very dawn of civilization, and within the limits of their narrow ideas men sought to render strict justice to all and lead lives of dignity and wisdom.

§2. THE ROYAL COURT

More than two thousand years later the Greek traveler Diodorus of Sicily would write, admiringly, of the older kings of Egypt:

> "They were served, not by bought men or slaves, but by the sons of the chief priests, educated with the greatest care and over the age of twenty. Thus the king, having night and day in his service real models of virtue, would never stoop to a reprehensible act, for a monarch would not be worse than other men if he had not around him those who would flatter his desires. The hours of day and night when the king had some duty to perform were fixed by the laws and not left to his own will."

At the services in the temples, it seems, the priest recited the king's virtues, or, in reality, held up to him the model-self which he ought to be:

> "He represented him as temperate, just, magnanimous, an enemy of lies, loving to do good, complete master of his passions, inflicting on the guilty less punishment than they deserved and rewarding good actions more generously than they merited."

We will not make the mistake of supposing that kings were always as courtiers described them, but it is clear that those monarchs of five thousand years ago, in the first age of civilization, were more humane and dignified than the later kings of Europe. In the earliest days, however, the priests were not yet powerful enough to fill the palace with their sons. The court, of several hundred people who lived in the palace, consisted of the king's numerous sons and grandsons and a group of men known as "the Privileged Ones": men selected for special merit and drawn to the palace. The common reward—for a good story, for instance, or a clever bit of magic—was one loaf of bread, one jug of beer, one measure of incense, and we read of one marvelous man getting an award of a thousand loaves of bread, a hundred jars of beer, one ox, and a hundred bunches of leeks. But the ablest officials were drafted into the royel household, and their sons were taught in school with the young princes, who wore a curly lock over the shoulder to distinguish them. The favorite was "anointed" by the king and given some high office of state: and through a descending hierarchy of officials, as far as the head of a village, these men and the king ruled Egypt in peace and justice. "I want my pot down to its bottom" was a proverb even amongst the poorest workers: meaning that every man insisted on having his strict rights.

Round the royal palace were the mansions of the higher officials, civic and military—though there was little glorification of soldiers in the early days—who formed a sort of aristocracy. All loved spacious and beautiful gardens, with large lotus-ponds, trellised vines, and innumerable trees and flowers. A high wall surrounded the garden, and at the far end from the gate, nestling amongst the trees, was the villa. It was a light structure, with latticed windows, of clay and wood, with gaily colored hangings to keep out the dust and rain, ceilings painted like a starry sky across which birds flew, floors painted in the guise of marshes with pools here and there. Finely carved ebony and ivory couches and stools, or of rich inlaid wood, with legs carved like those of the lion or the ox, stood here and there. There was a taste for beauty and daintiness in all things. At table spoons of sculptured ivory—we have large numbers of them—and neatly-shaped wine glasses were used. There were from a very early date four kinds (later a dozen kinds) of red and white wine, and a sweetish beer was made from fermented barley. Palm-brandy and other liquors were added. Ducks and geese and wild fowl, ox, antelope, and goat flesh, onions and lettuces, and garlic, honey and preserved fruit, gave variety to the table. Men and women anointed themselves, after bathing, with perfumed oil for the banquet, and flowers and perfumes made the air sweet. Then there were musicians, and the slow stately dance of the girls, and the art of the story-teller and conjuror to fill the night-hours. Silk was not yet known, but weaving was so ancient and perfect an art that the linens the rich folk wore look and feel like silk.

These higher officials were the germ of a nobility, and in the course of a few centuries they became real feudal princes with magnificent mansions and large estates in the provinces, which the king

had entrusted to them. Still we have no chronicles of the Old Kingdom, and we know these officials only from their posthumous boasts on the walls of their tombs. These show at least that they were far more sensitive to ideals and more conscious of duties to their subjects than the nobles of Europe would be four thousand years later. An ancient book of counsels says to them:

> "Do right as long as thou abidest on the earth. Calm the weeper, oppress no widow, expel no man from the possessions of his father, and injure not the magistrates in respect of their positions. Take heed lest thou punish wrongly."

On the wall of the tomb-chapel, cut out of a cliff, of one of these provincial nobles we read:

> "There was no citizen's daughter whom I have misused: there was no widow whom I have oppressed: there was no peasant whom I evicted . . . there were none wretched in my community; there was none hungry in my time."

There is a large collection of such inscriptions, and they at least tell us that there was in the aristocratic world a general acknowledgment of duties to the poor and helpless to which we shall rarely find a parallel in any later aristocracy.

After 2000 B. C. we begin to find papyri in the tombs: to learn from signs and stories more reliable particulars of life than we have on tomb-stones and in prayer-books. If we apply these to the Old Kingdom, though life does then seem to have been more orderly, we find just a normal amount of lapse from the ideal. Wine is abundant and greatly esteemed—"It had more wine than water," is the praise of a foreign land—and so drunkenness is not uncommon, though considered a disgrace. There are dishonest folk, as the king's justice shows. As to sex, where polygamy is the fashion for all who can afford it, and a harem is a legitimate luxury, there was not likely to be much roving of the men. We must remember, however, that the women were not in any way subject to the men, and this would tend to promote adventures. The wisdom-writers of the next kingdom, whom I will quote in the next chapter, have the usual cynical counsels against women, especially courtesans, and the stories often tell of the naughtiness of married women. I will give here one very old story, that of King Khufu and the Magicians, which probably goes back to the earlier period, and shows that, while irregularity of conduct was known, it was so brutally punished that it must have been rare.

It befell when the king was visiting the house of a priest at Memphis. The priest's wife had a lover amongst the citizens of Memphis, and she sent instructions—note her independent authority—to the steward of the priest's villa on the shore of a lake in the country to prepare the house, as she was coming to spend the day there. She and her lover drank wine all day in the villa and bathed together at evening in the lake. But the steward sent word to the

priest, who was also a mighty magician. He made a large crocodile of wax, and by magic incantations he bade the crocodile seize the next man who bathed in the lake. The woman and her lover soon came again to drink and bathe, and the enchanted crocodile seized the man and dragged him to the bottom of the lake. And the priest, apprized by his steward, brought the king to the lake, where the man had now been imprisoned for a week. The story does not make clear what was done to the man, but the adulterous woman was burned alive in the public square near the royal palace, and her ashes were cast into the river; and the priest was rewarded from the royal bounty with one cake, one jug of beer, one piece of meat, and one measure of incense.

Between the priests and high officials and the common people was the large army of scribes, or clerks, which might be recruited from the poorer class and through which one might rise to be a higher official; though this democratic feature belongs chiefly to the later period. Boys were sent to school—they seem to have been fairly numerous—at six or seven and taught to make the hieroglyphics and the common writing. They did not waste papyrus, which had to be made laboriously from reeds, on these youngsters. They must scratch their figures with bits of crockery on a flake of limestone. At last the youth could write, and he was equipped with his own writing palette—something like the modern child's cheap wooden paint-box, with slender reed-pens instead of brushes—and taught some branch of clerical work or administration. The difficulty of the language thus, as in China, made a sharp division between the literate and the illiterate, but as time went on the son even of an artisan, who was willing to make sacrifices to educate his children, could aspire to one of the beautiful villas in which exquisitely dainty women in the finest linens, heavily painted and perfumed, took equal rank with their husbands. We have large numbers of the life-like statues they placed in their tombs, for a purpose which I described in the Key, and, as far as we can read character from exact portrait-statues, it was in the third millenium B. C. generally of a high and refined type.

§3. THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE

Beyond this literacy-line was the great body of the industrial and agricultural population, on whose labors all the daintiness and luxury rested. Some scribes, of course, were poor enough, sitting under the shade of the houses (as I have seen them in England only fifty years ago) to write a letter, at small fee, for some unlettered man or woman. Egyptians even wrote letters to the dead, asking their spirits to use their influence or complaining to a dead parent of the confusion some unhappy will had caused. These scribes were, in effect, men of the people; and the skilled artisans were serfs of the king, the temples, and the rich, and little better off than the other workers. Life for these was hard but they were cheerful and industrious little men, singing over their work and chattering and laughing incessantly. The bearers of the sedan-chairs or palanquins —there were no horses in Egypt at this time—would, for instance,

when a client came, break into a chant about "Better is it when full than when it is empty," and all classes had their trade-songs, as sailors used to have their chanties.

Their quarters in the towns must have been deadly to children and weaklings. There were no regular streets, and, of course, no drainage or lighting or sanitation. Gray mud huts, with an acacia or sycamore tree here and there, and in places a muddy and unhealthy pool, sprawled irregularly over the quarter. Often the house was a single room of sun-dried clay bricks, with a roof of palm-leaves so low that a tall man would, if he were careless, put his head through. In Upper Egypt it rarely rains, but a very heavy shower once in a few years would ruin the workers' huts. When the rain ceased, men, women, and children would rush to save from the wreck the few crocks and wooden stools, and see if the linen-chest and the corn-bin were intact. Then they would level the ruin, and the builders would raise new walls on what was left of the old: bringing pails of mud from the ponds or the river, mixing it with grit and chopped straw, and shaping it in wooden molds. We have pictures inside the tombs, and even clay and wooden models, of groups of every type of workers at their tasks, and we can almost see their daily lives of five thousand years ago.

They slept at night on mats, curled at the edge and prickly to keep off the scorpions, and at break of day the family was alert and turning to the family-god whose image, in wood or stone, was enshrined against one wall. The door was open night and day, for there was nothing to steal—a richer man would have wooden bolts and locks, smeared with clay, on which he would impress his seal—and a hole in the roof served as chimney, to take away the smoke of the ox-dung fire. At sunrise the man was off to work, a loin cloth or coarse drawers about his middle, taking his midday meal of bread and onions, with, occasionally, a bit of dried fish or salt meat for a treat. There were a couple of hours at noon for food and siesta. Otherwise a man worked merrily until sunset, under the very ready stick of a master. His wage, consisting of corn and oil, and a little meat and fish and a jar or two of beer at festive times, was generally paid on the first day of the month, and the improvident folk fared badly in the last week.

The children ran naked (until puberty) about the district or, if the father could pay, attended school. The mother wore no veil or other sign of subjection. Maspero, who gives us the most vivid picture of their life, goes so far as to say that the husband was merely a paying guest in the home. When there was property, the wife could own and inherit or do business with it just like a man. She would go to market with whatever goods she had for barter, for poor folk had no money—richer people used gold rings—and would spend hours bargaining the cotton stuff she had spun and woven against a jar of perfumed oil or vegetables or ornaments or cosmetics. On a festival day the woman would rouge her lips, blacken and extend her eyebrows, elaborately dress and oil (and perhaps dye blue) her hair, then don her clean linen smock, from dress to ankles, and her glass bracelets and beads, and her amulets.

These charms against the ubiquitous demons and the evil eye must never be forgotten, for the minds of these folk were steeped in magical and superstitious ideas. If they ventured on the river, they must say the form of incantation to paralyze the wicked crocodiles: if to the country, there was a magical formula against vipers and scorpions. When the house was rebuilt, water mixed with blood must first be poured on the site to chase away evil spirits, and three holes must be left in the wall to admit harmless snakes that help to fight the evil ones. Some men, in very old times, hung over the entrance the shriveled hand or foot or genital organ of an enemy conquered in battle, and all had inscriptions on the wall to avert the evil eye. Everybody must know, too, the lucky and unlucky days, and even divisions of the same day; for sometimes the evil spirits ruled during half the day and good influences during the other half, and it was no use starting an enterprise while the evil spirits were dominant.

But one grew up to the life and had no knowledge of easier-circumstanced workers anywhere to cause discontent. There were slaves, it seems, but the great work of the country fell on the millions of peasants and their asses. On the work of the king or lord they were grouped in gangs of five, and these gangs were organized in groups of ten and one hundred; and the stick flew to their backs everywhere on the least provocation. For more serious complaints even the poor man could, with a green bouquet in his hand, seek audience of the prefect, knowing that it was Pharaoh's orders that in matters of justice there must be no discrimination between rich and poor. Each family worked its plot of ground, and the overseer scratched on the mud wall so many marks to represent the baskets of wheat or barley they must pay by way of rent and taxes. They were clearly less exploited and far merrier than the serfs of Europe would be four thousand years later. Men and women alike worked almost naked in the sunshine and the workshops, singing and chattering, looking forward to the great religious festivals for a rest; though it was in later Egypt, as we shall see, that national festivals would draw together hundreds of thousands of the common folk. They seem also to have been generally cleanly, for we read of it as a reproach to a worker to say, "He washeth himself once [a day] only," and stories tell of the wife pouring water on her husband's hands before he starts his meal of bread and oil and onions, and perhaps a cup of barley-brew.

Of their general level of character we can at this stage say nothing. Even later, when we get a fair amount of literature, we can learn so little about the mass of the people—there are few ancient civilizations in which we can—that it is unsafe to make general statements. These poorer workers are hardly likely to have had much chance of drunkenness, except at festivals, and there was everywhere such a stress on justice that we can hardly suppose there was an abnormal amount of crime. As to vice, the dominant position of woman in the home ought to mean that men strayed less than they would in places where women were subject. Of sodomy and

bestiality there is no mention in Egyptian literature, except that they are given in the list of sins in the Book of the Dead which the soul repudiates. We will return to these points later, but it is clear from all the literature and monuments that a great affection united the members of the Egyptian family and, in spite of her laborious life, woman had a happier time than she would have when the old empires were dead. It may not be entirely true that the treatment of women is the finest test of the height of a civilization, but it is clear that the general sense of justice, of which the complete equality of woman was one outcome, sets this Old Kingdom of Egypt, in the dawn of historic time, far above the condition of Europe in the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER II

EGYPT IN ITS SECOND AND FINAL STAGES



HIS old life of Egypt, this curious blend of feudal injustice and privilege with a high sense of individual justice, lasted nearly a thousand years. It was a world of near horizons, and few knew what lay beyond. From any part of the long narrow valley through which Father Nile mysteriously flowed—they had no idea whence its waters came—one looked east or west to a rampart of cliff that shut in Egypt. If an adventurous person climbed the cliffs he saw only a boundless desert, with savage animals and poisonous reptiles and insects. There was trade with Mesopotamia and Crete, but very few went with the solitary caravans or the sea-going boats. Men and women knew no other world but theirs; no other institutions but those which Osiris had given them ages before and upon which Ra shone and showered his blessing every day. The chief enemies were the hosts of invisible demons, and for the war against these they clung to their kings, who were so near to the gods, and to their priests and temples and magical formulae.

Yet the Egyptians changed, and more profoundly and earlier than most people imagine. Even in the first period, the Old Kingdom, there were eight different dynasties of kings, and one suspects that events which were far from the placid dignity we usually associate with Egypt must have led to the fall of some of these. We do know that at the end of the eighth dynasty, about the year 2360 B. C., the land fell into a confusion that lasted several centuries. We begin to get a pessimistic literature bemoaning the complete demoralization of the old civilization. Its persistent note is that the lowly now invade the high places: that the privileges and secrets of the rulers have become common property: that there are what we call today "new rich," of insolent manners, and that the serf of old times has now serfs under him. I gave the general frame of Egyptian history in the Key, but for my present purpose this confused revolutionary period is interesting, and we will glance at it and the changes of character which it caused, and then at the last stage of Egyptian history, when the walls are pierced by cosmopolitan influences and we get a growing contrast of liberalism and asceticism.

§1. THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION

In Little Blue Book No. 1077 I told how the earlier Egyptians had the same vague idea about a future life as had the Babylonians, and that they came in time to believe that not only the king, but every person, went after death to the blessed home of Osiris if at the trial of the soul he proved worthy of it. Some Egyptologists believe that this transfer of the privilege of the king to the entire community is the most important fact in the revolutionary period to which I have referred. Moret, for instance, a high authority, makes this change (in "The Nile and Egyptian Civilization") a fun-

damental part of what he calls the democratic transformation of Egyptian society after 2360 B. C. Repeatedly in the pessimistic writers we read how the worker now has gold round his neck, the woman of high birth has to sleep on a mat or skin (instead of an ivory bed) at night, the son of the prince can no longer be distinguished by his curl from the son of the plebian. The strong kings of Memphis, the binding force of the whole national structure, have gone, and the state totters. The writers cry for a Savior, a "Good Shepherd" (as they put it); and when at length, about the year 2000, a strong monarch appears and founds a new dynasty, at Thebes, we get, Moret says, a reorganization on more democratic lines of society and a "Period of Just Laws."

It would be very interesting to study the effect on morals if the chief change at this period were that now everybody, not merely the king, began to believe that after death his soul would be judged in the court of Osiris and its future condition depended on his moral conduct during life. My own hesitating conclusion is that there was more social justice but some relaxation of personal morals at this period. One has to hesitate because we have so little positive evidence for the earlier period: we have no written literature giving us any idea to what extent there was, let us say, dishonesty, sexual license, or drunkenness. It would be fallacious to infer that vice increased because we get more information about it. I am not misled by that common sophism but am comparing the general tone, as well as we can ascertain it, of the earlier and later period. Most nations become more lax as civilization advances, but it would certainly be very curious if such relaxation in Egypt coincided with the general adoption of a belief in a moral judgment after death and a reward of the virtuous. The larger measure of social justice may just as well be ascribed to the long period of rebellion as to new religious ideas.

The facts are obscure, but it seems certain that at no period in the historical life of Egypt was the hope of a blessed immortality confined to the king. Very ancient tombs of nobles are found with sketches of the judgment of Osiris incised on their stone walls. On the other hand, it seems clear that at some remoter time the great majority of, if not all, the Egyptians did believe that the king alone, being a son of Ra, would at death be taken to the realm of the gods. The contrast between Egypt and Babylon is not so mysterious as used to be thought. General belief in a happy immortality for a virtuous life was no more characteristic of the early Egyptians than it was of the Babylonians, Greeks, or Romans. It was natural that people should begin to believe that the king would share the home of the gods—we saw something like it amongst savages—and that all others would just live on in a world which was a misty counterpart of earth. It was natural that members of the king's family and nobles should in time have this privilege of Ra extended to them. To that development also we found a parallel in Polynesia. But from a prehistoric date the sect of followers of the god Osiris seem to have believed that they all would, if their merits outweighed their evil deeds, be taken to his happy realm. We shall find these mysticisms arising in Persia and Greece.

It is a very curious development, since Osiris, or one of the two elements put together in the character of Osiris (the other seems to have been a personal monarch), seems to have been originally a fertility god, and the cult of his sex-organ was an important part of the religion. Possibly it was the personal Osiris, the king, whether legendary or no, who taught the Egyptians civilization, who supplied the moral element. But we must not linger on such speculations here. What happened in this time of confusion was that the cult of the god Ra, who had been so closely associated with the kings of Memphis, and the religion of Osiris spread everywhere. Soon after 2000 B. C. we find the dead man commonly spoken of as Osiris (united to Osiris), and kings remind their subjects how Osiris will punish them.

The only definite improvement that Moret, who especially studies this period, can find is a larger measure of social justice. The kings suppressed tyrannical and ambitious nobles. The peasants—who are, however, still tied to the soil—get charters of freedom from feudal duties and more ownership of land. The lower class have better opportunities of rising to the higher classes. The religious ceremonies, which had been kept in the hands of the king and his priests, are now open to all and the great festivals at the chief shrines are holidays attracting hundreds of thousands of people. Everybody is now mummified after death, and, after the seventy days of preparation (a sort of pickling) of the body, everybody has, according to the means of his friends, a highly ceremonious funeral. There has been a great attack on privilege. In the confusion the people had broken into the courts and destroyed the records, invaded the workshops of the craftsmen and learned their secrets, torn the veil from the temples and vulgarized the mysteries of religion. Yet we must not exaggerate. The new Pharaohs were feudal monarchs ruling the land sternly through an immense hierarchy of officials. The priests soon again became so wealthy that they got most of the soil of Egypt. The military folk became more and more important. The renewed emphasis on justice means merely an improvement on the period of confusion, for from the dawn of its history to its last days Egypt, as we shall see, insisted sternly on justice to every class. That is just what many of us would expect. Now that the mass of the people were to have a reward in heaven, why trouble much about their hard lot on earth?

§2. LIFE IN THE NEW KINGDOM

It is more interesting to see what personal conduct was under the new regime; and as it remained much the same during the entire period which historians divide into the Middle and the New Kingdom, I take them together, reserving only the last phase with its picturesque contrast of asceticism and liberality. We have nothing like a complete record or literature, but, as I have explained elsewhere, writers became very active in Egypt, and amongst the objects placed in the tomb for the use or alleviation of the dead man's "double," we find the library of the scholar as well as the jewelry of his wife, the copy-book of the boy as well as the toys of the girl.

Frail as papyrus is, thousands of rolls have been preserved (generally in jars) in the carefully sealed tombs in the dry desert soil. As these tombs were naturally put away from the cultivable land and near the fringe of the desert, and as the mud of the river and the rubbish of ages have buried all but the temples and obelisks (rays of the sun in stone) of the cities, experts used to think that the Egyptians were a very somber people, brooding inordinately over death and religion. The literature, pictures, and other objects found in the tombs of ordinary folk have now restored the balance. They were a vivacious, pleasure-loving people, as fond of beer and wine, of song and dance, of flowers and paint and jewels, as the people of any other nation.

Two kinds of literature particularly help us to estimate their moral condition. One is a collection of books of ethical counsels or exhortations, of advice about life and behavior. From the number of such works that have survived, in proportion to the total literature preserved, we must suppose that these books were extremely popular. There is nothing quite like them in modern American literature except the religious books which so few people read, but these books are not religious. Professor Erman, who has published a translation of a large selection of Egyptian literature, says that "it might be supposed that for an educated person of this period the old faith was just an inheritance which he outwardly cherished." His language is too feeble, for in the whole four hundred pages of Egyptian literature which he gives there is scarcely any mention of "the gods," and the names of the Egyptian deities are given only in the temple prayers and hymns. The writers of the moral literature, especially, never speak of "gods" but always "God." The most famous of these treatises, "The Proverbs (or Counsels) of Ptah-Hotep," of which I have given an account elsewhere, may go back, Professor Erman says, to 2700 B. C. or earlier, yet the writer is a monotheist. While theologians still try ponderously to prove that the Hebrew prophets first revealed monotheism to the world about 800 or 700 B. C., if they do not insist on the legendary Moses, these books show that educated Egyptians as a class were monotheists a thousand years earlier. It is possible, in fact, that this use of the word "god" is often not much more than conventional. Some of the writers (of 2300-2000 B. C.) are obviously skeptics. "Lo, no one comes back who has gone," says one. "Ah," says another, "if I knew where God was, I would certainly make an offering to him." In any case, God is rather an ornament of the text, not at all the motive of the moral conduct recommended. It is a social and humanitarian ethic.

We at once ask how the ancient Egyptians applied this to the relations of the sexes, and there are some interesting indications. I quoted in Little Blue Book No. 1077 how the protestation of the soul before the throne of Osiris lays particular stress on "purity." "I am pure, I am pure, I am pure," the shade of the dead insists. But is this, as in many lands, simply a prohibition of adultery? The moralists clearly mean more than this. Over and over again the student is warned to keep away from the places where wine, beer, and

women are waiting for him. Obviously there were brothels, but we have to infer that in good middle-class society it was considered improper to go to them. Most writers who, like Professor Erman ("Life in Ancient Egypt") make an inquiry into this point tell us that the moral standard on sex matters was generally low and amongst the workers "very low." But the evidence they give does not justify general statements and is often unreliable. On the strength of a few papyri, for instance, Erman says that rape was a "common crime" amongst the workers. Now the Sicilian-Greek historian Diodorus, who assures us that he has been on his guard against accepting such "fables" as Herodotus endorsed, says this:

> "In relation to women the laws were very severe, for he that committed a rape upon a free woman was to have his organ cut off; for they judged that three most heinous offenses were included in that one vile act—wrong, defilement, and bastardy. In case of adultery the man was to have a thousand lashes with rods and the woman to have her nose cut off."

Although Diodorus collected his information in Egypt, we may not suppose that these drastic laws were always enforced; yet it is not in the least likely that under such laws rape and adultery were "common crimes."

Much of the evidence is no better. There is the usual tendency to find that people **must** have been very immoral in the pre-Christian Era. An author in the "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics" says that Herodotus describes the orgies of the people at the two most popular festivals of the year: the fertility festival (of Osiris) and the harvest festival. All the world over there is much license on such occasions, yet I find that Herodotus does not speak of orgies. What he says (ii, 60) is that boat-loads of men and women could be seen on the Nile going to Bubastis for the greatest festival of the year, to which, he was told, seven hundred thousand men and women, to say nothing of children, were attracted. Some of the men had pipes and the women castanets, and there was much singing and dancing; and we may safely assume that there were many jars of beer aboard. What shocked the Greek historian was that when the boat drew near a town, the women in the boat reviled the women in the town, and, to quote the Greek text frankly, "lifted up their clothes and showed their nude bodies." It is possible that Herodotus saw such a boatload pass a town against which the people had a grievance and the women made a gesture which was common enough until recent times, and which I have myself seen in the slums of London. I assume that, since the act was accompanied with words of contempt, it was not the front of the robe that was lifted. Herodotus does not go on to describe any orgy at the festival.

Dr. Erman rightly says that in one tomb—**one** only, remember—we have found a papyrus with indecent illustrations and annotations. It follows that there were some men, as there are in every civilization that ever existed, with that particular taste. There are fifty strictly moral papyri for one such; and Erman himself remarks that

until the New Kingdom not one papyrus in one hundred mentions love or woman—which must be a record. When, on the other hand, he finds a dark indication of character in a story of a king who, in order to detect a particularly audacious thief, sent his daughter to a brothel and ordered her to ask each man she entertained what was the boldest act of his life, until the thief was discovered, other experts retort, very justly, that the story cannot be of Egyptian origin. No Egyptian could imagine one of his semi-sacred kings making a prostitute for thieves of his daughter.

Yet there is much that warns us not to go to the opposite extreme. Herodotus picked up a story of a blind king who was told by the magicians that he would recover his sight if he washed his eyes in the water of a faithful wife. He tried his own wife and many other women before he found a cure; and he then burned alive all the unfaithful women. Evidently in Greek days there was a loose tone in some places to make such a story popular, yet notice the ending: death for adultery. In an address to one of the Pharaohs the courtier or priest assures him that in heaven he will be able to detach wives from their husbands at his will; it is a quaint ideal, but it also suggests that even the king could not do this while he lived in Egypt. Yet there was clearly misconduct. Here are some of the sayings of Ptah-Hotep:

> "If thou wouldst prolong friendship in a house to which thou hast admittance, as master or as brother or as friend, into whatsoever place thou enterest, beware of approaching the women. The place where they are is not good. On that account a thousand go to perdition. Men are made fools by their gleaming limbs, and lo! they are become herset-stones."

Another moralist says:

> "If a woman whose husband is abroad sends thee letters, if she speaks to thee every day without witnesses and is ready to spread her nets, it is a crime worthy of death even if she has not accomplished her aim."

Egyptian marriage, we may remember, was not a religious ceremony, and divorce was by mutual agreement of husband and wife. If the man proposed divorce, the woman retained her marriage portion and got one-third of the property accumulated since the marriage. When a woman divorced her husband, she returned to him half the marriage gift he had brought. One naturally suspects that amongst the poor there would often be this reshuffling without being punctilious about a new civil-marriage contract, and we often find that the worker has a "woman" instead of a wife. We know a great deal about the workers, as they were organized in companies: which may very well have given the Greeks and Romans their idea of unions of workers, which in turn led to the gilds of the Middle Ages. All the workers on a large barge or in a certain workshop, for instance, would form a company, with a banner of its own and a leader who had to keep careful record of his men. We have the notes of one of these foremen of more than three thousand years ago. He

had forty-three men under him, and he noted down their characters, their absences and excuses, and so on. Note that even a common boss of a group of workers could write. Even religion familiarized these men with sex-matters. Herodotus says that at the festival of Osiris the women of a village, preceded by a piper, took round a small statue of the god with a sex-organ almost as large as the statue and worked by a string. This organ of the god figured very prominently in the cult, as I have explained elsewhere. Yet—there is always a check to every indication of looseness—we must remember that Egypt almost alone never tolerated the temple-prostitution with which in other lands it became very familiar. Herodotus, who for all his stories represents the Egyptians as exceptionally strict, says that people were forbidden to enter a temple after sexual intercourse unless they purified themselves. Some writers claim that there was temple-prostitution at Thebes, but it is not at all clear.

We may fairly conclude that, in spite of the laws, there must have been a good deal of looseness amongst the workers, though we have no indication whatever that it was as bad as conduct was in Europe until less than a century ago. As to the middle class and wealthy, we must find some significance in the fact that, although Diodorus does not mention any legal punishment of it, there was (Erman says) in the whole of Egyptian literature no reference to sexual inversion. The vast world of officials that appeared in the Middle Kingdom must have been at least as regular in conduct as the middle class of the strictest city in America today. The very great popularity of moral literature which few would read today and the great emphasis on it in the education of youth suggest that the average of conduct was rather high.

As the wealth of the country grew, during the Middle Kingdom, and skepticism about the religious traditions began, we should expect an increase of voluptuous or sensual persons. Thebes is said to have expanded into a city nine miles in diameter, and its central buildings were magnificent. Wealth increased so much that we read of a high official of Amenhotep II making him (probably on New Year's Day) a present which included carriages inlaid with gold and silver, statues of ivory and ebony, gold collars, coats of mail, 680 shields covered with a rare skin, 30 ebony clubs overlaid with gold and silver, 140 bronze daggers, 360 bronze swords, 220 ivory whip-handles, and hundreds of other costly articles. We hear of an official being presented at one sitting with so many collars and bracelets of pure gold that, after putting on seven thick collars and nine heavy bracelets, he had to direct his servants to take the remainder home. There must have been opulent banquets in these times. The earlier Egyptians had squatted on the ground and eaten their modest feasts from tables a few inches high. Now they rested on luxurious couches while slaves waited on them, and the wine-vessels and guests were garlanded with flowers. One imagines that it was at some of these banquets of the rich that, as the atmosphere grew thick with incense and the fumes of perfumed lamps, as Syrian dancing girls whirled and wine flowed freely, men heard the amorous and often audacious songs of which we have a number. In one a

maid tells her lover how she likes him to be present when she bathes in her fine linen robe and the wet garment clings to and outlines her body, and the lover retorts that he would like to be her negress to see her rise and retire or her laundress to handle her linen. And so on. Such scenes have been witnessed in every period when a civilization felt its veins flushed with an access of wealth, but I repeat that the large literature we now have does not suggest anything like the very widespread voluptuousness we shall find at corresponding periods in Persia, Rome, Arabia, Syria, and late medieval Europe.

In other moral respects the experts are agreed in granting the ancient Egyptians an excellent character. All find that the atmosphere of the home was one of tender mutual affection. Here is a unique illustration: Diodorus says that a parent who killed his or her child was condemned to hug the dead body for three days and three nights, and the guards saw that there was no evasion. Parricides were tortured before being executed; and, apart from the use of the bastinado on suspected criminals, this seems to have been the one legal recognition of the use of torture. A man who killed his slave was treated as a murderer and put to death. No lawyers were permitted in court. The litigants must put the case and their criticisms and replies in writing, and the judges—thirty in number in a higher court—rendered their verdict on this. Even the humblest litigant knew, when he approached a court with his green bouquet, that the judge had strict orders never to discriminate between rich and poor. For the rest, they were zealously attentive to forms of courtesy—the common salutation on meeting a friend in the street was to lower the hand to the knee—and so cleanly that, Herodotus says, they bathed four times a day and shaved their heads (on which they wore wigs). The moralists are never tired of singing the praises of modesty, generosity (even to an erring wife), courteous and just treatment of inferiors, sobriety, and honorable and refined conduct in all things. If one wanted to find virtues in regard to which they had not the same standard as we, one might point out the slight stress on fornication (apart from adultery), the absence of condemnation of sexual thoughts and desires, or of the sense of sin, and so on. But we shall now see that the Egyptians developed even these ideas long before the Christian Era opened.

§3. VICE AND VIRTUE IN THE LAST DAYS

The last stage of Egyptian civilization is by most people believed to be illustrated in the life of Cleopatra: the beautiful and, as is almost universally believed, quite unscrupulous and unrestrained last ruler of Egypt. Films and stories have made even the general public familiar with this "wanton and passionate Egyptian" who closes the high and singular record of her race. Mr. G. B. Shaw has used the tradition in his own way in his "Caesar and Cleopatra"; and probably nothing more reckless was ever written about Cleopatra. He introduces her with the naive psychology of a girl of thirteen, whereas she was, when she first met Julius Caesar—not casually, but as part of a deliberate plan—a very able and highly cultivated and precocious woman of twenty-one, very clear-headed

and ambitious and trained in a dark school of politics. But Mr. Shaw—I would not criticize his generally delightful work if it were not for the fact that in this case he insists that he is giving a true historical picture—merely adds his own whimsical oddities to the general idea of Cleopatra as a typical royal Egyptian of the last days: voluptuous, thoughtless, degenerate, and unprincipled.

And the simple fact, which any serious person can find in quarter of an hour, is, as Mr. Weigall insists in his "Life and Times of Cleopatra" (1914), that there was not a drop of Egyptian blood in the veins of Cleopatra. She was a Greek. The first Ptolemy was one of the Macedonian generals of Alexander the Great who had got Egypt as his portion of the Macedonian Empire. His successors generally took advantage of the old royal tradition of Egypt and married their sisters—no dynasty of purely Egyptian kings did this to the same extent as the Greek Ptolemies—and thus not one of them had a tincture of Egyptian blood. They are very interesting from the fact that they were extremely cruel, unscrupulous, and immoral, yet they were the greatest patrons of science and literature the world had yet known; and under their rule and in their capital, Alexandria, the human mind made more sound progress than in any corresponding period until a century or two ago. A history of morals would be very far from complete if it omitted an account of Alexandria in those days, but it must be part of our account of Greek morals. Alexandria was the most cosmopolitan city in the world, but it began as a Greek colony and remained overwhelmingly Greek; and its rulers were not degenerate Egyptians but men only a few centuries removed from Macedonian barbarism. The worst features of their character, such as their readiness to murder, were, as Weigall says, entirely foreign to the character of the Egyptian people, who were "a kindly, pleasant folk." They drew an incalculable wealth from Egypt and bore the titles and decorations of the Pharaohs; but the later Ptolemies probably very rarely went up the river to Egypt and regarded their subjects as "confounded niggers," as Weigall says.

Let me add a word about Cleopatra herself, as she is in fact the last representative of royal Egypt. We have only one poor bust of her and not a single description by an Egyption writer. The conventional idea of her is based almost entirely on the hostile gossip of Rome. She was a pure Greek—her name is Greek ("Glory of her Country")—and evidently beautiful, dainty, fascinating, and sensuous. But she was highly educated, since she spoke an exceptional number of languages and had great scholars amongst her friends, and her whole conduct was directed by a deliberate policy. Her wealth was fabulous and she seemed to be very capricious in using it. At one of her banquets to Antony and his officers the floor was covered to a depth of two feet with roses, held down by a net. Weigall admits the story that at one banquet she dissolved a pearl worth about $400,000 in vinegar and drank it. But she was trying to convince Antony that the country which gave her such wealth was worth ruling and protecting.

We read the story of her amours in the same way. She was an

unmarried woman of twenty-one when she met Julius Caesar, and we have no evidence whatever that she ever had any relations with any other men than Caesar and, after Caesar's death, Antony. She had four children by them, and in both cases she expected to become the legal wife and empress of Rome and Egypt. Caesar was quite unscrupulous in love-affairs—the idea that he was ensnared by oriental passion is ludicrous—but there is evidence that he really intended to wed her. In fact, we must remember that at this time the old Roman ceremony of marriage had broken down (because it was cruel and unjust to the women), and it was recognized as a form of marriage if a couple lived together, as Caesar and Cleopatra did at Rome, as married folk. When Caesar was assassinated, and the Romans pressed their design of reducing Egypt to the status of a province of the Roman Republic, Cleopatra turned, in the interest of herself and her country, to the powerful Antony, and she "married" him in a recognized Roman way by living exclusively with him and bearing him three children. For all her gaiety and love of pleasure, the fascinating young queen—I should judge from her bust that the fascination lay in grace and daintiness and vivacity rather than beauty—really lived, as far as we positively know, as a virtuous wife and mother, the strong and brilliant daughter of a brutal and drunken Greek father, with a passionate desire to save her dynasty and country from the designs of Rome, ending her life prematurely, with pathetic dignity, when she saw that she had failed. The few deaths for which she was responsible must be judged in the light of the appalling tradition of her Macedonian dynasty.

The truth is, therefore, that Cleopatra did not close in shame an illustrious line of princes, as is generally supposed, but was much better than her predecessors; and that in any case this vicious and voluptuous court of the Ptolemies at Alexandria was not in the least Egyptian in character and must be treated later as part of the Greco-Roman world that had now spread over the Mediterranean. What amount of change there was in the real Egyptian world it is difficult to say, but it is significant that the greatest traveler and historian of the age of Cleopatra, Diodorus of Sicily, who wrote a forty-volume history of all nations, gives exceptional praise to the Egyptians, amongst whom he traveled, for the severity of their laws and the character of their life. The great cities of Egypt were in decay, and a poor and scanty population now clinging even to the magnificent temples of Thebes, and we have no Egyptian literature like that of the old days. We shall probably not be far astray if we assume that the cosmopolitan license which was exhibited to them in the royal house at Alexandria and the contact with Syria which Egypt had maintained for a thousand years had had some influence on the shrunken middle class. The mass of the people are not affected by such changes. A century ago the fellahin of Egypt still lived, and largely live today, as they had done in the days of the glory of Thebes.

But historians rarely notice, or do not set out in due proportion, the remarkable growth of asceticism as well as liberalism in that Greco-Roman world of the few centuries before Christ. What I

have just said seems to imply that a wave of Greco-Roman dissoluteness broke upon the fringe of a generally sober Egyptian civilization, but I have briefly told in my volumes on sex, and in this and the next two volumes will tell in full, how there was for several centuries before Christ a pronounced ascetic development as well as a growth of skepticism about moral standards. The tradition of history in Europe and America is so firmly set and so little disturbed in the college manuals of history that it is probable that nine people out of ten have a totally false idea of the actual moral development between 500 B. C. and 500 A. D. I have just been reading **The Forum** for October. It dismisses my "Story of Religious Controversy" in two sneering paragraphs (which show that the reviewer did not even read the book since he says that it contains nothing new), and it gives the place of honor to an article on religion by Dr. Millikan which flagrantly repeats all the historical fallacies I refuted in my book. These distinguished specialists frown upon any writer who is not a specialist, and they then lightheartedly dogmatize on such subjects as religion, in regard to which they have scarcely even an elementary knowledge of the history, philosophy, and comparative mythology which are needed for a sound verdict. What concerns me here is that Dr. Millikan makes quite childish statements about the uniqueness of the ethic of Christianity, the social and moral development of Europe after Christianity was enforced on it, and the connection of our modern advance with that ethic. When he says that a few moralists like Buddha or Socrates may have risen to the height of glimpsing the Golden Rule—which is so obvious a social platitude that few take the trouble to formulate it—but Christian teaching alone made it a fundamental rule of conduct, he betrays that he has not the slightest idea of the real historical development of morals.

The series of concrete pictures of the life of earlier nations which I give in these volumes will make that development clear. We shall find Babylonia, like Egypt, very conscious of the Golden Rule, very insistent on justice, but when we reach Assyria we shall touch the fringe of that very different area of the ancient world in which religion culminated in the identification of the temple and the brothel. This other half of the ancient world will be fully described, as far as we know it, in the next volume, and we shall then be properly prepared to understand the opposite tendencies and the confusion that we find occasionally in that Greco-Roman world from which our civilization issued. But I cannot close the description of moral evolution in Egypt without noticing how here also there was, in the few centuries before Christ, a marked ascetic development of the kind which men like Millikan believe to be peculiar to Christianity.

This was in part a native development, in part an importation into Egypt of an asceticism that spread very largely in India six centuries before Christ and in the Greek world a century later. Professor Amelineau, who has written the most important study of the development of moral ideas in Egypt—there is no English translation of his work—tells us that before the year 1000 B. C. we find

cases of men of intense religious fervor retiring from the world to lead lives of asceticism and religious contemplation. This tendency increased in Greek times and became chiefly associated with the worship of the god Serapis. The Greeks of Alexandria felt the need of a common measure between their gods and those of Egypt, and their rulers adopted the expedient of introducing from a neutral land the obscure deity Serapis and deliberately modifying the features of the god until he seemed to be a fairly harmonious blend of the Greek Zeus and the Egyptian Osiris. It was round the great temple of Serapis at Alexandria that the wonderful library and colleges were situated, the whole forming what was called the Serapeum, now the finest center of learning in the world. There was another very important temple at Memphis, and there were forty other temples of Serapis in the large towns of Egypt.

Schools in Egypt had long been connected with the temples, and the priests had lived in colleges with very strict rules about cleanliness—they had to shave all hair from the body every second day and bathe constantly—and certain ascetic restrictions of diet. Herodotus describes this semi-monastic condition in the middle of the fifth century. Then into the schools of philosophy at Alexandria came the teaching of Pythagoras and Plato, that the body is merely a prison for and defilement of the soul, and the ascetic practices increased. Manetho, a learned Egyptian priest and historian of the third century B. C., whose great work on Egypt is unfortunately known to us only in quoted passages, tells of a large development in his own time of ascetic communities, practically monasteries, of priests associated with the temples; and as, like the later monks, they gave pious advice and the benefit of their prayers to the people in exchange for their simple food, we must suppose that they had some influence.

The goddess Isis was, in this manufacture of a new Greco-Egyptian cult, assigned as the wife of Serapis, and mystic and ascetic elements were imported into her worship. The old "mysteries of Isis" (or Isis and Osiris), which some imagine to mean esoteric truths of great importance that were hidden from the public, were merely theatrical representations of the rude old legends of Isis and Osiris which the priests exhibited by night on a barge sailing on the temple-lake. There was a statue of Osiris covered with precious stones, and the parts of the other deities were taken by the priests. These annual "mysteries" were, in other words, a passion-play like that of Oberammergau, but Herodotus made a profound mystery of the business because the priests asked him not to describe it. When Osiris was identified with Serapis this cult approached nearer, both in spirit and ritual, to the Holy Week celebrations of the later Church. Long before the time of St. Paul the devotees of Isis looked to her for purification from sin, for regeneration and immortality (see the "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics"), and even in Rome the religion was a formidable rival of the Christian Church for the allegiance of serious people. In the second half of the fourth century (A. D.) at Rome, when few of the patricians still

were Christians, all the more distinguished of them belonged to the religion of Isis.

I anticipate only to show how there began in Egypt long before the time of Christ an ascetic religion, with great stress on the need of purification from sin and purity of life, which, apart from any influence of Christian teaching, spread these ideas over the Greco-Roman world. A third source was the very ascetic and monastic body of the Essenes in Judea which, as the Jews flocked in increasing numbers to Alexandria, inspired similar bodies in that city. I have told elsewhere of these Therapeuts or Healers who lived in large communities, of separate sexes, in Alexandria, never married, and, like the priests of Isis, never took wine or flesh. We now realize that this spirit was spreading all over the civilized world in the few centuries before Christ. Pliny, for instance, describes in his "Natural History" how about the middle of the first century we found such communities near the shore of the Dead Sea:

> "A solitary people, more wonderful than any in the whole world, without any woman or sexual gratification, without money, their only neighbors the palms. Thus, incredible as it may seem, these people had lived for thousands of years yet no child was ever born amongst them: so fruitful to them was repentance in the lives of others." (v. 15).

He is, of course, entirely mistaken about his "thousands of years," yet, as I showed, this was part of a great development which arose from the moral ideas of Egypt and other nations when they were brought into contact with the extraordinarily different ideas and practices of the phallic civilizations we shall examine in the next book.

CHAPTER III

THE LIFE OF THE PEOPLES OF BABYLONIA

IF WE wish to derive any philosophical conclusion from our study of Egyptian life in different ages it must be that the moral development was not vitally connected with the religious development until the last centuries; and even at this late stage it is rather a new philosophy of human nature than a religion that inspires the new ideas of asceticism and purification. There comes into the life of the mass of the people of Egypt some time between 3000 and 2000 B. C. the belief that each person will after death confront a severe moral judge and his or her eternal (or indefinite) future will depend on moral conduct during life. Yet there is not the slightest trace of any moral improvement after this "religious revolution." All the indications that we have convince us that the mass of the Egyptian people continued to the end in their traditional modes of behavior. Where we do find a growth of zeal about high standards of conduct, in the middle or official class, we find that the new doctrine of a blissful immortality as a reward for virtue is entirely ignored. I will not profess to have read every moral essay or story that has been translated into English, though I fancy that I have read most, but it is enough to say this: in the large and typical collection of moral writings given us by Dr. Erman in his work on Egyptian literature the hope of heaven or the fear of annihilation for sins is never mentioned. Osiris, to whose dread verdict we imagine the Egyptian people tremulously looking forward all their lives, is never named in these manuals of behavior of the educated people.

This conclusion will prepare us for what we shall find in the case of Babylonia. We shall find that from the first there is a very strong sense of justice, which is embodied in a minute and far-reaching civil code. When we get some literature of a more intimate character—letters and temple-tablets which reflect the ideal of conduct—we find, although it is not nearly so informing as the moral treatises and stories and songs of Egypt, that the finer shades or, as we might call them, graces of character are equally esteemed. We have a picture of a society in which men and women are generally deterred from grosser acts (adultery, murder, rape, theft, etc.) by a stern civil law, and in which they have the same appreciation of kindliness, generosity, honor, and truthfulness as we have. In the case of both these ancient civilizations, in a word, I suggest that we have a continued attempt, such as we traced in the last volume, to live up to the primeval code of social behavior in spite of the complications of superstition and the temptations which are multiplied in a more complex social order.

§1. THE PRIMITIVE LEVEL

By Babylonia I am understanding here, for convenience, the whole region which we now call Mesopotamia, except the part which

later became the kingdom of Assyria; which must, on account of certain peculiarities of its character, be considered separately. Babylon was a very unimportant small town or village until near 2000 B. C., and we will concentrate on it presently, but we may first try to ascertain the character of the city-states which preceded it and created the civilization of what came to be known as Babylonia, or the empire of Babylon. I assume that my readers know that two very distinct races mingled in this civilization: one, the Sumerians, a beardless folk from (apparently) the direction of Turkestan, who may be related to the founders of Asiatic civilization in India, the other a Semitic people like the Arabs. It is now fairly agreed that it was the Sumerians who, when agriculture was discovered, came down from the Persian hills upon the swampy plain, draining here and irrigating there, until some of their settlements became large towns with a political organization (including the territory immediately round the town), commerce, writing, and fine metal work and pottery. We call this civilization. By 3000 B. C. it was as far advanced in the region between the Tigris and Euphrates as in the corresponding favorable area of Egypt and North India.

At this early period the life of each of the many rival city-states centered on its chief temple, for the priest was also the monarch. In the middle of each was a heavy structure of brick, in architecture more like the new buildings of an American city than the temples of the Egyptians or Greeks, but, at least in the lower part, solid, not a shell containing rooms. One that has been carefully studied, and may have given rise to the fable of the Tower of Babel, rose, it is estimated, three hundred feet above the plain, square below and narrowing a little in the upper part as our modern buildings do. Three lofty flights of stairs led to the door of the real temple half way up the structure. This was reserved for the priests, the people rendering their worship and offering their goats for sacrifice in the spacious court-yard below, round which were the storerooms and offices. In these larger towns the priest-ruler had an imposing palace: always a squat brick structure, as stone would have to be brought from a considerable distance. The houses of the people had vertical panels in the clay walls and the line of the roof was crenellated. In the country probably people lived often in simple reed huts.

What kind of folk they were at this early date we gather laboriously from the remains that are buried under the fallen houses, for of literature there is naturally very little until Babylon becomes a city. When one notices the contrast of conditions in Mesopotamia (or Egypt) and Judea, one has to smile at the solemn explanations that are given of the fiction that the Hebrews were the first monotheists; I say fiction because we saw that educated Egyptians were generally monotheists. The level plain over which the Sumerians scattered is not a vast space—it is rarely more than forty miles wide—but it was fertile in every part, and the Sumerians spread in groups of families which in time became village-communities. And each had, just as the Semitic peoples of Palestine had, its own deity, or one spirit out of the primitive crowd which some accident or other led it to accept as its chief patron. Trade and the residence of the

priest of the chief shrine generally raised some villages to the rank of towns, and the god, the temple, and the priesthood rose with the social group. By 3000 B. C. a dozen city-states, each with what was thought to be a magnificent brick temple in its center, dedicated to its particular deity, divided the land amongst them. Polytheism was the natural consequence when at length a conqueror fused all these little states in one kingdom, both in Egypt and Babylonia; whereas, Judea, far removed from the great centers of civilization, was, although held as a colony by various great powers in succession, never fused with the other Palestinian states in the same sort of political unity, and thus succeeded in keeping to its one God until monotheism became a common intellectual attitude and its exclusiveness was confirmed.

We know enough about the life and ideas of these early Sumerians to understand why they thus came to have priest-rulers. Magic, religion, and divination were elements of supreme importance in their daily lives. There are traces at a later stage of Babylonian development of some discrimination in the condition of souls in the next world, but the original belief—and the general belief to the end—was that the world of shades was an unpleasant and almost featureless kingdom about which no one cared even to think. Shapeless winged forms of dead men moved aimlessly in its dust-laden atmosphere and were even thought to feed on the dust. The priests had therefore to connect their religion essentially with this life. They pictured it as peopled with swarms of invisible demons of the utmost malignancy who caused every accident and illness that befell a man, yet high above were the great gods who could protect their loyal worshippers from the demons when amulets and charms and incantations failed to intimidate them. The Sumerians were more religious and more dependent on their priests than the Egyptians or any people that reached the level of civilization just because they believed that gods and devils acted **now** and not in a hypothetical future life. When a man died, they put his nude body, at first without any sort of coffin or formal grave, in the earth under his house or courtyard, and none but the friends who humanly mourned their loss gave any further thought to him. But during his life he waged, from cradle to grave, a struggle against hordes of demons in which the magic, the prayers, and the sacrifices of the priest alone could help him. So the chief priest easily retained the less important function of political ruler as well.

§2. THE LESSON OF RECENT EXPLORATION

Many of my readers will find it convenient if I summarize here the discoveries that have been made in Mesopotamia during the last few years and were not yet published when I wrote the Key. For the whole region from Egypt to India V. Childe's "Most Ancient East" (1928) is, as I said, the best book, but for Mesopotamia there is an admirable small manual by the distinguished archaeologist C. Leonard Woolley ("The Sumerians," 1928). There is still a good deal of difference of opinion in regard to the origin of the various peoples, but a few points of real interest are settled by the remains.

One is that even before the Sumerians reached the plains of Mesopotamia—from the northern hills, most experts still think, though a few say by sea up the Persian Gulf—there was already a native population. They lived in reed-huts, with flat mud-roofs, on the marshes, with wooden doors turning on stone hinges. They had cows, sheep, goats, and pigs, and they grew barley, which they ground up to make a sort of porridge. These people of about 4000 B. C., possibly earlier, were in the last stage of the New Stone Age and interestingly show the rise toward civilization. They had remarkably good painted pottery and some copper utensils, though they generally used stone. The marshes were gradually draining, and we gather that the various sections of this large population fought so bitterly for the larger dry areas, on which they could build villages, that they ceased to make progress. It is the first definite indication of the way in which war checks the progress of culture.

Somewhere about 3500 B. C. the Sumerians, who seem to belong to western Asia and not be related to the Mongols (though the eyes in statues give that impression), descended upon the plains with a higher organizing ability. They pacified the inhabitants, developed ditching and irrigation, and founded the city-states to which I have referred. Curiously enough, their earliest annals date events Before and After the Flood, from which many experts believe that the legend arose from an actual very disastrous flood in Mesopotamia between 3000 and 4000 B. C.; though these annals are very legendary, since they make their kings rule for 241,200 years before the flood. It is interesting to learn that they give a reign of thirty to forty thousand years **each** to their early kings: which may explain the Hebrew idea of the longevity of the antediluvians. By 3500 B. C., Mr. Woolley says, the Sumerian civilization was superior to the Egyptian. Gold and silver abounded. In one prince's grave we found a gold helmet (more or less fashioned like a wig), a silver belt, gold dagger, and amulets of gold, silver, and lapis lazuli We found also four-ass war-chariots, gold bowls, bracelets, etc. In short, the articles show that already there was a powerfully organized civilization with fine industries and carrying on a commerce as far as Egypt, the Caucasus, and the Persian Gulf. Yet it was in some respects a semi-civilization. In the royal tombs there was evidence of human sacrifices "on a lavish scale": soldiers with their helmets and spears, ladies of the court with elaborate golden headdresses, musicians with their harps inlaid with gold and ebony, and so on, having been killed and buried with the queen.

The art itself is at times somewhat garish and barbarously extravagant, though some of the pottery is exquisitely shaped, and the decoration of the temples was surprisingly rich. In one there seems to have been a graceful wooden porch, overlaid with copper, before the door at the top of the lofty front staircase, a mosaic of mother of pearl, and some finely moulded lions' heads. The walls were adorned with copper bas-reliefs, and with figures in white stone or shell on a background of black shale. Even rings on chariot poles were of carved silver. There was a very high development of Sumerian art by 3500 B. C., and there was a well-developed

cuneiform script, so that we may call the condition civilization still touched by barbarism. The houses of the wealthier citizens were comfortable two-story structures of the oriental type, the rooms leading into a central court; and there is evidence of a sort of drain-pipe in the center of the court to allow the water to soak into the soil. The inside chambers of the temples must have gleamed with gold and silver and lapis lazuli, and the houses of the rich must have had a corresponding splendor. There is some evidence, I may add, that there were quarters for sacred prostitutes attached to the temples.

§3. SOCIAL LIFE IN BABYLON

These ancient rival city-states squandered their resources in war and made far less progress after 3000 B. C. than was made in unified Egypt. In the third millennium, it is true, a powerful and ambitious Semitic chief united them all for a time under his rule and persuaded large numbers of his race to quit their tents and their nomad life in the desert and adopt the civilized institutions of the Sumerians. His dynasty failed, and the cities continued their strife until, probably about 2200 B. C., another group of Semitic tribes settled on the Euphrates and made the unimportant town of Babylon their center. A century or two later their powerful king, Hammurabi, completed the conquest of the entire region, and we begin correctly to speak of the Babylonians.

I will not here attempt to describe the city of Babylon, for the great city of that name which so deeply impressed Hebrew captives and Greek travelers, the city to which almost all that we usually say about the Babylonians refers, belongs to the days when another Semitic people, the Chaldaeans, seized power in it and raised all the buildings that the Greeks considered so wonderful. It was not built until about 600 B. C., when its new monarchs were able to avail themselves of the resources of a much more advanced civilization. As, however, the Chaldaeans made a special point of restoring the old city, we assume that, apart from the more decorative features of the later age, the Babylon of Hammurabi must have been somewhat similar, if less splendid. The temples of the greater gods would rise from two to four hundred feet above the plain, the great staircases rising, outside and in front, to the door of the sacred rooms high above. The vast enclosures of the temples, the royal palace, and the mansions of the nobility would form the core of the city, and the mean-looking houses of the citizens huddled irregularly round them.

Since archaeology came to the assistance of the historian there has been a remarkable change in our estimate of the oldest civilizations. It had been assumed that, while the Egyptians were a rather somber people, the Babylonians were not merely gay but exceptionally voluptuous. We have, on the contrary, found, as we saw, that the Egyptians were as merry and light-hearted as any other people, and we begin to wonder if the somberness was not in Babylonia. We read of princely gardens in connection with the great palaces of a later date, but we miss the picture of the noble sitting in his light-framed house with gaily-colored hangings or enjoying the dancing

girls of his harem or quaffing his wine under the shade of the trees in his spacious garden. Rich Babylonians drank much wine—often to excess—but we are told that water was the customary drink. The houses were heavy structures of brick, with few window openings, the arched doorway leading through a gloomy passage into an open court into which the rooms opened.

Even to the eye the city must have seemed (except in its Chaldaean days) heavy and dull in comparison with Thebes. Blue and scarlet and gold were splashed over everything in an Egyptian city or home, and the white and scanty linen garments of the people would help to enliven the scene. In Babylon men wore, except on special festivals, when white was the fashion, long tunics down to the ankle of dark woolen material: black, blue black, or very dark brown. I speak of the middle class and more skilled workers—the marked social division put the skilled craftsmen along with the middle class and sharply removed from the lower workers—for almost every degree of scantiness of costume could be seen amongst the poorer workers. It confirms our impression when we find almost no light literature corresponding to the naive stories and sometimes very explicit amorous poetry of ancient Egypt. The very large literature we have recovered consists overwhelmingly of grim instructions in magic and divination, hymns, prayers, and psalms used in the temples, and business documents.

Yet this literature tells us so much that one is surprised to find Professor Breasted saying in his admirable "Conquest of Civilization" that Babylonian religion "never proclaimed the rights of the poor and humble nor championed their cause against the rich and powerful," and that we find merely some traces of a "sense of sin" in the temple-literature. The latter point I have dealt with elsewhere (Little Blue Book No. 1076) and will merely say here that Babylon positively groaned all day with a sense of sin and a wail of repentance. For every ache and pain and misfortune a man or woman fled to the temple, acknowledged his sin as the priest read out to him a full list of all possible transgressions, and then joined the priest in penitential psalms of the most abject description. He has offended the gods, and it really makes no moral difference that he expects the punishment of his "sin" in this world instead of the next. Unlike modern churches, which remain generally empty for six days of the week, the courts of the Babylonian temples must have put shoals of penitents through their discipline every day.

As to the rights of the humble, let us first glance at the status of woman, who in Europe was denied almost all rights from the early Middle Ages until the second half of the nineteenth century. Throughout the history of Babylonia woman maintained a position almost of equality, and, since it is by no means a Semitic practice to give her this position, we must suppose that it was the Sumerian ideal and goes back even into prehistoric times. Experts usually say that she was as free and independent as in Egypt, but we notice some differences: whether they were due to the Semites or were original is not clear. A man could legally divorce his wife by merely pronouncing the words (though he usually got a scribe from the

temple to draw up a "bill of divorcement") and returning any dowry she may have had or pay her a sum of money, but if a woman left her husband her conduct was investigated and, if the fault were on her side, she was "thrown into the water" or "thrown from the tower." There was also still some trace of a purchase of brides. Herodotus tells a curious story—we never know when to believe him—of auctions of marriageable girls. A village or small town brought together once a year all its mature girls—they commonly married at thirteen or fourteen—and the higher price paid for the fairer maids was used to provide a dowry for the less fortunate. As a rule the parents arranged the marriage and the sum which represented the ancient bride-price. Here, to give a complete idea of what occurred, is the translation of a marriage-contract, signed by fifteen witnesses (including two priests and five women), of about 2000 B. C.:

> "Ishtar-ummi, daughter of Buzazum and Lamassatum, is taken by Warad-Sin, son of Ibni-Sin, in marriage. . . . Warad-Sin has given two-thirds of a pound of silver and a slave to Buzazum and Lamassatum as purchase-money. For all time [they] and their children renounce all claims on Ishtar-ummi. If Warad-Sin leaves Ishtar-ummi, he will give her one pound of silver. If Ishtar-ummi leaves Warad-Sin she shall be thrown from the tower."

The marriage consisted simply of the declaration of the parties that they married each other and the drawing-up of the contract, but some experts believe that the final clause, which seems so unjust to woman, is an ancient form which the man uses to protect his pocket: in case of divorce he will not insist on her being thrown into the Euphrates if she does not insist on her pound of silver. It seems probable enough, for we find other contracts in which the bride stipulates how the money shall be invested. We find that women commonly had and negotiated with their own property, and they could become scribes and even judges. There were schools for girls. Polygamy was legal, but the wife generally took care that, if there was another lady, she was in the inferior position of concubine; and Hammurabi's laws secured strict justice even for the humble concubine. In fact woman became so free and independent that we get a little of the usual cynical literature. "The wife," says one writer, "is a well, a well, a pit, a pit, a sharp iron dagger which cuts a man's throat."

We have not the same warm literature as in Egypt to enable us to appreciate the emotional atmosphere of the home, but the high position of woman tells us much. On the other hand, we have very clear evidence of a concern for justice to the humblest persons in the community, and the kings who see to it invariably say that they are carrying out the wishes of the gods. Hammurabi closes his code of laws with a long speech which is full of expressions to the effect that his religion commands him to be just to all:

> "It is I that the great gods have elected to be the Shepherd of Salvation, whose sceptre is just. . . . That the strong may not oppress the weak: that the orphan and the

> widow may be counseled . . . to sustain the feeble. . . . By command of Shamash, the great judge of heaven and earth, justice shall glisten in the land. . . . The oppressed, who has a lawsuit, shall come before my image as king of justice."

These words of a ruler whose fathers had been barbaric sheiks three centuries earlier show that, contrary to Professor Breasted's statement, the Babylonian religion expressly enjoined the protection of the poor and feeble. And, as I have shown elsewhere, they are not mere ritual expressions. The Babylonian code of law of about 2000 B. C. has the singular distinction of laying down a legal minimum wage for every one of the poorest workers, even for the hire of their boats or cattle. The agricultural laborer was throughout the whole period of civilization the most despised and exploited of workers, but seven clauses of the Babylonian Code were concerned with him. Even the slave is granted certain rights two thousand years before the Stoic morality appeared. By clause 175 of the Code a slave may marry the daughter of a free man and the children shall not be slaves: by clause 117 the man or woman who has become a slave through debt (as was common in ancient times) cannot be held in bondage more than three years: by clause 217 a man whose slave needed surgical treatment was compelled to pay for it. These are only a few instances of a concern for justice for the weaker that pervades the entire Code. The Mosaic Code is notoriously based upon it and often less just.

We again see confirmation of the theory I presented in the last book. The sense of justice has not to wait for any development of moral intuitions or of monotheism. The primitive community is forced in self-defense, whatever other virtues or vices it has, to set up a rigorous ideal that the rulers or representatives of the community shall see that every man has his rights, and the various peoples rise to the civilized level with this feeling. The experts are agreed that in his Code King Hammurabi has done little more than collect the old Sumerian laws, and we see this remarkable sense of justice still bearing traces of the barbaric world in which it was born. In some clauses there is the law of retaliation: an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth. In others—death for adultery, for instance—the king has softened the law by adding that a husband may forgive his wife and the king may forgive the man. But even in what seem to us half-barbaric features there is a primitive idea of securing justice.

The few letters and other documents of daily life that we have confirm this impression. We have quite a large number of the letters of Hammurabi himself, and they picture to our minds a most industrious and fair-minded ruler attending to all the details of his kingdom. There was no painting in Babylon, and there was not, as in Egypt, a belief in the future that would move men to make the grave a real home vividly reproducing for us the homes of four thousand years ago. Yet we can easily imagine the king on his ivory or ebony couch—there was trade, by donkey and camel caravan or boat, throughout the whole of this early civilization—dic-

tating to the scribe who stands by with his soft tablet of clay and his triangular (or quadrangular) pen, and lightly jabs one angle of the bottom of his pen into the clay to make the wedge-shaped (cuneiform) marks of the Babylonian characters. Then he sprinkles dry powdered clay over the surface, perhaps bakes the clay, and puts it in a clay envelope to be addressed and sealed. Forgery or falsification would be difficult when a clay tablet became hard, but there was an additional safeguard. Over the baked clay and its message a new layer of soft clay was often placed and on this the message was repeated. In case of dispute about the text of a contract one had only to break away the outer layer of clay and see if the message underneath it corresponded.

Probably all but the poorer workers and slaves could write, as in Egypt, for schools, attached to the temples, were numerous. We have found the remains of one of about the time of Hammurabi, about fifty-five feet square, with four or five different rooms, for different sexes or classes, opening into the customary central court. The only material needed would be a box of soft clay from which the pupil could take enough to make a ball, which he would flatten into a thick tablet, easily rubbing out again his marks on the soft stuff. There was much the same zeal as in Egypt to become skillful and rise to the priesthood or the official class: which meant very much the same thing, as the temples even served as banks and charged high interest (often twenty percent) on their loans. There was no coined money until long afterwards, but only the poorest did their business in goods. Units of weight of silver were the common medium of payment. For those who could not write the public scribe was available. We have a letter from a slave to his owner appealing for money for food and clothing. He has been sent in charge of a cargo of oil, probably loaded on asses, to some distant town, and the brigands have stolen it, but the police have accused him and put him in prison. Imagine a Roman slave sending a polite request to a distant master for money to buy clothes! All letters begin with the courteous formula: "Speak to ————: thus says ————: Shamash and Marduk keep thee well." The tone, like so much in Babylonian life, seems to us cold, but it was a matter of custom. We have even a short love-letter that opens:

> "Speak to my beloved: thus says Gimil-Marduk: may Shamash and Marduk for love of me keep thee ever in health! I write this letter to ask how thou art . . . "

There is not enough of this kind of literature to let us read the hearts of the ancient people of Babylon. Most of the tablets are dry business documents or bewildering magical recipes and incantations. Here is the tooth-ache formula (the pain was believed to be due to a worm at the roots of the tooth):

> "After Anu had created the Heavens, the Heavens created the Earth, the Earth created the Rivers, the Rivers created the Canals, the Canals created the Marshes, and the Marshes created the Worm. Came the Worm and went before Shamash, before Ea came her tears, and she said,

'What wilt thou give me for my food? What wilt thou give me for my drink?' Ea said: 'I will give thee dried bones and scented . . . wood.' The Worm said: 'What are the dried bones and scented . . . wood to me? Let me drink among the teeth and set me on the gums that I may devour the blood of the teeth and of their gums destroy the strength. Then shall I hold the bolt of the door.' So thou must say this: 'O Worm! May Ea smite thee with the might of his fist.'"

So you addressed your tooth-ache three times and applied a mixture of beer, oil, and the juice of a certain plant; and if the demon departed not you went to the temple and confessed your sins and took some food for the god (or his servants). Every ache and every demon had its formula, and so the Babylonians advanced little in medicine. One of the quaint stories of Herodotus is that even in his time the sick man was put out in the public street or square, and passers-by asked about his illness until one came along who had had experience of it and told him what to do. Probably this simply means that an invalid liked to be placed in the porch of his house and talk to neighbors. At all events the Hammurabi Code, fixing the surgeon's fees for operating on wounds, sore eyes, tumors, and broken bones—his hands were to be cut off if he caused death by negligence—shows that even by 2000 B. C. there was medicine and surgical science and a caste of "doctors."

I have dealt elsewhere with religion and character (Little Blue Book No. 1076) and need add little here. About sexual standards and conduct we have even less positive indications than in early Egypt. But the temple-literature, on the one hand, embodies a complete moral code, and the laws of Hammurabi, on the other, impose sentence of death for adultery, rape, and incest, so that we should expect more severity instead of more laxity than is usual. Let me add that, as I showed in another Little Blue Book (No. 1079), ancient Babylonian religion is almost unique in admitting no phallic elements. We shall return later to the familiar story, told by Herodotus, of a supposed law that every woman must be deflowered at the temple before marriage—the marriage-contracts show that there was no such general law—but I must anticipate to the extent of saying that apparently there were some such temples, either as old survivals or introductions from Syria, in some parts of Babylonia. I mention it at this stage because, to illustrate the general idea of character of the ancient people, I want to quote part of a long moral treatise or poem which is given in full in Sir E. A. W. Budge's "Babylonian Life and History" (1925 edition). It seems to be ancient, yet it must at one place refer to certain phallic temples of Ishtar:

"As a wise and discreet man thou shalt belittle thy knowledge:
Set a bridle in thy mouth: watch carefully thy speech.
As the riches of men let thy lips be accounted rare.
Let audacity for wickedness be an abomination unto thee.

Utter not words of arrogance or lying counsel.
The head of the man who worketh dissolution is dishonored.

* * * * * * *

Harm not in any way thy adversary.
Recompense with good the man who doeth evil to thee.
Oppose thine enemy with righteous dealing.

* * * * * * *

Marry not the strange woman whose lovers are many,
The maiden of Ishtar whose person is dedicated to the goddess.
The woman servant of the temple, whose strength is abundant,
Will never be a support to thee in thy misfortunes.
In fighting she will exert herself against thee;
Reverence and obedience exist not in her.
If she entereth thy house, lead her out;
For her mind is set upon the path of the stranger.

* * * * * * *

Utter no calumnies: say the thing which is fair.
Use not words of evil: speak that which is good.
Thou shalt worship thy God daily
With offerings, prayers, and correct incense.
Mayest thou make thy heart to incline obediently to thy God,
For it is that which is acceptable to God."

Curiously enough, Budge's book is published by a Protestant organization (S. P. C. K.) probably every minister of which refers darkly in his sermons to the sinful horrors of ancient Babylon and the wonderful new message of kindliness and forgiveness brought by Christ, yet here, of most ancient times and apparently popular with educated people in Babylonia, is the full higher code: modesty, truthfulness, clean speech, devoutness, sobriety, and even forgiveness of enemies. It appears that long before even Lao-tse (in the sixth century B. C.) urged men to return good for evil, it was a moral platitude in wicked Babylonia. Budge does not comment on "the maiden of Ishtar." If the line proves that there was sacred prostitution somewhere in Babylonia—it was certainly not the common service of Ishtar, as I have shown from the prayers and hymns to that goddess—it proves also that the average educated Babylonian regarded it with abhorrence. Budge finds no prevalence of vice or crime. The Babylonians were, he says, "not a cruel people," and they treated their slaves humanely. Their ideal, in short, was the same as ours; and if the law was really applied in the days of the legislator, they must have been nearer to the ideal than we are.

While, therefore, I have in this chapter to use fragments of literary evidence and describe the people in general terms, we do in the end succeed in picturing them to ourselves as they were in the great days of the older city of Babylon. We see the narrow streets, with their laden asses and camels, and the quays by the river

teeming with keen men of business: full-bearded men, perhaps with frizzled and perfumed hair, in long black tunics, their carved seals for the clay documents dangling at their girdles. The law watches every hire of a worker and every business deal, in the interest of justice. We see the womenfolk, their long cloaks turned back and showing the left breast, moving freely about the streets and even engaging in business. All are scrupulously clean—it would be fatal to approach a god without bathing and donning clean garments—gravely courteous, fond of domestic festivals and music, sober, and careful not to do any wicked act which will bring the ubiquitous demons on them. At times they see a woman flung from the high tower on the wall overlooking the river or a man burned alive in the market square for some moral transgression. Between Hammurabi and the devils the path of virtue is clearly preferable. There is the usual fast set of rich or idle men. There are women "whose lovers are many." There is anger and vindictiveness, and soured folk in their chambers stab or burn wax images of their enemies or summon the spirits of the air, with sonorous words, to punish them. But Babylon is convinced that all such weaknesses are punished at once with bodily affliction, and this is a great teacher of virtue.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHARACTER OF THE ASSYRIANS

AN authority on Babylonian culture is still known as an Assyriologist, but for the purpose of this study of morals it is necessary or useful to distinguish clearly between three peoples, and three different ages. All three were Semitic (or Semitic and Sumerian), but so also were the Hebrews and their Palestinian neighbors. The first two, the Babylonians and Assyrians, differed materially in their environment and in the period of their greatness, and in the culture they borrowed from others. The Assyrians had settled on the elevated lands on the Tigris, far to the north of Babylonia, and they were almost as closely in touch with the culture of the Hittites and the Syrians, east of them, as they were with the Babylonian. They did not, moreover, become a fully civilized power until the eighth century B. C., when they entered upon a very singular development, and were masters of the world for one intoxicating century. The Chaldaeans, or Kaldi, were an entirely different Semitic people who invaded Babylonia in its state of prostration, blended amiably with its decaying population, rebuilt the city, and made it the great metropolis which the Hebrews and Greeks came to know. It is thus necessary to deal with them separately, as some of the vices of the Assyrians were quite foreign to the nature of the Babylonians whom we have studied, and, on the other hand, some both of the virtues and vices attributed to the Babylonians refer to the city under the rule of the Chaldaeans. The reader will at least find it useful to bear in mind that the heaviest charges made against "the Babylonians" or Babylon have no reference to the city of Hammurabi which we have examined.

§1. THE ROYAL HOUSE OF NINEVEH

Some years ago I translated into English the travel-book of a genial Swiss archaeologist, Dr. Güyer ("My Journey Down the Tigris"), who went to study the Assyrian ruins. He describes impressively the complete desolation that now covers the site of the most famous palaces and one of the greatest cities of the ancient world, not far from the modern city of Mosul. Indeed he gives us a pathetic reminder what appalling losses the race has sustained by its wars and international rivalries. Two thousand five hundred years ago there were in this desolate spot the first great libraries the world had ever known. All the culture of four earlier civilizations was gathered together by the Assyrians, and their princes had collections of tens of thousands of inscribed tablets and cylinders. Now, such is "the advance of culture," that the inhabitants of the region take supreme pride in two of the most ridiculous religious fakes that it is possible to imagine: the tomb of Adam's son, Seth, and the tomb, with a tooth of the whale that swallowed him, of the prophet Jonah!

This region in the seventh century before Christ was the most wonderful and wealthy in the world. I again refer my reader to the Key to Culture for the historical sequence and say only that, after being held at bay in their hilly lands, with green meadows serpentining up amongst the mountains, for many centuries, the Assyrians at last found their opportunity and their leader. Babylon had not long sustained the virility of the days of Hammurabi, and an Asiatic people had come down from the mountains with an animal that was new and impressive to the ancient world—the horse—and conquered the kingdom. In the east the Hittites, Syrians, and Egyptians had been locked in a ferocious struggle that had weakened all of them. Then the Assyrians, hardened in character like the early Romans by centuries of defensive warfare, adopted the horse from the Kassites and the use of iron from the Hittites and organized irresistible armies of spearmen and iron-plated chariots with sharp prows. In the eighth century the rule of Sargon II, their monarch, extended from Palestine to the Persian Gulf and he, using his immense multitudes of war-captives and all the resources of his empire, resolved to create for himself an unprecedented splendor.

Some short distance from Nineveh he created the new royal town of, to translate its Assyrian name, Sargonville. We are going to find the Assyrians a hard, cruel and ruthless people, hated by all the other nations of the old world, but many instances of savage character which we saw in the last book have prepared us to believe that men may be ferocious in war against strangers, yet just and amiable within their own lines. Sargon, we read, spent many days in communion with the gods in choosing the locality of his new city, and, when the decision fell on cultivated land near Nineveh, he equitably bought out or gave full value in land elsewhere to the original inhabitants. A city founded on injustice might be handed over to those hordes of fierce demons whom the Assyrians feared no less than the Babylonians and Egyptians. Then the immense site, a mile square, was suitably sown with small figures of the gods and charms, and the work began. In the hilly region stone was plentiful, and massive foundations of stone were laid. Upon these rose city walls of brick eighty feet thick—Babylon boasted that two chariots could ride on the top of its walls, but the Assyrians said that seven could easily race abreast on their walls—and a palace building which itself covered twenty-five acres of ground. It took six years to build, for the bricks for public buildings could be made only at certain holy seasons and under the auspices of a particular god.

Round the palace, inside the city-walls, were houses and mansions for eighty thousand people. How these lived we shall see presently, but I may give first some idea of the splendors of the Assyrian civilization. From Egypt the Assyrians had imported the art of glazing bricks, and it was now possible to avoid the monotonous yellow-gray of an adobe town. White surfaces of walls and temples and palaces, relieved by large figures of animals in blue and yellow, reflected the sunlight. The temple followed the

Babylonian type, and no doubt the successive stages of the building were colored as I will describe later in the case of Babylon. The palace had an imposing entrance of three arched doorways—the Babylonians had invented the arch—and massive glazed towers with colored bulls and lions; and at the threshold were gigantic stone figures of bulls, with wings and human heads, to scare away any adventurous demon.

But we need not linger over Sargonville. Some years after it was completed the monarch was assassinated, and his son Sennacherib left it almost deserted and built a new and even finer palace for himself. From the Hittites, who had in their mountainous home developed the art of sculpture, the Assyrians had learned how to carve the stone of their own district, and beautiful bas-reliefs, probably painted, representing the exploits of the Assyrian kings, ran in a frieze round the inner walls of the vast chambers. Skillful workers in wood and metal were brought from Phoenicia, beautiful objects were imported from Egypt which Sennacherib brought into his empire, masses of iron came from Asia Minor, rare trees and flowers were brought from all regions, even India (the cotton-tree, for instance), and the vast palace of Sennacherib beside the Tigris shone with splendor that was famous from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.

Merciless as Sennacherib was to rebels and conquered peoples, for he bespattered the whole soil of his empire with their blood, he was not a selfish voluptuary, but sought in every way to help his Assyrian people. He used the new art and resources liberally in the beautification of Nineveh. Its walls were not, as Diodorus says, sixty miles in circuit; and the author of the book of Jonah betrays how long after the event he wrote his romance when he says that it would take a man three days to walk around them! But in those old days a city with walls of a circuit of ten miles, as those of Nineveh really were, was phenomenal. Beautiful parks and palaces adorned it, and the chief avenue, Kingsway, is said to have been sixty yards in width. There were drastic building regulations for the beauty of the city. One, of which we have found a copy, ran:

> "If any one of the inhabitants of the city takes down an old house and builds a new one in such fashion that its foundation encroaches upon Kingsway, he shall be hanged on a pole on his house."

But before we glance at these folks who filled the streets of Nineveh, let me finish the short and instructive story of their kings. After Sennacherib came Assurbanipal, and fourteen years after his death Nineveh and all the royal palaces were a melancholy ruin. Moralist historians seemed to have an excellent opportunity to point once more the moral that the vice and effeminacy of kings bring ruin, for the Greeks had a story that Sardanapalus, as they called this monarch, was an indolent voluptuary who, when the enemy closed on Nineveh, made a funeral pile of his treasures, and he and his harem of beautiful women were burned on it. We are warned again what libels of the ancient peoples the Greeks and Hebrews

imposed upon the world until science began to explore the desolate region near Mosul. Assurbanipal not only did not die a violent death and was not the last king of Assyria, but it is actually from the ruins of his palace-libarary that we have derived our most extensive knowledge of that ancient world. He was the most enlightened monarch of old times. It was, as I have elsewhere explained, the sins of his fathers—the sowing of hatred amongst subject peoples and the immolation of their own people in war—that brought ruin at the hands of the Medes and Chaldaean-Babylonians.

§2. THE PEOPLE OF NINEVEH

I have given first the sketch of the imperialism of the Assyrians because this conquest of an incalculable wealth and tyranny by a ferocious use of armaments must have affected the character of the people. They had long before adopted the legends and deities, the arts and sciences, of the Sumerians further south, but high above all the gods of Babylonia they put their native god Assur, a sun and war god, who had been to them during two thousand years of defensive warfare what Jahveh was to the Hebrews. But there was another distinctive influence. Their country lay between the ethical civilization of Babylonia and the phallic civilizations of Syria and Asia Minor, and it was equally open to the influence of both. If, as we have strong reason to believe, the desert of Syria and Mesopotamia was then a green and cultivated region, the Assyrians would naturally turn westward; and, in fact, the highest civilization, now that Egypt and Babylon were in decay, was in this region. It was, as we shall see in the next book, the great phallic region of the ancient world, and we look for its influence in Assyria. We have reached the interesting point in the evolution of morals when taking a broad view of the world, the ethical civilizations seemed to be doomed and nations which retained the old mother-earth goddess and had temple-prostitutes seemed to be about to conquer civilization.

We must remember, however, that a people may be very phallic in religion yet admirable from the broader moral or social viewpoint. We are in this respect not so well informed about the Assyrians, but what we know suggests a state of things not very different from that we found in Babylonia. Boys and girls were married very young, as arranged by their parents. The girl was often thirteen and the boy fifteen. The ceremony which took place in the house, was simply that their hands were symbolically bound together with a soft woollen band, and the blessing of the gods was invoked and a contract drawn up by a scribe from the temple. Days of dancing and feasting followed; though the expert does not say if, as in Babylon, the married pair were then enclosed in the bridal chamber for a week. The woman, unless of the highest class (a queen remained almost invisible to ordinary folk for life), had much the same freedom as in Babylonia. The poorer women went about freely in their bare feet and long shaggy tunics. The wives of the artisans and shopkeepers sat at their domestic work on the flat roofs of their houses, until the afternoon sun drove them below to

the cooler rooms, chatting across the street with neighbors. Divorce was easy, the husband paying a sum to his divorced wife; and the unfaithful wife was, as a rule, simply put out of doors.

We can be quite sure that in these houses, with their white stuccoed walls and polished cement floors, we should find the phallic emblems which the Hebrew prophets had so terrible a struggle to keep out of Judea. On one side might be a figure of the ghastly devil of the southwest wind, which brought drought and fever: the very figure of the devil was so hideous that, people thought, it would drive the devil away. In another part would be the phallic emblem which the Old Testament writers call "the grave" or "the Asherah." It was the great age of the mother-goddess, the deity of fertility, and it is generally said that Ishtar, in passing from Babylon to Nineveh, had been identified with this goddess of love of the nations further west. This does not seem, however, to have been the official attitude. I have given in Little Blue Book No. 1076 a number of prayers or hymns to Ishtar, all of which represent her as an ethical deity, and one (p. 48) expressly represents her as angrily punishing a frail woman. The phallic writer, Langdon, himself says that "as patroness of law and order she appears to have enjoyed the supreme adoration of the kings of Assyria from the age of Assurnasipal I [885 B. C.] to the end of the Assyrian Empire."

It is, at all events, not clear that the popular phallic interest meant that there was in Nineveh such a general relaxation as older writers used to think. The question of the character and cult of Ishtar is very complex, and we shall see a little more about it in the next chapter, but phallic writers so confidently claim Nineveh as devoted to the cult of love that we must lay some stress on the temple literature. The writer on Ishtar in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics remarks that the Assyrian hymns and prayers to her, at the period I am discussing, "breathe a noble ethical and religious spirit," and are "among the finest products of the Babylonian religion." It was an age of confusion in which two drastically opposed tendencies on the subject of sex were at work, and we shall not get any clear understanding of it until we cover the remainder of this ancient world in the next volume. It is enough to say here that the impression one gets from reading the Old Testament, that the low morals of the Hebrews and their cult of Astarte were partly due to the Assyrians, is, as we shall see, wrong. The best Assyrian literature has the same ideals as the best Babylonian, and the ultimate motive is the same: the gods insist on righteousness and, where there is a departure from it, they permit the malignant spirits to have their way. The literature, in fact, seems at times to lose sight of the punishment of transgressions and approach the attitude of aspiring to righteousness simply because the god wills it.

In most other relations of life conduct was at a high level of orderliness because the "police" were instructed to be very severe, though there seems to have been a good deal of graft amongst the officials. Cleanliness was cultivated as zealously as in Babylon, the

people of the better class having a sort of bath-room, with large earthenware vessels, in their houses and possibly, as we find at an earlier date, pipes or clay rings leading into the ground to let waste water find its way into the subsoil. The type of house was much the same as in Babylon. A dark passage led into an open central court into which the upper rooms opened. The furniture, even of the rich, was simple, but extremely artistic. In the less wealthy homes all slept on mats on the floor except the husband and wife, whose wooden bedstead, with its lions' feet, would seem aesthetic besides the crude iron frame, with brass knobs, which was so popular in Europe and America a generation or two ago.

Although we do not get so near the life of the Assyrians as we do to that of the Babylonians, we may assume that there was little difference. For two thousand years the men of Assur had taken their ideas from the superior Sumerians further south, and the laws which were gathered together by Hammurabi must in the main have applied also in Nineveh. The one conspicuous vice, cruelty in war or to rebels, is unfortunately familiar in almost every nation that has had for ages to defend its position. In the imperial period this in turn would lead to slavery on a very large scale, and we can hardly suppose that the slaves were as well treated as in Babylonia and Egypt. The nation had not time to outlive the half-barbaric features it so naturally developed. Retribution for its cruelty to subject peoples came with appalling swiftness and completeness. It was not possible to destroy such massive work so thoroughly as is sometimes imagined. Roman travellers still admired the ruined but impressive buildings and even in the Middle Ages we read of men being able to shelter in them. But Assyria sank in ten years back to the obscurity from which it had emerged, and the social interest shifts back to Babylon once more.

CHAPTER V

THE BABYLON OF THE CHALDAEANS



HE city which has become in the literature of every land the very symbol of vice, sensual pleasure, and selfishness is not the capital of King Hammurabi, the life of which was, as we have seen, ordered on a basis of strictest justice and generally sober and dignified. What changes may have occurred in it during the obscure centuries that followed we need not try to discover, for the time came when the rage of the Assyrians destroyed it more thoroughly than Nineveh itself would presently be torn asunder. The Assyrian king had even directed the canals, which united one town with another in Babylonia, upon the city, and, having far less stone in its foundations and buildings than Nineveh, the dissolution of the clay structures must have been lamentable. It would, of course, be impossible to destroy entirely such massive walls and temple pyramids as were customary in Babylonia, but the city was a ruin when a new and more benevolent Semitic people, the Kaldi or Chaldaeans, came from Arabia by way of the Persian

Gulf, made the desolated city their capital, and at length rebuilt it with far more than its original splendor.

It is this city, built at a time when the epic of the ancient world was near its end (in the sixth century B. C.), that the moralist always has in view—or, if he knew history, would have in view—when he shudders over the abominations of ancient Babylon. I have therefore taken this social history in such stages as to make clear that the historic civilization of Babylonia is not involved in those charges, whether true or untrue, which are usually brought against the city. But we begin at once to suspect the charges themselves when we reflect on their sources. The Greek, Herodotus, who is generally quoted, is not known for certain to have visited Babylon—he pointedly speaks of his personal observations in Egypt but not in Babylonia—and he in any case attributes to the people only one "shameful custom": sacred prostitution in the temples. I will glance again at this very disputed charge presently, but any thoughtful person must be surprised that it has lent itself to so much moral indignation for the last thousand years. The Old Testament itself repeatedly tells us that there was sacred prostitution in the temple at Jerusalem, and, as we shall see, it probably lasted many centuries, if not to the time when the priests were brought to Babylon. Moreover, in the temple at Jerusalem there were prostitutes of both sexes: a practice which would probably have filled any Babylonian with profound disgust.

Apart from this the suggestion that Babylon was in any way exceptionally irregular or immoral comes from accusers of an embittered temper and usually a comprehensive ignorance of Babylon. It is based largely upon the book of Daniel, the author of which is so grossly inaccurate that he evidently knew very little about Babylon when he wrote his romance; on epithets in the Old Testament which are often applied to Babylon; and especially on the fantastic imagery of that weird book of the New Testament, **Revelation,** and its identification of Babylon with supreme wickedness:

> "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication:
>
> "And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.
>
> "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration."

Even when Christian commentators have taken this, on account of the reference to martyrs, as an invective against Rome, they have assumed that the parallel with Babylon was just. It is my conviction that this passage is the chief source of the world-wide repute of Babylon as the most licentious city that ever existed, especially as the phrases or the entire passage later became very popular with Protestants in their application to Papal Rome—"Scarlet Wo-

man" and "Whore of Babylon" were, until our respectable days, the most familiar description of the Papacy.

It would be superfluous to argue that none of these references to Babylon in the Bible have the least value. As long as "Daniel" was believed to have been written by a Jew who had lived in that city at the time which he is supposed to describe it was natural to credit at least one Hebrew writer with an intimate knowledge of the city. But the knowledge which the archaeologist has brought to light shows that the writer lived centuries after the fall of Babylon and was quite ignorant of its life and history. All that we have, therefore, as a basis for the extraordinary reputation of ancient Babylon are the naturally bitter and not very discriminating invectives of the Jews whom it had conquered and harshly treated and one statement of a Greek writer who is notorious for the unreliability of his stories. Writers who remind us that the Greek geographer Strabo and the pseudo-prophet Baruch confirm Herodotus do not notice that they came long after the historian and may have borrowed from him.

§1. THE WONDERFUL CITY

But let us first glance at the city itself and realize why it had such a fascination for the minds of men in the few centuries before Christ. Since it was a city of brick or sun-dried clay, an adobe city, archaeologists could not expect to find underneath the great mound by the Euphrates such remains as we find beneath the mounds of Yucatan, but the structures were so solid, and so frequently faced with glazed brick, that we have learned enough about the ancient city. It confirms our suspicion that Herodotus described it from hearsay when we find him saying that it covered a hundred square miles and was surrounded by walls eighty-five feet thick, three hundred feet high, and overtopped by two hundred and fifty lofty towers. The circuit of the walls, which is easily traced, is ten or twelve miles, and the height cannot have been anything like what Herodotus says. As to the thickness, however, he was correctly informed. There were two enormous walls, each twenty-five feet thick, and, as the space between them was filled up with clay and rubble, they in effect made a single wall nearly ninety feet thick. Amongst their other military accomplishments the Assyrians had invented some sort of battering ram, and city-walls had to have a tremendous thickness to compensate for the soft material. At intervals lofty towers rose from the top of the wall, and it must have been from one of these, on the river front, that certain classes of offenders—mostly sexual offenders—were hurled, bound, into the river.

This alone would deeply impress a traveller who approached the city over the level Babylonian plain, but towering high above the wall he would see the great piles of the chief temples, and the royal palace. A feature of the palace counted as one of the Seven Wonders of the World: the Hanging Gardens of Babylon. The Greeks describe these as a series of ascending terraces, each six feet high and four hundred feet long, planted with choice trees and

flowers and watered by means of an hydraulic screw from the river. A stumpy ruin we have found is believed to be all that remains of the terraces, but modern authorities are convinced that what the Greeks called the Hanging Gardens meant only an elevated terrace-garden or roof-garden on one side of the palace, possibly for the enjoyment of the ladies of the palace. A bas-relief shows one of the Assyrian kings seated under the palms on such a terrace drinking wine, while ladies of the palace recline on couches about him. If we assume that the terrace walls were of white glazed brick, relieved by colored figures of animals, and that the nobles and richer merchants had similar terrace-gardens, we understand the impression that this feature of the city made on visitors.

In a distant quarter of the city were the great temples, and from the palace to this quarter ran a broad paved road, the palace-entrance of which, the Ishtar Gate, still survives to give us some idea of the scheme of decoration. It is a massive double structure, still thirty or forty feet high, faced with glazed brick and having, originally, five hundred and seventy-five large yellow and blue glazed bulls and dragons let into the brick-work. In that almost smokeless land of intense sunshine these great glazed walls and gates and terraces may well have looked very beautiful.

The great temples added more color to the picture. Careful study of the better-preserved temples in different parts of Babylonia lead experts to think that they did not rise in tiers, like some of the Mexican temple mounds (which, by the way, are much nearer to the Babylonian structures than to the Egyptian pyramids with which some would connect them, though there are nearly three thousand years of time between the pyramid-age in Egypt and the beginning of even the Maya civilization), but rose to a considerable height before tapering; and that three broad staircases ascended in front, as I have already described. There is, as I said, so much unexpected decoration on even the oldest temples that these latest and grandest of Babylonian temples must have been lavishly decorated. Their chief feature was the color-scheme of the external surface. The largest temple, which rose to a height of three hundred feet and measured about three hundred feet on each side of its square base, is described as having at its lowest level, which was dedicated to Saturn, a black belt twenty-six feet high. Above this were, in succession, belts of the same height in orange brick (to honor Jupiter), red brick (Mars), and gold or yellow (the Sun). Three belts of fifteen feet each were then dedicated to Venus (yellow tiles), Mercury (blue) and the Moon (silver—probably sheeted with silver). A great court, with ten gates, spread round the foot of the temple, with the stores and offices of the priests and priestesses; and in the temple in the upper part of the structure were large gold statues of the gods and gold (or gold-inlaid) furniture.

The Chaldaeans, who must have been simply a dominant minority amongst the Babylonian population, sought to conciliate their people by professing to restore the ancient city as it had been when the Assyrians had destroyed it a few decades earlier, but they had now all the art of the Assyrians and their subject peoples to

draw upon, and the new Babylon must have been far larger and finer than ever before. They even connected it by a great bridge, more than four hundred feet long, with its suburbs across the river. Its streets were, of course, generally narrow and tortuous, as is still the case in oriental towns where shade is more welcome than sun and few need to hurry, though the adoption of the horse—which came with the Kassites in the nineteenth century B. C.—would give more animation than the older throng of asses and camels. But apart from the remarkable public buildings I have described the aspect of the city would be like that with which we are already familiar. It is more material to inquire into the character of the people.

§2. WAS THERE A DETERIORATION OF MORALS?

Advance in wealth and social complexity generally brings a relaxation of the older moral standards, just as a savage people loses its innocence—that is to say, gets new anti-social impulses—when it rises in the scale of culture. Large cities inevitably mean congested wealth, with a voluptuous enjoyment of it, at one end of the scale, and poverty, with theft and other forms of demoralization, at the other end. Prostitution and knavery and violence are always more apparent in the large city, and they give the visitor from smaller towns or villages (which are more furtive in their irregularities) an impression of great wickedness. Now that Babylon had become the metropolis of that teeming region from the Persian Gulf to Damascus we must take this into account; for, desolate as the same region now is, we must not forget that in ancient days it bore an industrious and prosperous population in nearly every part.

Yet we have so little serious evidence about the character of the people after 600 B. C. that we can do no more than show the worthlessness of the tradition that makes the city very corrupt. Indeed, almost the only positive evidence we have, that of the temple-literature, seems to show that the Chaldaean rulers fully sustained the strong ethical note of the older Babylonian religion. Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest of them, the monarch who rebuilt the city and was in fact the greatest ruler of his age (though pathetically represented in the Old Testament merely as an insane outcast from human society), addressed Marduk, at his coronation, in language which shows that men still regarded the gods as the supreme guardians of virtue and justice and punishers of evil conduct. I have given his prayer, and other hymns and prayers, in Little Blue Book No. 1076. And since Ishtar is so plainly conceived in Nineveh as a guardian of virtue, she is not likely to have been conceived differently in Babylon at this date. Clearly the ideal remained the same as in the days of Hammurabi, and we have no serious reason to suppose that men were less faithful to it.

In fact, we know that even in Babylon there was at this time a development of the new type of ascetic religion that was springing up all over the world at that time. Count Baudissin has written a large work on an obscure deity, Esmun, who began to be venerated in Babylonia at this time ("Adonis and Esmun"). He shows that it

was a Phoenician deity who was blended with the Adonis (or Tammuz) of the Babylonians and conceived very ethically as "a young god, subordinate to the supreme god, who dies and is born again and is regarded as healing the sick and raising the dead to life." Baudissin claims that it was largely due to the influence of this cult that the priests of Jahveh purified their cult of phallic and barbaric elements and gave it an ethical character.

We have no pictures of life in Babylon at the time, as the few remarks of Herodotus do not at all bring the people vividly before us. We therefore have this real situation in face of the reputation of the city: no serious writer suggests that there was more dishonesty or violence, more cruelty ("Daniel" is, as all scholars admit, sheer romance) or selfishness, than in other large cities, but the story spread in the ancient world that there was a quite exceptional degree of sexual license. I have briefly referred to this in several of my works, and the best thing I can do for the reader here is to make a complete study of the matter.

It is not easy. Of twenty experts, writers on history, archaeology, or ethics, whom I consult hardly two come to precisely the same conclusion; and let me say that all of them overlook the fact that, while Herodotus speaks of this "shameful custom" of temple-prostitution, he represents the Babylonians generally as so sensitive to the uncleanness of sex that, when a married couple have had intercourse, they must sit all night on opposite sides of some sort of altar on which incense is burning and must not touch even the vessels of the house until they have washed. I take it that this is one of his "fables," but how is a moralist justified in ignoring entirely this statement and insisting on the truth of another, in the same chapter, which makes the Babylonians very callous about sex? There is, strictly, no inconsistency between the stories. A city might, in that old world, quite easily tolerate sacred prostitution in certain temples of the kind described by Herodotus yet think sex-intercourse apart from this sacred duty in some sense defiling. But in the latter case you have a clue to the general attitude of the people and in the former only an old custom applying once in a woman's life.

However that may be, every authority on Babylon now rejects the story in the form in which Herodotus gives it, although even Sir J. G. Frazer accepts it in his "Golden Bough" and all phallic writers repeat it. The statement that every woman of Babylon had, before she could be married, to go to the temple of Mylitta (there was no such goddess in Babylonia) and wait until a stranger gave her a piece of silver and had intercourse with her is not only without an atom of support in the Hammurabi Code or in any fragment of Babylonian or Assyrian literature, but it is shown to be false by marriage contracts which specially describe the bride as a virgin. Some recent Greek scholars who have sought to prove that Herodotus is more reliable than he is now considered to be say, as Tolman and Stevenson say in their "Herodotus and the Empires of the East," that he is certainly wrong in saying that all the women of Babylonia had to be deflowered in the temple, but that there

were professional sacred prostitutes in temples at Crech and other Babylonian towns. One writer says that there may have been an old temple of the kind in Babylon itself. That is a totally different question. Herodotus says nothing about professional women, and what he does say is discredited. Mr. Woolley, who is now one of the best authorities on the whole of ancient Mesopotamia, says in his recent work, "The Sumerians," that there is no trace anywhere of such a law or custom as that described by Herodotus. It is quite time the story was relegated to the spacious land of ancient fables.

Woolley adds, however, that it is quite certain that the Sumerians had sacred prostitutes in their temples. The popular romance of Gilgamesh clearly implies that the lower priestesses of Ishtar at the ancient Sumerian city of Crech were sacred harlots, and Ishtar herself is represented as a goddess of love of unrestrained impulses. Some even of the ancient hymns speak of her as "the temple harlot," the "glad-eyed goddess of desire," and so on. She is at times figured as a nude woman with exaggerated organs. All this points to a primitive phallic cult of Ishtar with sacred prostitution. This is far from surprising. It connects the Sumerians with the civilizations of Syria and Asia Minor on the one hand, with Crete (which had only a goddess of fertility), and with the primitive civilization of India. Through the entire region there was a cult of a mother-goddess or fertility-goddess which easily leads to a consecration of love.

In the civilizations which we shall study in the next volume this cult was retained and, when the resources of a higher civilization were devoted to developing and adorning it, some remarkable temples appeared. In Egypt the ethical ideal soon conquered the primitive naturalism, and it remained only in the legend and ritual of Osiris; for the statement of Strabo, that there were sacred prostitutes at Thebes, does not seem to be favored by Egyptologists. What I am trying to ascertain here is whether in the Babylonian civilization also the ethical element suppressed the phallic, but the experts are hopelessly disagreed. Some think, on the strength of the Gilgamesh epic, that sacred prostitution was retained at Crech alone. It would not be surprising to find old temples of the kind in this ancient provincial city which the Babylonian authorities did not think it prudent to try to suppress, but the ground for saying it is not very safe, since no man can tell the date to which the story refers.

Mr. Woolley and others think that such temples of Ishtar still survived at Babylon, and they appeal to the Hammurabi Code. Clause 182, for instance, speaks of a "wife of Merodach of Babylon" who may inherit from her father and "may give what she leaves behind to whom she sees good." The law seems to regard her as a sacred woman who will not have children. But these passages are so obscure that there is no agreement. There are in the law six classes of consecrated women. The names of four classes have a prefix which denotes a married woman, and in one case their conduct is so jealously watched that if one of them, even after retiring

from the service of the temple, is seen in a wineshop, she is condemned to death. Some are described as "virgins consecrated to God." Most of them, apparently, are not expected to have children. Some experts hold that all were priestesses in the ordinary sense, and some, like Woolley, hold that, as the consecrated women of the lowest order were not held in respect and it was thought more or less a disgrace to marry one, they were probably sacred courtesans.

Even, however, if there were in Babylon itself such temples—and remember that the Hammurabi Code reflects the life of 2000 B. C., not 600 B. C.—they would not prove a low moral standard of the Babylonian people. Mr. Woolley thus describes the temple-prostitutes whom he admits in Mesopotomia: "The devotee gave to the service of the god the virginity which, as plenty of clauses of the law prove, **was no less precious to the Sumerian woman than to others.**" Other Assyriologists point out that, necessary as it may have been to tolerate such practices, the women were clearly not held in much esteem. In the moral writing which I quoted in an earlier chapter a man is warned, as we saw, against marrying "the maiden of Ishtar." And there is another side to the matter. The idea of sacrifice in sacred prostitution is, as I have shown in my volumes on sex, a later ingredient of phallic cults. The original idea is that of cooperating, rather in a magical than a religious sense, with the spirit of fertility, and in a land so steeped in magic as Mesopotamia we should expect this to be popular. It seems fairly clear that the Hebrews clung so tenaciously to sacred prostitution mainly because they believed that the fertility of the earth and of their flocks, if not their wives, depended on it. A people with this belief might have every conceivable virtue yet be proud to have their daughters enlisted in so vital a service of the common good.

This interesting inquiry may not reach a definite conclusion until further discoveries are made, though even now if some Assyriologist would arrange all the evidence or what seems to be evidence in chronological order we might come nearer to agreement. Meantime I suggest that the development was probably as follows: The Gilgamesh epic and the other reference to the votaries of Ishtar and the older hymns to her do seem to indicate that her cult originally included female temple-prostitution, as the worship of a spirit of fertility generally did. But as time went on the character in which Ishtar was conceived in Mesopotamia underwent remarkable variations, as any study of Babylonian religion will explain. It is enough to observe that, since she was from the start conceived as a mother-goddess, taking a quite maternal interest in mankind, men and women particularly turned to her to intercede for them with the greater gods and avert their wrath. The temple-literature shows this quite plainly. She thus in time comes to be regarded herself as a patroness of virtue, of law and order; as, again, the psalms and hymns abundantly show.

At this stage, I suggest, the ethical ideal which she was believed to defend would eliminate the crude sexual methods of honoring her. Whether this had occurred by the time of Hammurabi is not clear, but Assyriologists do not seem to pay sufficient atten-

tion to that king's own conception of the goddess. It is plainly expressed at the foot of his Code. In imploring the gods one by one to curse any king who tampers with his just legislation, he says, when he comes to Ishtar:

> "May Ishtar, the mistress of battles and combats, who wields my weapons, my guardian angel [spirit], who loves my reign: may she in her passionate heart, in her deep anger, curse his royalty, turning her favors into evils."

The rest of the long and sonorous curse is entirely of a military nature. Ishtar is still "passionate," but she is the god of battles. This of itself would tend to alter the character of the worship of her and exclude prostitution, but it would not prevent temples of the older type from lingering in places. But by the next period when we get considerable evidence about Ishtar, the Assyrian period, she has become in every document the reconciler, the queen of heaven, the "lady who hears sighs," a goddess of righteousness. It does not seem possible that a public opinion formed on this religious conception of the character of Ishtar would, at the date we have reached, tolerate the crudeness of prostitution in her service. The idea of it being service in any form was lost.

I submit that this tentative suggestion reconciles the apparent contradictions of the evidence and disposes of one of the chief reasons why moralists still speak with a blush of ancient Babylon. Whether in this Chaldaic Babylon there was any unusual amount of sexual looseness apart from consecrated prostitution we simply do not know: or, rather, we have not the slightest serious evidence that there was. A Palestinian Jew of (at the earliest) the last decade of the first century (A. D.) would know very little about social life in either Rome or Babylon, and therefore no historian would take the least notice of "Revelation"; which, quite fallaciously, is the chief source of the heavy libel of the Babylonians. Earlier Hebrew writers, though after the Babylonian Captivity, might be expected to know more about it, but one might as well expect impartiality in a French writer on the morals of Berlin. In any case, they say no more than we find repeatedly said about every large city in history: that there was a—to the provincial mind—shocking display of harlotry and luxury. Thus, though we are very poorly informed about social conditions in this last and greatest phase of the life of Babylon, we can say quite positively that there is no serious evidence that life in it was looser than in any other large city of those or any other times. These Chaldaean kings seem to have taken their work seriously. They fostered the sciences of astronomy and mathematics, and it was upon the work of their priests and scholars that the Greeks of Alexandria would build a few centuries later. They were truculent in their treatment of the rebellious Jews, but that was the military fashion of the time. They created a prosperous and orderly civilization on the ruins of the older Babylonia, and, through the Persians and Greeks and Hebrews, they passed on to Europe all the good that had come of those three thousand years of striving on the plains of Mesopotamia. The

Sumerians had been amongst the greatest founders of civilization. The Chaldaeans were amongst the worthiest of the Semitic tribes that came from Arabia to take up and develop their work.

CHAPTER VI

THE POSITION OF THE HEBREWS IN MORAL DEVELOPMENT

ALTHOUGH my chief purpose in these chapters is to give pictures of actual life in the different periods of history, it is impossible to ignore certain current beliefs in regard to the moral evolution of the race. In fact, the reader will probably be grateful if I point out here and there how these concrete pictures of ancient life, or these larger collections of facts about the conduct of earlier nations, prove some of the statements I made in earlier books that must have seemed inadequately established. As far as the ancient world is concerned, the most important of these current fallacies is the almost universal belief that the Hebrew race in some way originated a moral code higher than that of the large empires of the ancient world and thus contributed in a special manner to the advance of civilization.

It seems to me that it would not be too strong an expression of the historical truth to say that the Hebrew race in its Palestinian home originated nothing and might be ignored in any history of morals. It reveals a defect in public education that opinions which were natural enough when the only known ethical literature of the ancient world (before the appearance of the Greeks) was Hebrew should remain unaffected after all our discoveries of Egyptian and Babylonian moral and religious literature. No historian has appreciated more warmly than I the services of the Jews to civilization at a later date, particularly when the Mohammedans gave them the opportunity, but, as their story is now told in any fully informed historical work, they clearly contributed nothing, and had not the least chance of contributing anything, to civilization until long after the more ancient civilizations were extinct. The literary vehicles of the ancient world were the written languages of the Egyptians, the Babylonians, and (in a much less degree) the Hittites. To this great literature the Hebrews contributed nothing. They came into the world too late. All the ideals of civilization were already created when their first scribes learned to wield a pen. The only literary vehicle which we know them to have used was the "alphabet" invented or developed by the Phoenicians or the Aramaeans of Syria about 1000 B. C. Long before that time, as we have seen, every facet of moral idealism had been exhibited to the world. Moreover, during the next four or five centuries, the Hebrews made no contribution to the moral literature of the world. How poor they were in this respect may be judged from their own story that as late as the year 622 B. C. their little nation was paralyzed by the discovery that it possessed a sacred book. In fact until the heads of the Jewish people were transplanted to Babylon, where they would find an immense ethical and religious literature, they had only a few small works which cannot possibly have been read by any person who was not a Hebrew. We may even go further and say that in

the days when the famous Greek moralists were giving the world their books, which were read from Babylon to Sicily, there was still no Hebrew literature that was ever read by any others than the relatively small number of Jews who could read or that had the least influence on the world at large.

Unless therefore the current idea is still based solely on a medieval ignorance of the moral literature of Egypt and Babylonia and Persia, it must make one of two pleas: either that the moral message in the Hebrew Bible is not weakened by association with such a mess of magic and superstition as we find in Egyptian and Babylonian literature, or that it is through its Christian offshoot that Jewish moral literature influenced the world. With the second claim I have dealt elsewhere and will deal later. As to the first, one has only to read the Talmud to see how, though for some centuries it was forbidden to write more books, the Jewish teaching, whatever its value, was diluted in just the same way with most fantastic superstitions. Very much of the Old Testament itself is fantastic and half-barbaric in its ethic, but the man who wants us simply to compare this with the literature of other ancient nations is misleading. It is only a select part of Jewish literature, and nine-tenths of it is of no interest to anybody but a Jew.

In short, the historian ought now to say that whatever the Hebrews originated was of no permanent human value, and that what was of permanent value was taught them by other nations. If we set firmly aside their own or the Fundamentalist version of the writing of their various books, as every historian does today, and if we study them from the point of view of time and place (which means opportunity), this is just what we shall expect. They were the youngest pupils of a very ancient and well-ordered civilization. They came into the school two thousand years after man had in most respects definitely and creditably formulated the social law. Further, they were in an ideal position for learning, and an impossible position for teaching. They were absorbers, not originators. Their prophets did not advance in the conception of justice and its application beyond the level of Hammurabi; and the law which their priests compiled at a late date and fraudulently ascribed to Moses is palpably an adaptation of the Babylonian Code. Sketches of the condition of the people at three successive periods will make this quite clear.

§1. THE LIFE OF THE PRIMITIVE HEBREWS

In a scholarly study of the relation of the Hebrews to neighboring peoples, published by Columbia University ("Aram and Israel"), Dr. Emil Kraeling concludes that they were part of the wave of hungry migrants from the deserts of Arabia into prosperous Mesopotamia, who found no room to settle until they reached Syria and Palestine. He thinks that the Hebrew tribes arrived late and found Syria and Palestine occupied by the great body we know as the Aramaeans (to whom I will return in the next book), and were compelled to remain wandering in the desert south of Palestine until the tremendous struggle of Egyptians, Aramaeans, and Hittites had weakened the resistance and they were able to get a footing on

the hilly region of south-eastern Palestine. It is a very disputed and quite unimportant point whether in their wandering they entered Egyptian territory, for no serious historian thinks that this, if it occurred, altered their character as primitive nomads of the desert. Dr. Kraeling thinks that they did touch Egypt, then wander again in the desert, and finally begin to settle in Palestine about 1180 B. C.

For the life of the people in this early stage we can quite accept many of the little pictures of Genesis. We saw that one branch of these Semites from Arabia, the Kaldi, contrived to settle in southern Mesopotamia, and Ur would be one of the first cities in which they lived. "Ur of the Chaldees" is, therefore, not only a legitimate expression, but a group of Chaldaean families may easily have traversed the region from Ur to Palestine. The mysterious word "Hebrews" is said to mean "from beyond" (the Euphrates?). This, of course, does not in the least confirm the historical legends of Genesis, for the Kaldi come into history even later than the Hebrews. No one could possibly have written the phrase "Ur of the Chaldees" before at least 900 B. C. But the little sketches of the life of the legendary patriarchs, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, correspond fairly well with what we know of nomads of the desert.

They had tribal organization, but the families were very individualistic. A father of a family consults nobody when he feels a divine call to sacrifice his son or dismiss his favorite concubine. A son must earn or purchase his wife from a distant family by labor. The fertility of the flocks is the main concern—they live mostly on milk, perhaps with a little game and a lamb or sheep on very special occasions—and there is much setting up and anointing of phallic stones. The law of the tent or immediate group of tents is the moral law. There shall be harmony—no stealing of each other's sheep or wives—in the little group, the serious disturbance of which would be felt by all of them. Of course, there was stealing and cheating, but you could trust your neighbor if he put his hand on your person when he swore his oath. Like their nearest racial neighbors in the desert oases (Edom, Moab, Ammon), the Hebrews had one god, or special spirit, but in practice it was the creative spirit in nature they sought most to reconcile, not the distant spirit of the mountains and the thunder and lightning. Jahveh was chiefly inspiring as a god of war; and he imposed no restrictions. No savagery was immoral when you took to the desert against an enemy. This was as important for the tribe as brotherly harmony within the social circle.

The earliest authentic Hebrew literature depicts for us just this type of folk struggling to hold and extend their pastures in the green valleys that broadened downward from the mountains. It was written very much later than 1100 B. C., for it is fairly certain that there was no Hebrew script to write in until long after that date. But doubtless songs and narratives were handed on from generation to generation, as they are more apt to be when a people cannot write, and they—as far as we can recognize them—nearly all chant victories over the "enemies" of the Hebrews; that is to say, the folk

whose fields and flocks and eventually towns they are determined to steal: at the command and with the assistance of Jahveh, of course. The long struggle hardens the tribal organization, accentuates the importance of the war-god, and prevents them for a century or two from learning the elements of civilization from the advanced peoples of the plain.

No scholar now takes seriously the claim that they reached an advanced culture under two famous kings named David and Solomon. Their genuine history during two centuries was probably handed down only in greatly inflated songs of victory which were later patched together and embedded in an obviously fictitious narrative that was meant to show that they owed everything to Jahveh. One of these ancient traditions is, from the primitiveness of the language, recognized by most scholars in the Song of Deborah (Judges, v). The narrative that leads up to it is obviously fictitious. The Hebrew leader goes down from the hills at the head of ten thousand men and smites, to the last man, a mighty army which includes nine hundred iron-plated chariots of the Assyrian type: which, without the infantry, would have made mincemeat of a few thousand wild fighters from the hills. The enemy general flies to the "tent" of a woman of a friendly tribe, and she invites him in with words of peace and brutally murders him in his sleep. Then the strong woman of Israel, Deborah, composes this ancient chant of victory, gloating in barbaric terms over the murder and treachery; though peoples' sense of values in these things is so perverted by sectarian zeal that Deborah's shrieks of praise of a callous murderess are still greatly admired. We who look back on it all with some historical sense quite understand. Deborah is just like the strong woman of the party opposed to Mohammed fifteen centuries later who decorated herself with the ears of the followers of the prophet whom her own men had slain and brought in. The life of the Hebrews about 1000 B. C. was much the same as that of the Arabs of 600 A. D.

§2. THE PHALLIC RELIGION OF THE HEBREWS

The book of Judges is a compilation of the traditions and songs coming down from this wild period expanded into a fictitious narrative, of naive audacity, which was meant to prove that the Hebrews did marvelous things when they clung to Jahveh alone and suffered terribly whenever they turned to other gods. What amount of service of Jahveh there really was in that early period it is impossible to say, but, if the narrative contains any historical truth at all, it shows that, as we should expect, as soon as the fierceness of the early fighting moderated, and the Hebrews settled down in at least habitual peace with their neighbors, they began to copy the religion as well as the more advanced ways of the older peoples. As long as people believed that these "Canaanites" and "Philistines" were some of the riff-raff of the globe that Jahveh had not deigned to take into his confidence, and that the Hebrews were, on the contrary, the most enlightened (by special revelation) people on earth—and remember that until little more than half a century ago history could not firmly contradict this—it was quite natural to suppose that the

Hebrews had their sanctuaries of Jahveh, the purely spiritual monarch of the universe, everywhere, with an elaborate priesthood and ritual that went back to the days of Aaron. It was naturally supposed that it was the wickedness of the human heart that led the Israelites away from Jahveh; though what all the priesthood were doing from the time of Solomon and his temple down to 622, when they seem to have forgotten that they ever had a service of Jahveh created for them, was always gloriously vague.

It is all now quite intelligible. We have discovered that Palestine was highly civilized at the time when these bedouins of the desert who had turned into pastoral highlanders such as you may find round Afghanistan today came upon the fringe of its civilization. The Aramaeans, who covered Syria and reached down into Palestine, had founded a great empire, with a city of advanced culture like Damascus, centuries before. The Philistines have still not a settled place in the scheme of history, but many believe that they were refugees from Crete (a civilization equal to that of Egypt), and they certainly had an advanced culture. On the coast the Phoenician cities were so highly civilized that their textiles and metal-work were prized all over the known world, and their artists and craftsmen were summoned even to Nineveh to do fine work which even Babylonian craftsmen could not do. So when the Israelites, Moabites, and Edomites had made it plain that they had come to stay, the war dwindled into occasional raids and there was much peaceful intercourse. The merchants of Tyre and Sidon and Damascus saw a "new market" open. The Hebrews began to have a surplus of wealth with which they could purchase the luxuries of the plains.

This natural economic development, to which we find parallels at all stages of history, had two important moral consequences. One was that the Hebrews adopted the pronounced phallic religion of Palestine and Syria. Unlike the Kaldi, who had settled on the fringe of a civilization with an ethical religion, the Israelites had reached the fringe of the very different civilization which we have to study in the next book, and in the course of time nearly the whole nation discarded Jahveh and adopted the worship of the Aramaeans, which glorified sex. Jahveh had been chiefly a war-god: one of a multitude of gods whom the Hebrews had found particularly favorable to themselves. They had never been monotheists in the sense of believing that Jahveh was the only god and was the spiritual monarch of the universe. They had merely held, patriotically, that Jahveh was a more powerful god than the Dagon or Baal of their neighbors. Now that they were interested in the arts of peace, in town-life and agriculture, they felt that Jahveh was an anachronism of the desert days. They intermarried very freely with the other folk of Palestine, and the women brought their religious ideas with them. I agree with those theologians who say that before the year 1000 the worship of Jahveh had shrunk until (as the first chapter of I Samuel suggests) there was only one sanctuary, that at Shiloh, where Jahveh was served; and he was there represented by a fantastic bronze statue of a seraph.

If there is any truth at all in even the expurgated early history

of the Hebrews, they had always had a very strong tincture of phallic religion: perhaps we ought to say magic, as their practices in this respect had no relation to their primitive cult of Jahveh. The Old Testament is in its earlier half more phallic than the corresponding earlier part of any other sacred book: the Persian, Hindu, or Chinese. Even in the English version, which softens the crudeness of the Hebrew text, one feels how the minds of even these priestly and prophetic writers were saturated with sexual ideas and imagery. Hence they were fully prepared for the phallic religion of the Aramaeans. Their new prosperity was based, as elsewhere, on agriculture and the rearing of stock, and they were easily persuaded that the cult of fertility-gods was now much more important than the service of a Jahveh who was to most of them now unintelligible. From that time onward, especially after Omri entered into an alliance with Tyre and tried to promote commerce and industry in Israel, we hear of nothing but "high places" and mysterious "groves" and poles and Baals, and wicked kings and shaggy prophets coming down from the mountains with blood-curdling curses of all the abominations of Israel. One early prophet asks the Lord to have all these priests of false gods burned alive on their altars, and another has a group of playful children eaten by bears.

In all this crude period with its legendary narratives we do, as I said, trace two developments of moral importance. One is that worship quite generally became phallic, and this would in time lead to an ethical reaction. It is necessary only to point out that this phallic development went so far as sacred prostitution, and of both sexes, in the temples. It is so common for clerics and other moralists to express their horror at the debasement of human nature in the sacred prostitution of other nations that many readers who are not familiar with the Old Testament will find it difficult to believe that it was practiced for ages as part of the religion of the Hebrews. In I Kings (xiv, 23-24) we find a complete establishment of a phallic cult, with male sacred prostitutes, in Judah:

> "For they also built them high places, and images, and groves, on every high hill, and under every green tree.
> "And there were also sodomites in the land; and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel."

Next in point of time we find Hosea (iv, 14) telling us that sacred prostitution still continues:

> "I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, nor your spouses when they commit adultery; for themselves are separated with whores, and they sacrifice with harlots; therefore the people that doth not understand shall fall."

Deuteronomy was written centuries later, and this prohibition (xxiii, 17) must seem strange to those who imagine that it was written by Moses in the primitive conditions of the desert:

"There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel.

"Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow; for even both these are abomination unto the Lord thy God."

Legislators do not sternly forbid practices which are totally unknown to their people, as these would be to bedouins of the desert. This is the book (or part of the actual Deuteronomy) that was "found" in the temple in or about the year 622 B. C.; and the sequel, told in II Kings (xxiii, 4-15), makes this quite clear. The whole country, including Jerusalem, had to be purified of phallic worship. There were still companies of both male and female prostitutes in the temple itself at Jerusalem, and, if we are to find any truth whatever in the story of the production of the book, the entire country, including the priests of Jerusalem, had forgotten the service of Jahveh, so remote was the time when they had practiced it. Here, in the Bible itself, is the true moral condition of Judea in the reign of King Josiah, some two thousand years after "Ptah-hotep" of Egypt had written a monotheistic moral treatise as advanced as any Unitarian treatise of our day:

"And the king commanded Hilkiah, the high priest, and the priests of the second order, and the keepers of the door, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal [patron of male prostitutes], and for the grove [phallic column], and for all the host of heaven; and he burned them without Jerusalem in the fields of Kidron, and carried the ashes of them unto Beth-el.

"And he put down the idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem: them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven.

"And he brought out the grove [phallic emblem] from the house of the Lord, without Jerusalem, unto the brook Kidron, and burned it at the brook Kidron, and stamped it small to powder, and cast the powder thereof upon the graves of the children of the people.

"And he broke down the houses of the sodomites [male sacred prostitutes], that were by the house of the Lord, where the women [sacred harlots] wove hangings for the grove [phallic pole].

"And he brought all the priests out of the cities of Judah, and defiled the high places where the priests had burned incense, from Geba to Beer-sheba, and brake down the high places of the gates that were in the entering in of the gate of Joshua the governor of the city which were on a man's left hand at the gate of the city.

"Nevertheless the priests of the high places came not

up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren.

"And he defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnon, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire of Moloch [human sacrifices].

"And he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord, by the chamber of Nathan-melech the chamberlain, which was in the suburbs, and burned the chariots of the sun with fire.

"And the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz, which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord, did the king beat down, and brake them down from thence, and cast the dust of them into the brook Kidron.

"And the high places that were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the mount of corruption, which Solomon the king of Israel had builded for Ashtoreth [phallic goddess] the abomination of the Zidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom the abomination of the children of Ammon, did the king defile.

"And he brake to pieces the images and cut down the groves, and filled their places with the bones of men [slaughtered their devotees].

So few of my readers are likely to have a Bible at hand that I reproduce almost in full this extraordinary picture. It shows that the people whose "moral genius" some prize so highly, and whose "revelations" others think so unique, were at the very lowest level of religious-ethical culture. Male prostitutes in the temple at Jerusalem and human sacrifices at some of the provincial shrines as late as the year 620 ought to prevent any person from talking about the ethical impulse which was given to the world by Judea. The whole country was comprehensively degraded, for Jerusalem and the temple themselves were steeped in these crude superstitions. The archaeologist has merely added color to this sketch in the historical books of the Old Testament for he has unearthed some of these ancient Hebrew phallic temples—see R. A. S. Macalister, "The Excavation at Gezer" (1912), vol. III—and the imagery would suit the loosest type of the Hindu temple. And what the Bible narrative makes quite clear is that this had been the condition of Hebrew worship from the days of Solomon, that the provincial priests refused to accept the reform, and that the successors of Josiah restored the "abominations." The people, convinced that their welfare depended on these cults, fought against the introduction of Jahveh. And since we have no reliable knowledge whatever of the days of David, and the whole earlier period is very obscure, the story of the Jews down to the Babylonian Captivity is a story of a group of semi-barbaric tribes coming in from the desert with a local god and a good deal of phallic practice and in the course of five centuries sinking to the

lowest level of the phallic region into which they entered. I have said that they were merely absorbers. Down to this point they had absorbed the worst ethical elements of their environment and ignored the higher ideals of Egypt and Babylonia, with which their leaders were fully acquainted. Greece and Persia were already beginning their cultural work when they were still at this low level, and China and India had already produced their greatest moralists, Kung-fu-tse and Buddha.

§2. CITY-LIFE AND THE PROPHETS

The second development of moral interest in this period of Hebrew history is the idealism of the prophets. I have already pointed out that the earlier of these were simply fanatics for the worship of Jahveh who had all the ferocity which had originally been associated with that god. Their zeal for the pure worship of Jahveh does not interest us here. They were hermits or wanderers whose lack of agricultural interest left them free from the impulses which made others zealous for the service of a god of fertility. There was no superior ethic in their message except that, as is the way of hermits, they scorned the harlotry of the townsfolk and their cults. When their representatives did at last prevail in the days of Josiah, the triumph was celebrated with an orgy of animal sacrifices.

But the economic condition of the Hebrews had steadily changed, and economic changes always involve moral changes. The increase of private possessions and luxuries and the greater complexity of social life not only bring new impulses to covet and thieve, but they bring about a contrast of wealth and poverty which inspires the poor with a new sense of justice. Probably, as we see in the early historic period of Greece, which is fairly parallel to and contemporary with the settlement of the Hebrews, the better-off folk, the merchants and officials, of the towns began to acquire the land of the farmers, by loaning money, and farming large estates. In Greece this led to a great dispersal of the people, the rise of moralists with a strong sense of justice, and ultimately to a social and political revolution. The Hebrews had little chance at that time to disperse, as the Greeks did, since they were confined to their territory by a fringe of populous countries, and the close alliance of their kings and priests and the early ruin of the kingdom by the Assyrians and Babylonians prevented a political revolution. In the circumstances the economic development was bound to lead to a considerable growth of preachers of justice.

These circumstances easily explain the rise of the first prophets who have a distinct ethical message. To credit them with superior moral intuitions is absurd. Their ethical feeling was narrowly concentrated on proclaiming the rights of the poor and the vices of the rich. In other respects they had the crudest moral ideas, and their language is often barbarous. They are so far from having an idea of the brotherhood of men that they cry to the Lord to inflict the most horrible mutilations on the refined young women of the city who wear gold chains and Tyrian purple, and recline on ivory or ebony couches, while the poor feed and are housed like dogs. Amos

and Hosea are no improvement on Elias and Elijah. They are sons of the people who articulate the familiar and natural curses of the rich by the poor.

A better note is struck in Isaiah, or the first Isaiah, and Jeremiah. This very clearly reflects the new political and economic conditions. Not only the Phoenicians and the Philistines and the Hittites and the men of Damascus are now known in Jerusalem, but the Egyptian and Assyrian cultures have reached it. Jeremiah was a well-educated man and must have known something of the ideals of the higher civilizations with which the Hebrews were now in contact. Isaiah also seems to have been an educated man of good social position. Some of the psalms also appear to have got into use at this time; and, as I have elsewhere shown, some of the best of them are clearly borrowed, slightly altered, from Egypt. The narrow zeal of the early prophets, fierce enough to express itself poetically, now gives place to a broader conception of justice and humanity. All men are brothers and must adjust their claims on a basis of justice. All Hebrews in particular are children of Jahveh and must not hate each other.

I need not dwell either on their message or on the conditions of life just before the Babylonian Captivity, for they are just what we find elsewhere. The rich are living in such houses as we have described in Nineveh, with fine Phoenician furniture of ivory and cedar, beautiful Phoenician textiles and metal-work, gold-inlaid beds and chariots, and so on. The highest ideals of the best men are not above the Egyptian and Babylonian and Persian level. We have to make a new study of the Hebrew prophets, not to go on talking about them as our grandfathers did in the days when it was believed that the only moral literature in the world in the seventh century B. C. were the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah. Now we have to take their finest thoughts and ask if these already existed in other civilizations, and if the educated Hebrews were likely to know of them. We have seen that they existed long before in Egypt and Babylonia, and the political history of Jerusalem in the seventh century answers the second question. The Jews were absorbers, not originators: pupils, not teachers. In the seventh century Jerusalem became a cosmopolitan city, and they were developing a promising moral culture based on that of the older civilizations. Just then came the long Babylonian Captivity, when the educated Jews learned also the high moral culture of the Persians and Chaldaeans. From that time onward it would be ridiculous to seek original ethical ideas in Palestine.

Vol. III

A Modern Analysis of Biblical Sex Scandals

HOW AN ADULTEROUS OLD KING DISPOSED OF AN UNWANTED HUSBAND AND OTHER WORLDLY AFFAIRS, ALL BASED ON THE BIBLICAL STORY OF DAVID AND BATHSHEBA, INCLUDING JUDAH'S AFFAIR WITH HIS DEAD SON'S WIFE, WHO PLAYED THE HARLOT; THE FATE OF ONAN.

By D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1947,
By E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of Americ

1. SCANDAL IS AMUSING

Both scandal and gossip have value. Each serves to amuse.

A fair-to-middling cyclone may make front-page headlines and get a column write-up in the daily press—if the editor is short of more exciting copy. A good third-class scandal will get box-car headlines and plenty of space. And why not?

Not long ago newspapers were grabbing for every piece of copy they could get on the accusations of one set of dogs against another set of dogs. Men elected to high office by John Q. Public were being accused of war-time grafting. Little war lords were also being accused. Even high ranking generals were within vibratory reach of the breath of scandal. And all of this would have paled into insignificance—newspapers would have doubled in size—and extras would have been printed, had someone produced a nice, juicy authentic story concerning some general who had ravished the wife—the beautiful wife—of some GI, and then had the soldier shot.

Of course, nothing like that happened. But its sequel happened once—only, instead of being just a common general, the adulterous one was a high and mighty king.

The story isn't new to those who have read it. It's safe to say that no great number of people living today have read the story. It can be found in a book which is reputedly a best-seller—and doubtless the least read. The title reads "Holy Bible."

The Bible has never been barred from the United States mails. Less offensive material than much contained in the Bible has been barred from the mails. That material will not be found in this book. If, however, you have an authorized King James version, you might turn to Isaiah, the 36th chapter and the 12th verse. Read it and you may wonder why ministers are never inspired to open at random for sermon texts and light on that one.

Scientific sex is one thing; sexiness another. Those seeking a "sexy" story may find an abundance in the Bible. The modern rendition will no doubt be preferred. This book will give its readers the scientific and humanistic side of sex by comparing modern knowledge and humanistic principles with the often savage and near-aboriginal practices of so-called biblical days.

2. DAVID'S ADULTERY

The Bible explains, in the 11th chapter of Second Samuel, that when a year was expired kings went forth to battle. Obviously the object of the battle was loot, women and power. Such a practice would today be regarded as banditry. It seems that King David sent his commander and soldiers out to battle while he remained in Jerusalem.

After a nice long afternoon nap, doubtless so that he might be refreshed for the night, David arose from his bed (2 Sam. 11:2) and walked upon the roof of the king's house. (He, himself, was king.) The roof must have been high enough to have been quite a vantage point with a commanding view of the settlement — or community — around about it. Evidently David did quite a bit of looking and was pleased

when his eyes fell on a beautiful woman "washing herself." David's action was something like the ancient version of the modern "Peeping Tom." David, however, did not peep. He *spied.* (Evidently the woman did not know that he was looking at her.)

Back in the time when historical records give us a chronology of the various dynasties, David and the clans of Jehovah were and are neglected. According to reputed practices in David's time, women were required to isolate themselves somewhat from other persons during their menstrual periods. When menstruation was over women were required to bathe before presenting themselves in "society." One can well imagine the "woman hours" which were lost to productive work by this practice. Had they but known of the modern sanitary napkin in those days!

Being pleased with what he saw, and being king and in a position to command, David inquired after the woman and learned that she was Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah—one of his soldiers. David "sent messengers and took her." She was "purified from her uncleanness" (her menstruation evidently) and so—David went to his bedroom and she "came in and lay with him." He then sent her away. Various biblical accounts indicate that this was by no means David's only adventure in adultery.

It happens to be a biological law that when male and female have sexual congress, a pregnancy may result. Thus, from all reports, David being a potent and fertile man, Bathsheba became pregnant. As is somewhat customary even today, she sent word to her seducer that she was pregnant.

Having plenty of wives and concubines, David was, perhaps, not averse to having more—but this woman had a husband and this woman's husband was out risking his neck or a spot below or beneath the fifth rib, while maiming, murdering and looting for his king. And the king's messengers knew of the king's adulterous act. They would hold their peace—but what about the woman? King David was in what we of today would call *something* of a pickle.

After carefully thinking matters out—and knowing that Bathsheba's pregnancy was not far gone—he did a gracious thing and sent word to Joab, his commander on the field of battle, saying "Send me Uriah, the Hitite."

The average soldier of today would, under similar circumstances, feel rather grateful for the furlough—and respite from the arduous duties of battle. This is perhaps the way Uriah felt—at first. But even the messengers of a king may have wagging tongues and somebody, somewhere, "ratted." Uriah knew what had been going on in his absence and why his king had sent for him. He knew, also, that if he went to his own house and slept with h i s wife he would be regarded as the father of any child born to his wife (and by his wife). Uriah respectfully reported to his king and the latter demanded of him information as to how Joab, the king's commander, did, and of how the people did, and *how the war prospered.* (The latter sounds much more like modern man than it does an aboriginal.)

After receiving Uriah's report David ordered him to go to his own house and "wash his feet." The king sent a *mess of meat* after him. But Uriah preferred staying at the door of the king's house and hearing the gossip (and truth, too, no doubt) of the king's servants. He remained away from his own house and made certain that there were plenty of witnesses to the fact.

One can imagine the pleasure it gave David's servants to convey to him the word that Uriah had remained with them in preference to visiting his beautiful wife. And David, disturbed, sent for Uriah. He wondered if Uriah had not been tired from his journey and why Uriah had kept away from his own house.

Uriah explained, "The ark, and Israel and Judah, abide in tents; and my lord, Joab, and the servants of my lord, are encamped in the open fields; shall I then go into mine house, to eat and to drink, and to lie with my wife; as thou livest and as my sould liveth I will not do this thing." Strong words.

David then had Uriah "tarry" a day and he sent and had Uriah come in where there was food and drink and he made Uriah drunk. After this, Uriah went to bed with David's servants, slept, and kept strictly away from his own house and Bathsheba, his beautiful wife.

Came the dawn and David busied himself writing a letter to General Joab.

3. THE LETTER AND HOW THE KING COMMITTED MANSLAUGHTER

Uriah was either too honest to read the letter written by his king, or was unable to read, or was an extra brave and valiant man. He took the letter written by his king to the commander, Joab, and, with his own hand, gave the letter to Joab.

In the letter David wrote: "Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle and retire ye from him, that he may be smitten, and die."

A brave man among brave men—Uriah, the Hitite, died. Joab had observed the city and had assigned Uriah to a spot where he knew there were valiant men.

From the biblical account it would seem that Joab made quite a few errors of strategy and feared that word of these "boners," as military men of today call them, would reach the king. He, therefore, prepared a neat report for the king and gave excuses for the strategic errors, well knowing that David would see through these excuses. As a *coup de grace*, he reserved the one thing he knew the king would want to know about until the very last of the report—the fact that Uriah was dead.

After learning that Joab had acted well as his agent in special murder, David sent consoling word to Joab to let him know that he was so pleased with the death of Uriah that Joab's errors were as nothing. In war, David reasoned, all men take their chances. What David said to Joab was: "Let not this thing displease thee. The sword devoureth one as well as another."

When Bathsheba learned of the death of her husband, she "mourned" the regulation period, whatever time that was, and then went to David's house when he sent for her. She became his wife "and bare him a son." The mourning period and the time between a dead husband and a new living one must have compared favorably with many similar practices of today.

Nathan, the prophet, desiring a little ego expansion (as happens with modern ministers and others, and is quite natural and sometimes commendable) called to see David and told David a little story. Rendered into easier English, this is what Nathan said to David:

Two men, one rich and the other poor, lived in a city. The rich man had many flocks and herds and the poor man had but one little ewe lamb. He had bought the lamb and nourished it and it had grown up with him and with his children. This little lamb was somewhat strange as lambs go because it ate *meat* with the poor man and drank from the poor man's cup, and even though the poor man did have children, the lamb was like a daughter to him and lay on his bosom. And when a sojourner came along and stopped with the rich man instead of sending out for an animal from his own flocks, he had the poor man's lamb taken away from him and dressed for the stranger to eat.

Nathan's story made old King David pretty mad, and being *the* law, David ordered the death of the rich man and the restoration of a lamb to the poor man. What a chuckle Nathan must have had when he told David that the little story represented what David had done to Uriah. He then explained just what Jehovah thought about the whole thing (which was just what Nathan wanted Jehovah to think) and enjoyed David's discomfiture greatly. He reminded David of the curses to which he, David, was subject, and then (because he knew of David's power both as a king and as a warrior) he calmly explained, "The Loard hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die."

All of which sounds greatly like the 20th century—and leads one to think, in jest, that old Doctor Wonmug has been playing the devil with his fantastic time machine. Men still do much the same as old King David did—women do as did Bathsheba—husbands even die, in a manner as did Uriah, and the priests come along and after scaring the hell out of the offenders—for reasons well known to themselves—forgive their sins and get everything fixed up with the Almighty.

4. HUMANISTIC ANALYSIS

The modern psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, psychologist, or humanist, with a clear knowledge and ability not besmudged by a theory of "sin," would look upon David and others and all that they did as near-savages, and as bandits—mere babes in intellectuality. David and others were the products of their times and just as life on this planet evolved upward for ages running into calculus, David and those of his time (admitting that they even existed for the sake of theory) were links in the chain of humankind leading from antiquity to modernity. That we still have Davids and Nathans and others is neither because of the book entitled Holy Bible nor in spite of it.

Why should David be painted as an immoral imbecile just because he was polygamous and adulterous? It was a low trick, one penologists and criminologists of today would regard as dastardly criminal, for David to have Uriah killed—just because it was so easy to do so. The psychiatric viewpoint would cover David's fear and would probably recognize in him something of what is known as paraphrenia expansiva—even though David was a powerful person without depending upon a paraphrenic imagination to suggest his power to him. Should one take the time to follow the extremely dull reading (Bible-fashion) covering more or less the life of David, it would be admitted that David had some reason for being expansive in his aberrations—even though, measured by modern psychometric methods, his personality was decidedly a psychopathic one.

Parents of today who are inclined to be religious-minded even though they have never read a dozen chapters in the Bible and have only some second-hand information or misinformation concerning it, often advocate that they would prefer having their children remain at home on Sunday and read the Bible than to have them going to Sunday shows, ball games, and attending numerous other healthful amusements (especially dancing) youngsters get such a healthy "kick" from. Such parents would rather see their children reading the Bible than see them reading the confession magazines and various novels—especially on Sunday.

Once a pious man who worked at his blacksmith shop all week and rendered excellent and honest service to his patrons, and rested on Sunday, yet never read the Bible, inherited a sizable family of stepchildren. This man of "goodness and kindness" disliked greatly for his stepdaughters of "courting age" to go out with young men to Sunday

theaters and other amusements. He wanted them to stay at home and read the Bible. The children paid little heed, but each week they heard the same lecture.

Then, one of the stepdaughters married. Her husband was in the twenties and rather mature. He admired the stepfather of his wife—and this admiration grew out of a nmber of reasons. One was that he was an excellent provider. Another was that he was a master craftsman. Another was that he did honest work for an honest price. The older man amused him with his weekly lecture to the girls about their *beaux*, Sunday amusements, reading the Bible, etc.

Being of a psychological turn of mind, this younger man purposely humored the whims of the stepfather-in-law. He agreed that the older man was right when he explained that reading the Bible could give infinitely greater pleasure than numerous of the amusements the older man disapproved. And then—

On a summer Sunday afternoon, when youth was being served in it own way, the stepson-in-law got out two dust-covered older versions of the Bible.

He suggested that he and Mr. S do responsive reading as Mr. S had suggested the youngsters should do. The younger man, P, selected the reading. In doing this he merely selected some of the actual sex stories of the Bible in their unadulterated (and unexplained) biblical form. Presently the older man became much confused. He must have realized that some of the reading was quite suggestive to young minds not trained in sex science and to whom sex education at home and in the schools had been denied. Himself a rather inhibited and modest man, he blushed to read of pure and unadulterated (only somewhat intoxicated) rape on the part of God's favorites, and incest in a like category. The story of how a daughter-in-law used woman's "wiles" to seduce her father-in-law, a patriarch and as such one of God's Holy Men, not, however, above bargaining with harlots.

As told by P, several times during the reading which did not last overly long, Mr. S examined his Bible to make sure he was not being hoodwinked. At times he spluttered while P actually read both parts—the lead of Mr. S, and P's response.

During a pause P suggested that he was thoroughly in sympathy (which, of course, he was not) with the ideas of Mr. S concerning the way young people should spend the Sabbath. P further suggested that he believed he could persuade the young couples and perhaps a few others to gather at the S home on the following Sunday for Bible reading and offered to lead or teach them.

They read further. Mr. S kept examining his Bible (an old one and one not readily mistaken for another), and eventually announced that he had never known the Bible contained such stories.

P suggested that it was good for young people in groups, and especially when older persons of both sexes were present, to study this hidden angle of the Bible.

Such was beyond the comprehension of Mr. S.

P commented at length upon those "good lectures" Mr. S had been delivering as a weekly routine. The youngsters would wonder what could be wrong were the lectures suddenly discontinued. And—being kindly disposed and of an accommodating nature—P made a generous gesture in offering to explain the matter to the youngsters but only in the presence of Mr. S, because P did not regard it as quite propitious otherwise.

The kindly-disposed and extremely uncomfortable fatherly gentleman begged that the whole matter be forgotten.

Bibles returned to their repose, dust-collecting; and their purposes as records of family births, deaths and marriages.

5. THE FATE OF ONAN

Peoples of all times have had customs peculiar to clans, tribes, and races. According to legend there was a family or tribal custom in biblical times, and among certain (probably all) Hebrews, that when a woman was widowed she was to become the wife of a brother of the dead husband.

Judah was the ruler or patriarch of a considerable tribe and he was apparently a man greatly favored by Jehovah. Judah took a wife for his first born son whose name was Er. The wife's name was Tamar. The Lord got on a rampage, judged Er to be a wicked man, and slew him, according to Genesis 38:7. Judah then sent his son Onan in to Tamar, telling him, "Go in unto thy brother's wife and marry her, and raise up seed of thy brother."

Onan apparently did not fancy the idea but he dared not disrespect his father's wishes altogether. It is just possible that Tamar did not appeal greatly to Onan. It happens in this day and time that not every man appeals to a woman and that not every woman appeals to a man. There seems to be such a thing as a desire, at least, for personal choice.

Onan obediently went in, and, using the story as a hypothesis, gave the world a much-indulged practice which is highly prevalent today. Moderns call the practice coitus interruptus. It has been called Onanism. And Onanism is a term which has likewise been applied to masturbation (also known as pollution and by the better and more applicable term, self-gratification), and to various means aimed at parenthood control.

The biblical report states that when Onan went in to marry and have sexual congress with Tamar, he knew that the seed should not be his. The Bible states that he spilled "it" on the ground. Modern interpretation is that the "it" referred to as seed is what today is called semen.

Onan's act displeased the Lord and so, the Lord slew him also. One might think that Judah would have, by the time the Lord had slain two of his sons, been a little fed up with the whole affair—but he appears to have gone about his business calmly, taking some precaution, however, for his son Shelah, who was still quite young.

Evidently Judah felt that Tamar had something to do with the slayings of his sons because he advised her to remain a widow in her own father's house until Shelah should be grown, "lest peradventure Shelah die also as his brethren did."

As advised, Tamar went to her own father's house and remained a widow.

6. PLAYING THE HARLOT

Time passed and Shelah grew up. To Tamar he appeared to be fully capable of acting the part of a husband. Perhaps Judah was still a little concerned—fearful of what the Lord might do to Shelah should Shelah bungle the job of husbandry. Possibly he was occupied with other matters and had let his widowed daughter-in-law slip somewhat from his memory. During the time of Shelah's growing Judah's wife died. He had reached an age and acquired power to the end that had

he so desired he might readily have had any eligible woman as a wife. He was still a widower, however, and planned to take his men to the mountains to shear sheep.

Word reached Tamar that Judah was preparing to go to the mountains. She was well aware of the road by which Judah would travel and being tired of the garments of widowhood, she put these aside and wrapped herself with a garment and put on the veil which seems to have been a part of the costume of harlots (more appropriately called prostitutes today), and went and sat by the wayside.

It is easy to understand Tamar's insight and the fact that she knew her father-in-law's nature. She knew that others would not dare supersede Judah in bargaining with her. And so, she sat in an open place and waited.

When Judah approached he observed that Tamar wore the veil of the harlot, and, not knowing that she was his daughter-in-law, he bargained to go in and lie with her. She merely asked what he would give. Doubtless she wanted no material remuneration. Judah offered a kid from his flocks. It was then that shrewdly (or luckily) Tamar sought a pledge that Judah would send the kid as promised. No doubt she merely wanted to make the matter appear businesslike to Judah and to impress him that she was not an amateur. Judah readily complied by giving as a pledge his signet, his bracelets and his staff. The biblical reading, Genesis 38:18, is: "And he gave *it* to her, and came in unto her, and she conceived by him."

Evidently pleased with herself Tamar arose and went her way and put away the veil with which she had played the harlot and donned again the raiment of widowhood.

Judah sent the kid—but his friend who carried the kid could not find the harlot. His inquiries brought protests from the men of the place where Tamar had waited for Judah that there had been no harlot there. Judah decided to let the harlot keep his pledge. Assuredly he had kept his part of the bargain. He said, concerning his pledge, "Let her take it to her lest we be shamed."

Temporarily, at least, the whole affair slipped from the mind of Judah.

7. A HARSH JUDGMENT

Gossip had a way of getting breathed about as far back as several hundred centuries ago. Modern means of communication do not appear to have increased the certainty of gossip being spread. Just as soon as Tamar began *showing up,* as pregnant women have a way of doing, the gossips got busy and wagged their tongues and word reached Judah. The way the story has been set down the gossips told Judah, "Tamar, thy daughter-in-law, hath played the harlot; also behold, she is with child by whoredom." Judah commanded that Tamar be brought forth and burnt.

It sems strange that such an austere man had no apparent thought of anyone being burned when he was bargaining for the privilege of possibly making Tamar pregnant—nor later, especially when he "went in unto her and lay with her." The old fellow must have been rather sadly humiliated when Tamar produced his *pledge,* articles beyond a doubt familiar to all who saw them, and gently stated: "By the man to whom these belong am I with child."

Judah was rather magnanimous. Instead of having Tamar burnt he merely had her led away. And to appease the whole matter he "knew" her no more. In modern language it would be said that he had no further sexual relations with her.

8. MODERN CONCEPTS

In the United States today some 50 million people have their names inscribed on the rolls of some church. By no means are all of these names those of mature adults. It seems a good guess that two-thirds of these names represent children. A large proportion of the remaining third are child-like adults. Some who are actually regarded as adults solemnly profess to believe the Bible and all that is in it. Many fanatics regard it as a sin to misread one word of the Bible. They profess to believe every word of it. This is indeed a sad state of affairs. But with it there is a sort of redeeming grace, and it is that practically none of those who profess have read the Bible. Most of those who profess the loudest and who, perhaps, attempt to read the most, are poor readers and make little of what they read. Many of them haven't the slightest idea of pronunciation of biblical terms and names. Many, indeed, have a poor idea of the pronunciation of their native, or even adopted, tongues. Men and women donate large sums to the shrines erected to what the Bible is believed to represent—and millions of dollars to the "conversion of foreign pagans." Some of them join "reform" organizations and go about preaching their own particular brand of ignorance and superstition. Some of them become censors. They are unfamiliar with the so-called stories of smut contained in the Bible, nor are they aware of the fact that the Bible is rich in four-letter words not infrequently banned from polite conversation and often banned from the mails if appearing in certain books other than the Bible.

Should that which occurred to Judah and Tamar occur today it would have greater value as gossip than as anything pertaining to moralistic concepts. Prostitution has been called the oldest profession, and men have consorted with prostitutes since the beginning of history —or before. Had Judah and Tamar desired sexual relations—their desires should have been their own affair. The practice of having a woman in Tamar's position burned was a brutal one. Women are not burned under similar circumstances in modern civilization.

Compared to modern glamorized scandal these old scandals from the Bible are sordid and dull. It is not our purpose here to glamorize them. Nor is it our purpose to ridicule the Bible. It is our purpose to incite people to think. And would it not be well if those people who go about advising others to "read the Bible," should themselves become interested enough to follow the advice they so freely give?

9. THE CRY OF RAPE

Rape, in the sexual sense, is regarded as the sexual violation of a woman. One popular and authoritative dictionary defines rape as "the violation of a woman without her consent." This seems to be a strange definition. How can a consenting woman be violated?

It has been contended, and frequently at that, that were the sexes so constituted as to permit it, man would be raped more often than woman. It is well known that woman is often pleased with man's advances and not only invites but seeks sexual congress with man. It is likewise well known that woman has often consented only to change her

mind if surprised in the act—and in the latter event—cried *rape.* Men have been sent to prison in such cases. And it is quite likely that no one in particular set the original pattern. A pattern is, however, to be found in the Bible.

Genesis 39 gives a good example of this. Potiphar was a captain of the Egyptian guards—an officer of the Pharaoh and reputedly a eunuch. No statement as to his eunuchism, however, is to be found in Genesis 39, which concerns other matters.

According to the chapter Joseph had been made the practical master of Potiphar's house. He was well favored—so the story goes—and the "favor" may be regarded as something general. He kept an account of the business matters of his master and his master was well pleased.

In modern terminology, Potiphar's wife got a crush on Joseph. And why not? He must have been handsome—he was *well favored.* Anyway, the master's wife "cast her eyes on Joseph, and said, 'Lie with me.'" The expression meant that she desired sexual relations with Joseph and about the meaning there can be no doubt. Men were apparently quite fertile in those days and when they "lay" with women, women conceived and *bare* children. Joseph refused and bragged about having such a high position with Potiphar. He boasted about the authority over all that was Potiphar's except his wife. Why should he want the mere wife of his master? One of Joseph's boasts was, "There is none greater in this house than I." This must have included his master's wife. Joseph asked how could he do this "great wickedness and sin against God?" Men in God's favor of that day and time, it is to be observed, when they found an actually desirous and desirable woman, acted as though God were thus favoring them and took advantage of the opportunity. They served their own desires first and settled with God later. Doubtless Joseph either was not interested in Potiphar's wife or he feared losing all of the material good things which were his to possess.

Day by day Potiphar's wife spoke to Joseph and entreated him for his favor—but he hearkened not. Finally, the woman became exasperated and took hold of Joseph's *garment* (the rendition is singular) and repeated her request. Joseph left his garment in her hand and fled. The woman then called in the men of her house and told them: "He came unto me to lie with me and I cried with a loud voice." She reported that Joseph had left his garment with her and that he had run away. She put the garment away to show to her husband to whom she repeated her story. Joseph landed in prison.

The modern sisters of Potiphar's wife, who have never read or even heard of the biblical story, have repeated her antics and tactics. It is probable that were truth known concerning all of the "false cries" of rape, prison doors would open and many men who were innocent of rape and in instances too numerous to mention incapable of it, would walk out into the free air of the outside world.

The story as recorded in the Bible is scandalous. It is scandalous not only when it is repeated today—but that it is repeated at all. That is—in action. It would be scandalous were it not repeated now and then in words to remind humanity of what it does to itself—and of what it did back in the ages presumed by many to have been the golden age or the law of perfect morals.

10. CIRCUMCISION AND TWO MEAN TRICKS

The Bible legend has it that somewhere far back along the chain of a civilization which waited thousands of years to dawn, a young lady "went out to see the daughters of the land." Just what her purpose was other than to see is not clear. Instead of daughters, she encountered a

son of the land—a royal prince—no less. The daughter or fair maiden who went out to see the daughters, was Dinah, borne by Leah unto Jacob. The prince was Shechem—son of Hamor, the Hivite.

The Hivites were an uncircumcised people. Dinah's tribe were of the circumcised. The legend says that Prince Shechem saw Dinah, took her and "lay" with her, and defiled her. There is no explanation of what constituted the defilement. Anyway, he loved the damsel and spoke kindly to her. (Strange? It must have been a somewhat unusual practice in the day of morals to end all morals.) Shechem told his father, "Get me this damsel to wife." The matter of getting wives must often have been like modern man asking a friend to stop at the drug store and pick him up a package of cigarettes.

Dinah's brothers were pretty sore about the thing although they did not accuse Shechem of rape. They did accuse him of dealing with their sister as with an harlot.

Scheming had its inception and Hamor and Shechem planned to get possession of the cattle, herds and possessions of Jacob and his sons. Jacob and his sons had plans, likewise, to get possession of Hamor's and Shechem's wealth—and women.

The Jacobians made much ado over Shechem's treatment of *their* daughter and sister. Shechem had wrought folly in Israel—"Which thing ought not to be done."

The Jacobians considered an offer of the Hamorians. Hamor offered to let Jacob, et al., dwell and trade in his land and to permit Jacob and his tribe to take wives from among the Hivite women of Hamor—in exchange for similar favors.

Jacob and his sons finally agreed on the grounds that the Hivites must be circumcised. Hamor agreed and told his men that what they would gain in return for sacrificing a little bit of foreskin would be great. He reasoned, "Shall not their cattle and their substance and every beast of theirs be ours?" And so, the Hivites were circumcised.

The sons of Jacob calculated cooly and knew that by the third day the Hivites would be sore and not much in fighting trim. They bided their time and on the third day fell upon Hamor's city and slew all the males. They slew Hamor and Shechem with their swords and took Dinah from the house of Shechem. They took the wealth and women and little ones (girls—all of the males had been slain) and spoiled whatever they could not take with them and readily appropriate to their use.

Jacob appears to have had nothing in particular to do with the acts of his sons although he doubtless did not hate gain. He did feel that he might be blamed and he accused his sons of making him "stink" with various tribes. The answer of the sons was: "Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?"

Neither Jacob nor his sons seemed to think of *how* they were dealing with the Hivite women—the women of Hamor and Shechem.

There are people like Jacob and his sons and Hamor and his son today. They find it easy to justify themselves and to blame others but they can hardly be accused of having taken their pattern from the Bible. It is a book unfamiliar to the great masses of people and is apparently less read among professed religionists than among Freethinkers who, being unbiased in matters which have to do with the study of mankind, are by no means averse to reading the Bible.

11. FATHER AND DAUGHTERS

Many have heard something about the story of Lot. Many who have heard about the story have never read it. It is certainly best to treat the story as legendary.

Angels are legendary except as figures of speech. Biblical reports speak often of angels who were supposed to have appeared often on earth in the dark and distant past. Has anyone ever gone about explaining why angels suddenly ceased to appear on earth? Or, for that matter, why God disappeared so many years ago—and stopped visting the earth in person?

Let's consider the legend of Lot a story anyway. According to the story two angels went one night to Lot's house. In fact, they did not go directly to Lot's house but encountered Lot at the gates of the city. Lot insisted that they go to his house and they insisted on spending the night in the streets. Lot finally persuaded them and made a feast for them. (Angels are strange. Some eat and some don't. Some have wings and some walk. No wonder mankind understands devils better.) After the feast, and presumably before bedtime, a crowd gathered outside Lot's house. They called to Lot and asked where the men who had gone to his house earlier were, and said, "Bring them out unto us that we may know them." According to the biblical use of the word, know, that crowd certainly did not just want to get acquainted with the angels. They wanted to *know* them and it is perhaps from this legend that we now have a legal term—regarded in law as felonious—Sodomy. (The scene of the legend was Sodom.) A popular medical dictionary defines sodomy as: "Unnatural sexual relations between persons of the same sex, especially males, or between a beast and a human."

Lot understood just what was meant, for he termed it "wickedness." Listen to what Lot said to the gang: "I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly." It is notable that Lot addressed them as *brethren*. And then, Lot made a suggestion which, perhaps to him, did not seem in the least wicked: "Behold now I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes; only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof."

Even a large group of sodomists would, it seems, have found it good in their eyes to *know* virgin women. However, they still demanded the men.

If strange things happen today it seems that stranger things are said to have happened thousands of years ago and no doubt this is true because a great evolutionary process was going on in Nature. The story of Lot is strange reading indeed.

There are those today who rant about the Bible being such a masterpiece of literature. Literature? Maybe. But if those who thus rant mean that the Bible is literary, then read this disconnected material from Genesis. Beginning at the 19th chapter and the 24th verse, the King James version reads: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; (25) And he overthrew those cities and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. (26) But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt."

If there is anything literary about that—anything is literary. It is understood that the 26th verse refers to Lot's wife, but it reads as though it was the Lord's.

After Lot had escaped from Sodom, the legend tells us that he went eventually with his two daughters to live in a cave. The daughters seem to have conspired to no longer remain virgins. The story has been told many times and needs but brief reference here. The daughters are supposed to have made Lot drunk and to have "seduced" him while he was drunk in order to "raise seed to him." The Bible states that he neither perceived when each lay down with him nor when she left.

Ask any prostitute and she can tell you how incapable a man is of performing sexual intercourse when he is so drunk that he does not even know he is with a woman.

Lot made his daughters pregnant and there does not appear to have been any divine disapproval of the incestuous relationship.

There is nothing in the sexual side of the story here depicted which could not be told to quite young children and with all propriety by a person capable of giving the children the right kind of instruction. On the other hand, as rendered by the Bible—the terminology is vague, yet not too vague for pre-adolescents to understand. They look upon such a story as given in the Bible as "cloaked," and naturally when uninstructed see the vulgar side of sex therein. It is for just this reason that some of the breeze-like sexy stories and motion pictures of a similar brand afford cleaner and healthier amusement for youngsters than does the Bible.

12. BROTHER-SISTER—HUSBAND-WIFE

Like Father, Like Son

Moderns have an aversion to incestuous marriages. In biblical times brother-sister marriages were quite common. The biblical legend records that Abraham, one of God's favorites, married his half sister, Sarah. It appears that there were more half-brothers and half-sisters in those days than those of a full relationship. Men of power had numerous wives and many concubines.

There came a time when Abraham and Sarah went for a journey in a strange country. Abraham was of the opinion that Sarah was of such physical charm as not to be despised by a man of power and supererotism. He was also aware of the fact that few, if any, rulers had any more scruples against disposing of an unwanted husband, than did King David when he arranged neatly for the murder of Uriah. As would be said today, Abraham and Sarah made it up between them to deny their marital relationship and to tell the truth—that Sarah was Abraham's sister.

When Abraham and Sarah came to the land of King Abimelech, the king saw Sarah and "sent out and took her."

The story goes that before having sexual relations with Sarah the king had a dream in which God told him that he might have relations with Sarah but that he would be as a *dead man,* meaning that Sarah would not respond in the least because of the fact that she had a husband who pleased her.

As was usual, Abimelech made his excuses to God and explained quite thoroughly that he was innocent of any wrong because he had been told by Abraham, himself, that Sarah was his sister. Of course, it had been bruited about that God saw and knew everything, but it is highly probable that Abimelech hadn't heard about that yet. And so he made a thorough explanation.

Even today one can turn on the radio almost any Sunday morning and hear some preacher saying, "O Lord, God Almighty, Father Omnipotent and Omniscient, we know that thou knowest all things—even before they happen, but—" and then they go ahead and tell God all about it. It is to be doubted that they have any idea of the words omnipotent and omniscient—two words which are false to the core.

After Abimelech had made peace with God according to Abimelech's own ideas, he explained his dream to his servants and the members of his household. He rebuked Abraham after a manner, yet gave him a considerable amount of wealth in sheep, oxen, and menservants and womenservants—and a thousand pieces of silver. In explaining about the silver to Sarah, he referred to Abraham as her

brother (Gen. 20:16), and his giving of the silver was meant as a rebuke to Sarah.

Later, Isaac, son of Abraham, took a wife who was the daughter of his father's brother. This wife, Rebekah, the legend explains was a woman of beauty. When she and Isaac journeyed into a strange land, (he also happened unto the land of old Abimelech), men asked him concerning his wife and Isaac followed his father's tactics and claimed Rebekah as his sister. After a long time old King Abimelech of the Philistines looked out at a window and saw Isaac "sporting" with Rebekah. He decided that surely Rebekah was Isaac's wife and sent for Isaac and demanded a confirmation. Perhaps Rebekah appealed to Abimelech, but he wanted no more dreams and hard bargains with God. Isaac admitted that Rebekah was his wife and received Abimelech's blessing. Abimelech made Isaac and his wife welcome and Isaac sowed in the land of Abimelech of the Philistines and reaped in the same year "an hundredfold." Even in that legendary age wealth was a requisite to greatness in certain persons and Isaac "waxed great and went forward, and grew until he became very great; for he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds and great store of servants; and the Philistines envied him."

As they appear in the Bible these stories are practically pointless and senseless. They do seem to show in a way that in man's invention of sin, he overlooked in those biblical versions to include incest in the category although moralists, pseudo-moralists and self-styled reformers of modernity have branded incest as one of the terrible sins.

The stories involve a pattern often followed today—even by persons who have never heard of these biblical stories. The legend does not explain what the "people" thought of those affairs. Under similar circumstances today gossips would impute chicanery to the man in Abimelech's position—that is, a man of wealth, power and influence—and would regard any such settlement as Abimelech made in the case as evidence of a little "affair" between the parties involved. And, except in the case of a frame-up between man and wife, this would, doubtless, be true.

When one reads history, the authenticity of which has been examined into at great labor and expense, and then compares present civilization and its practices in various categories, well knowing that those compared do not know enough about the Bible to use it as a pattern, it may be readily believed that (1) there has been a lot of boondogling in the interpretation of the Bible, and (2) that many of the Bible stories have been based upon the conduct of the human family as of a date much later than the date ascribed.

The earliest historical records go back to some 6,000 years ago. These pertain to the civilization of that time in Egypt and Mesopotamia. Historical dates up to 1580 B.C., it is generally agreed, are the nearest approximation. From 1580 B.C. onward, chronology is regarded as being within a year or two of correctness—a matter historians regard as not being worthy of serious dispute. These historical records give data on the "Pharaohs" of Egypt—yet nothing indicates evidence in support even of biblical veracity.

It is in order to explain that the Christian answers that his Bible is the New Testament, and his religion is based on the teachings of Christ. He finds it convenient to forget that Christ constantly referred to the "scriptures," and that matters were so arranged that the Old Testament prophets prophesied the "Coming of Christ."

13. THE ONE HE LOVED

Some of the so-called sexual scandals of the Old Testament were sidestepped in the New Testament. History gives no hint of the authenticity

of the "happenings" recorded in either of the testaments. Jesus was supposed to be God, and somewhere along the way the two of them picked up the Holy Ghost. By some freakish twist the three of them appear to have become mixed into one.

Legend says that Christ was God and that both were *perfect.* One may well ask, Perfect what? God slew and murdered at *will* and *will* seems to have been *ad lib.* There was no end to his slaughter—even when he killed the firstborn of Egypt. It hasn't ever been explained why One who knew everything and was everywhere at once had to have the Israelites smear their premises with the blood of animals (Feast of the Passover) in order that God might distinguish the Israelites from the Egyptians—but how can anyone explain an unintelligible conglomeration of gibberish? Through hundreds of years men of like minds put the gibberish together and it is for the reason that it represents human thought thereby offering a possible link in man's mental and social evolution that it is of interest.

Long before the time of Christ, that which we of today refer to as homosexuality, was known and practiced. This was, of course, seen in the story of Lot and the references to Sodom and sodomy. A reference will likewise be found in Leviticus 19:22, which reads: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind: it is an abomination."

Any Christian will tell you that Christ (now dead if there was such a person) loves you. Christians will likewise explain that Jesus loved everybody. It causes one to see in a passage of scripture a strange portent. The passage is John 21:20, and reads: "Then Peter turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper."

The rational person is led to recall an admonition ascribed to Jesus: "Let him who hath eyes, see and him that hath ears, hear."

The person of vision, when hearing the reference, "the good book says thus and so," and who has really read THE BOOK (the Bible) cannot be blamed for asking: "What's good about it?"

14. COMPARATIVE HUMANOLOGY

Humanology is the science which studies humans—and humans as persons and the science which treats of this study is known as personology. When we speak of persons as being human, however, we mean, as a rule—humane or kind.

It is true that we have our "scandals today." And it is true that but the faintest glimmering of the scandals of the Bible has been covered in preceding chapters of this book. It is equally true that even the misguided of today who believe that they derive their sense of moral values from the teachings of a book which has no authenticity in fact or in history, do not advocate inscribing our "modern scandals" in a book and offering it as a guide for generations who may live hundreds of centuries hence.

Staunch Christians and deistic believers of today laugh at old Greek, Roman and other mythology. Such mythology, they say, was pure heathenism—paganism. There never were—these people will tell you—all of the gods the old Romans, Greeks, Egyptians and others taught concerning. They *know* that they have the last word.

People who advocate the reading of the Bible either do but little reading of it or have no idea of the meaning of what they read when they read it.

Recently, at a community meeting which was not supposed to have anything to do with religion or religious ceremonies, a "devotional" was held. A woman whose actual schooling was probably the equivalent to

the fourth grade, was called upon to lead the devotional. She arose and stated that she felt that the hand that opened the Bible should be guided by God, and so—she opened her Bible at random—explaining, meanwhile, that she would read the chapter her "guided" hand opened at—and it happened that the chapter was a "begat." The woman solemnly read, or tried to read, the chapter which consisted of So and So begat So and So and So and So, begat So and So—through—ad nauseam. She was unable to pronounce the names so that one listening could have made sense of them. When she finished she felt much inspired by the reading and prayed, thanking God for having inspired the opening of his blessed book at such an inspiring chapter. The majority of those present quite approved and so, among them, there was mutuality.

One may well say, "Let these children have their consolation." It is unfortunate that many of these same children are not willing to permit others to have *their* consolation. As an example, among this particular clan, members made an agreement to "spy" on other members of the community. Action was to be taken to humiliate everyone possible not conforming to the brand of religion by which the clan "claimed" to live.

When some person was found doing anything other than ordinary chores on Sunday that person was visited by various members of the clan and each sought to convince the offending person that he or she was doing a great wrong and committing a great sin. The conspiracy against humanity failed to gain great headway.

The folklore of the community was rich in so-called sexual scandals. A girl who had led the B.Y.P.U. happened to get pregnant outside of wedlock—and she was thoroughly ostracized. "None of the great forgiveness babbled about so much was even thought of by any of the ostracizers and persecutors." They did not want their own daughters to even speak to this "huzzy." One of the leaders was the mother of a recalcitrant child which she conceived in extra-marital relations. Fortunately for the ostracized one, she found greater consolation and joy in her child than she had ever dreamed of finding in the dreary B.Y.P.U. basement.

Scandal is unknown among primitive tribes of today. It was, no doubt, unknown among primitive tribes of the most ancient times. According to the time in which old King David was supposed to have lived, adultery was common enough. As a rule kings appropriated women whom they desired to themselves, regardless. Bathsheba, we may reason, submitted to David through either desire or fear. Old David's method of disposing of Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, would be regarded as repulsive—a blow below the belt—by decent-minded so-called criminals of today. According to theology, however, David was a king by divine right. And no matter what David did, he redeemed himself by "repenting and asking God for forgiveness." Persons entirely ignorant of the contents of the Bible gladly and quickly swallow the "repentance and forgiveness" theory.

A freethinking woman with rational views would have been greatly amused had she been, in a manner, in the "same boat" as two women the writer heard conversing in a hospital ward.

One of the women was a Catholic, the other a Protestant. Both had been operated on in order to save them from the results of personally attempted abortions.

Said the Catholic woman: "How I envy you. All you have to do is to repent, and pray for forgiveness and everything concerning your act is over. But me—I've got to confess and do penance—and heaven only knows what that penance will be."

Said the Protestant woman: "I'm glad I'm not a Catholic and have the right to take my troubles straight to Jesus. I've already repented and asked forgiveness and I feel assured that my blessed Lord has forgiven me. All I'm worried about now is getting well and out of here."

Lot's incest with his daughters has been repeated countless times since Lot's time. It would seem that the worst thing about such affairs is the fact that known incest brings social ostracism, and robs the daughters of the happiness they might otherwise enjoy with suitable husbands.

As to Abraham and Sarah—they were apparently satisfied. So have other brothers and sisters been likewise satisfied. Who should be concerned about such relationship—and why? Rarely do such relationships contribute to the betterment of humanity and a heritage for posterity. It is unfair for those practicing such relationships to bring children into being who may have to suffer ostracism and humiliation because society frowns on incestuous relationships.

Those who "know their Bible" will recall that Sarah was *barren* until the Lord came along many years after she had supposedly passed the change of life and made her pregnant.

If Tamar wanted sexual relations with her father-in-law, and especially, herself being a widow, that was her own affair. The scandal of such matters in ancient days was that Judah, the father-in-law who "lay" with her, could have ordered her killed. Tamar was in no way related to Judah by blood.

When various sexual relations outside marriage occur, and the participants keep the matter to themselves and are not caught, nothing (if pregnancy is avoided) comes of it. The world goes its way—humanity goes about in its own way of living—undisturbed. But let knowledge of "clandestine sexual relations" be found out, and the breath of scandal waxes hot. Who are the actual offenders? Scandalmongers incite murder. Of course, there are people who enjoy murder—just so long as they are not the victims—either of murder, or the possible consequences to the murderer. How many people do you know who do not enjoy scandal?

Judging the scandalous affairs of the Bible how can modern man advocate the Bible as a guide by which to live? And considering that the Bible and those who profess to follow its teachings have subjugated woman—have held her in bondage and in submission to man's will for thousands of years—how can woman even tolerate the Bible and its supposed adherents who, figuratively, delight in seeing woman bound in chains—subject entirely to the will of man? How would woman accept the biblical test for jealousy? There can be no doubt but that it was an exceedingly bitter dose. It was supposed to make the belly of the guilty to swell and her thighs to rot. In these modern times any sane person knows that such a test would have a like effect upon all who were compelled to take it. Any difference would be in the degree of severity. Occasionally there might be immunity which would signify nothing as to sexual faithfulness or sexual faithlessness.

What was this test? How was it administered? On what grounds could it be brought about?

15. BITTER WATER—BIBLICAL TEST FOR SEXUALLY FAITHLESS WIVES

The biblical bitter water test for sexually faithless wives would be easier to read were it rendered into modern English. Because of the significance of its unfairness, it is given as it appears in the King James version of the Bible. It begins with the 11th verse of the 5th chapter of Numbers:

> "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, if any man's wife go aside, and commit a trespass against him, and a man lie with her carnally,

and it be hid from the eyes of her husband, and be kept close, and she be defiled, and there be no witness against her, neither she be taken with the manner; and the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be defiled: or if the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be not defiled; then shall the man bring his wife unto the priest, and he shall bring her offering for her, the 10th part of an ephah of barley meal; he shall pour no oil upon it, nor put frankincense thereon; for it is an offering of jealousy, an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance. And the priest shall bring her near and set her before the Lord: and the priest shall take holy water in an earthen vessel; and of the dust that is in the floor of the tabernacle the priest shall take and put it into the water: and the priest shall set the woman before the Lord, and uncover the woman's head, and put the offering of memorial in her hand, which is a jealousy offering; and the priest shall have in his hand the bitter water which causeth the curse: and the priest shall charge her by an oath, and say unto the woman, if no man hath lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone aside to uncleanness with another instead of thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse: But if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if you be defiled, and some man hath lain with thee besides thy husband: then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman, the Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the Lord doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell; and this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot; and the woman shall say, Amen, amen. And the priest shall write these curses in a book, and he shall blot them out with the bitter water: and he shall cause the woman to drink the bitter water that causeth the curse: And the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter. Then the priest shall take the jealousy offering out of the woman's hand, and shall wave the offering before the Lord, and offer it upon the altar; and the priest shall take an handful of the offering, even the memorial thereof, and burn it upon the altar, and afterwards shall cause the woman to drink the water. And when he hath made her to drink the water, then it shall come to pass, that, if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, that the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter, and her belly shall swell and her thigh shall rot: and the woman shall be a curse among her people. And if the woman be not defiled, but be clean, then she shall be free, and shall conceive seed. This is the law of jealousies, when a wife goeth aside to another instead of her husband, and is defiled; or when the spirit of jealousy cometh upon him, and he be jealous over his wife, and shall set the woman before the Lord, and the priest shall execute upon her all this law. Then shall the man be guiltless from iniquity, and this woman shall bear her iniquity."

* * *

The whole quotation is a garbled mess of nonsensical repetition, yet it conveys the general idea and it is likely that the intelligent woman of modernity can read it and deduce its implications without feeling resentment. And this in spite of the fact that women unhesitatingly state that the commandment or whatever it was supposed to be does not apply to them.

No one of common sense needs to be a physician in order to at once realize the fact that a nauseous draught will have a similar effect upon women and men alike regardless of their "guilt" in certain matters, or

their "innocence." Now and then a person with healthy "insides" may be more or less immune to the damaging and nauseous effects of an otherwise poisonous concoction.

The vague and more or less unintelligible language of the passage leaves a great deal to the power of deduction. It does not make it clear to all whether the "holy water with dust from the floor" constituted the bitter water, or whether this was used in addition to some other concoction.

The modern woman is not incensed so much at the dose as because of a suggestion that woman be subjected to such indignity.

When the above passage is read to a group of women or by a member of a group of women—few women register anything more than either boredom or inattention. But if the passage is handed to a woman privately and she agrees to read it—either silently or aloud—her resentment will be plainly evident—and this will be true even though the woman be a fanatical religionist.

Such a test tells nothing, and some of our modern "truth serum" treatments and "lie detector" devices tell little more.

Women are quick to observe that according to the practices advocated in the legend—a husband had merely to be suspicious, in order to have the test invoked. Women observe also that man was not subjected to any corresponding test.

Fortunately for humanity many persons who believe themselves to be devoutly religious, take their religion in but occasional and minimal doses—and then with plenty of salt. There is consolation in a realization of the truth of this—otherwise, the most demonistic humans alive or who have ever lived, have failed in constructing their pictures of a "hell after death," by comparison to the hell there would be right now throughout the world. The old Inquisition of the Roman Catholic Church and the practices of various religious sects including the Protestants of burning heretics at the stake were tame by comparison to what we would have today except for the good people who, humoring tradition, have a faint idea that they are religious and that they perhaps believe a great deal concerning which they know practically nothing, and for which, in actuality, they care less.

Parents of the present are inflicting far less religious perversity on their children than did parents of a generation ago inflict upon theirs. Still another generation will see still greater improvement.

It is strange, however, that living among us today, there are large numbers of superstitious men who may be easily led to believe that a certain shot, medicine, pill, draught, or electric or other odd-looking gadget, can prove whether their wives are sexually faithless. More concerning this will be explained in the final chapter of this book.

Deceptive practices have not gone into the discard. There are innumerable persons who believe that a "little magic" can deceive husbands, wives and others. It should not be difficult to sell, at a near fabulous figure, such person's actual charms against being caught in their deceptions.

One neat little lesson is to be found in the Bible, wherein a friend suggested a method of deception to a young man who was lovesick for his half-sister and who had incestuous desires toward her, by those persons who are (1) strictly opposed to, or (2) who are in favor of, rape.

Normally no one should suppose that anyone else is interestel in knowing how to approach the act of rape. The Bible would seem to show a young man how to have an opportunity to rape his sister—while the end of the story is patterned after the modern story in which the "villain" always pays.

The story with which perhaps few readers are familiar, is here given. It may serve as an example of what those uninstructed in sex matters and who would hardly, therefore, understand the story, and who might

misconstrue or misconceive, may find, if they but turn to the Bible for the old-time "dime" novel form of entertainment. Here, also, one may recall Mr. S and his stepson-in-law P, and build an idea of how it would be to have uninstructed youngsters to select various accounts for responsive reading.

The story concerns children of David, the man who seduced Bathsheba and had her husband murdered.

16. HOW AMNON RAPED HIS SISTER

Tamar appears to have been among the famous names for women of the Bible, although not quite as common as Mary, Sue and Sal, so popular today. Amnon was a son of David, the king, and Tamar was David's beautiful daughter by a woman or wife not the mother of Amnon. Absalom, another of David's sons, was doubtless the whole brother of Tamar. It was Absalom who saw to it in time that Amnon was killed for raping Tamar, and also Absalom who arose against his father and caused the old king to take flight. In time Absalom's armies were defeated and Absalom was slain, and although old David did, as he so often found it convenient to do, he went on to other acts and penitences. David lamented because Absalom was slain.

The biblical reading is not easy, yet, there are persons who would believe that a rendition into sensible English served to distort the story. It is difficult to understand how the story could be distorted insofar as readable English is concerned. For the sake of unquestioned "veracity" the story is quoted as it appears in the Bible. It will be found in the King James version, 2 Samuel 13:

1. And it came to pass after this, that Absalom the son of David had a fair sister, whose name was Tamar; and Amnon the son of David loved her.
2. And Amnon was so vexed, that he fell sick for his sister Tamar, for she was a virgin; and Amnon thought it hard for him to do anything to her.
3. But Amnon had a friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah, David's brother, and Jonadab was a very subtil man.
4. And he said unto him, why art thou, being the king's son, lean from day to day? Wilt thou not tell me? And Amnon said unto him, I love Tamar, my brother Absalom's sister.
5. And Jonadab said unto him, lay thee down on thy bed, and make thyself sick: and when thy father cometh to see thee, say unto him, I pray thee, let my sister Tamar come, and give me meat, and dress the meat in my sight that I may see it, and eat it at her hand.
6. So Amnon lay down, and made himself sick: and when the king was come to see him, Amnon, said unto the king, I pray thee, let Tamar my sister come, and make me a couple of cakes in my sight, that I may eat at her hand.
7. Then David went home to Tamar, saying, go now to thy brother Amnon's house, and dress him meat.
8. So Tamar went to her brother Amnon's house; and he was laid down. And she took flour, and kneaded it, and made cakes in his sight, and did bake the cake.
9. And she took a pan, and poured them out before him; but he refused to eat. And Amnon said, have out all men from me. And they went out every man from him.
10. And Amnon said unto Tamar, bring the meat into the chamber, that I may eat of thine hand. And Tamar took the cakes

which she had made, and brought them into the chamber to Amnon her brother.

11. And when she had brought them unto him to eat, he took hold of her and said unto her, come lie with me my sister.

12. And she answered him, nay, my brother, do not force me; for no such thing ought to be done in Israel; do not thou this folly.

13. And I, whither shall I cause my shame to go? And as for thee thou shalt be as one of the fools in Israel. Now, therefore, I pray thee, speak unto the king; for he will not withhold me from thee.

14. Howbeit he would not hearken unto her voice: but, being stronger than she, forced her, and lay with her.

15. Then Amnon hated her exceedingly; so that the hatred wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he had loved her. And Amnon said unto her, arise, be gone.

16. And she said unto him, there is no cause; this evil in sending me away is greater than the other that thou didst to me, but he would not hearken unto her.

17. Then he called his servant that ministered to him, and said, put now this woman out from me, and bolt the door after her.

18. And she had a garment of divers colors upon her: For with such robes were the king's daughters that were virgins apparelled. Then his servant brought her out, and bolted the door after her.

19. And Tamar put ashes on her head, and rent her garment of divers colors that was on her, and laid her hand on her head, and went on crying.

20. And Absalom her brother said unto her, hath Amnon, thy brother been with thee? But hold now thy peace, my sister: He is thy brother; regard not this thing. So Tamar remained desolate in her brother Absalom's house.

21. But when King David heard of all these things, he was very wroth.

22. And Absalom spake unto his brother Amnon neither good nor bad; for Absalom hated Amnon, because he had forced his sister Tamar.

23. And it came to pass after two full years, that Absalom had sheepshearers in Baalhazor, which is beside Ephraim: And Absalom invited all the king's sons.

24. And Absalom came to the king and said, behold now, thy servant hath sheepshearers; let the king, I beseech thee, go with thy servant.

25. And the king said to Absalom, nay, my son, let us not all now go, lest we be chargeable unto thee. And he pressed him: howbeit he would not go, but blessed him.

26. Then said Absalom, if not, I pray thee, let my brother Amnon go with us. And the king said unto him, why should he go with thee?

27. But Absalom pressed him, that he let Amnon and all the king's sons go with him.

28. Now, Absalom had commanded his servants, saying, mark ye now when Amnon's heart is merry with wine, and when I say unto you smite Amnon, then kill him, fear not: Have I not commanded you? Be courageous, and be valiant.

29. And the servants of Absalom did unto Amnon as Absalom had commanded.

* * *

There are some frank impressions in connection with the confusing lingo in which those who seek solace in mythology seem to want their literary hash dished up. Amnon wanted to rape his sister. His sister did

not seriously object although she disliked the shame which would go with the rape. She could have been quiet about it, but she was outraged because Amnon was none too well pleased with her and ordered her from his house. According to the impressions given of marriage in those days, permitting her to remain in his house would have constituted marriage and no stigma would have been attached had Amnon permitted his sister to remain.

Such an occurrence—or a similar occurrence—would today bring about a number of reactions. Sociologists—real ones—would understand and would realize that man is still a creature of instincts—some of which revert to the primitive. There are many who cannot conform to the most minor standards of herd. The clergy would yell "sin—terrible sin." Reformers and sanctimonious perverts would cry "scandalous." Hounds of the law would yell "crime." Genuine psychologists, if asked, would label such an affair as having occurred principally because of ignorance. Psychiatrists should say, "Bring all concerned and let us determine who is and who is not sane—or whether all concerned are sane."

Admittedly reading the Bible is a thing much neglected. If parents who admonish their children to read it would but read it themselves they would defer reading on the part of their children until the children were sufficiently well grounded in the various facts of life, and properly instructed in sex science, that they might read anything whatsoever they desired without running the risk of endangering their morals, their health, and their freedom, by reason of reading.

Were the Bible actually read as advocated by radical and other religionists, organized religion would decline, and the Bible might well become that which it is well suited to be—a relic of barbarity. Thus it might find repose in dusty attics with out-of-date magazines and such rubbish as sometimes accumulates in attics. Forgotten or accepted in the same manner and with the same attitude which applies to other mythologies it could do no further harm to the human family.

17. RATIONAL VIEWS AND HUMANISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

Not infrequently we refer to "civilizations" of the past and often many of us wonder why we even speak of civilization in the present age. Perhaps there shall never be such a civilization as the idealist is inclined to visualize. People of the present age may well accept the civilization we have and be content about it. If anyone can build a better mouse trap than someone else and can thereby contribute to the betterment of humanity and the advancement of civilization—let him. If the world wants to make a beaten path to his door—let it. And if someone invents a poison that is better than a mouse trap—let the wise accept it and use it.

If untold millions of people want to cling to the beliefs of magic which were so popular even in these United States not so long ago—let them cling to their magic. After all—it will take other centuries of progress to see superstitions weeded out—and rationality holding sway as does the law of gravity find general acceptance today.

Only a small section of humanity is ready to exercise rationality as against subterfuge, superstition and a retreat into the realm of magic and imagination.

It is true that no shrines have been built to the greatest philosophers who have lived and taught and contributed to the advancement of humanity, and that shrines to the tunes of billions of dollars have been built in honor of the mythical magicians, sorcerers, et al. Philosophers built their own shrines—shrines which will stand yet for thousands of years. Temples to Jehovah and "His Son" and Ghost will crum-

ble to dust or be converted to humanitarian uses—yet the teachings of the great philosophers will remain and be practiced. .

The affairs of adulterous and murderous old King David should have no influence upon civilization today—and there is no doubt a belief that most people have even forgotten that such a man as David is said to have lived.

Those engaged as consulting psychologists, physicians, psychoanalysts, psychiatrists, sexologists—humanists—know that the myths of the Bible still influence the mind of man—and unfavorably. The writer's files can yield not scores, but hundreds of case records which offer mute testimony of the fact mental sufferers are the victims of biblical teachings. And this is true whether there was an abnormal condition of the mind before or after biblical teachings were propounded to the victims.

Persons have asked: How severely will God deal with adulterers—or adulteresses? Many have asked: What *does* the Bible say about homosexuals? Women have gained the idea that intercourse before marriage or outside of marriage is "the unforgivable sin." Men have believed that physical illnesses were a "punishment from God" because they had practiced "Onanism." Onanism as used refers to masturbation (autoeroticism or self-gratification). Marriages have been wrecked because one or both partners to the marriage had been taught and believed that sex and everything pertaining to it is an "unclean and sinful thing." These persons do not stop to realize that sex makes of them either men or women. Even being either man or woman is an unforgivable thing in the minds of many. They believe that they were "conceived in sin," meaning that they regard it as having been sinful for their parents to have indulged in the procreative act which brought them into life.

It would be surprising to members of the general public to even grasp a slight idea that couples living among them suffer mental torture because of fear based on biblical teachings (and church teachings) after every indulgence in sexual congress. Doctors whose particular practices cause their patients to try to "act" normal when with them, have but little idea of how many of their patients seek treatment and advice elsewhere because of their fears and unnecessary inhibitions.

Now and then clergymen shout the name of David—the holy man of God, and point out his shining example of repentance and pleading—his supplications for forgiveness. The average person has but to think for a moment and he or she may know how many times—how many scores of hundreds of times—the names of the great philosophers are heard and read to hearing or reading the name of David, even once.

Some of the acts imputed to the legendary characters of the Bible, although not good, were probaly exemplary for the ages and time they are claimed to have represented.

Old King David once swapped a bunch of Philistine foreskins for a wife—a wife who was already the wife of another man. The biblical reference is brief and much clearer than many other passages.

It will be found in 2 Samuel 3:14 and reads:

> "And David sent messengers to Ishbosheth, Saul's son, saying, Deliver *me* my wife Michal, whom I espoused to me for an hundred foreskins of the Philistines.
>
> "And Ishbosheth sent and took her away from *her* husband, even from Phaltiel—the son of Laish.
>
> "And her husband went with her along behind her, weeping, to Bahurim. Then said Abner to him: Go, return. And he returned."

* * *

Who has ever heard a clergyman weeping with Phaltiel? Ministers and other biblicists read the words with complete stoicism insofar as the losing husband is concerned. With them the important thing is that David, the king and holy man of God, had what he wanted and his commands were obeyed.

Clergymen do not stop to discover that what they are reading about represents other cruelty far greater than the cruelty to Phaltiel—or even David's cruel act in having Uriah, Bathsheba's husband murdered.

In that day and time, if any credence is to be given to legend, foreskins meant identically the same thing that scalps later meant when the North American Indian, resentful at the intrusion of "foreigners" upon his lands (and this often included ravishing his women) scalped the intruders—our forefathers. The Philistine foreskins were "trophies of war" and meant that 100 Philistines had been slain—and this no doubt was a wager between David and Saul.

All in all, David's criminality, his "repentance" and his wearing sackcloth and ashes while "atoning" is reminiscent of the story of a pious man of years ago who had two daughters whom he forbade to have beaux. The daughters had clandestine dates—and their mother favoring them, assisted them. The pious old man went away often for days attending "meetin's." At such times his daughters enjoyed their young men friends normally—always of course, with a weather eye out for "Pa."

When the old fellow would return home he often "stropped" the girls for good measure for fear they had had "courtin' company" in his absence. Now and then the girls ran and at such times their father chased them—old muzzle-loading shot gun in hand. He never even shot near them—they were his field hands. They were his slaves. But as the old man chased the girls he was often led over the roughest routes about the farm—through brushes, briars, bramble vines, over rail fences, and across footlogs. The old fellow often became entangled in the vines, stumbled over the rough terrain, and otherwise wore himself out and returned to his house—put the gun away—and all was calm and forgotten until the next time. In stumbling or falling or being delayed, the pious old creature cursed—and his style was said to go like this: Goddamit, God forgive me, goddamit, God forgive me, etc. Such represented the tactics of David.

Once the girls decided to play a trick on their "Pa" and, removing most of the charge from his muzzle loader, stuffed clay down the muzzle (open) end. At the time of the next chase, the old fellow let out one of his usual "goddamit, God forgive me's" and pulled the trigger. The gun blew up in his face and he forgot to add the forgive me.

Perhaps "Pa" had been studying the story of David rather intently.

There are both men and women today who could easily be persuaded that a concoction of "bitter water," or a sugar-coated pill, for that matter, would tell whether their mates are true to them—sexually. Such persons frequent the places of Gypsy fortune tellers, soothsayers, etc., and wisely, the fakers keep peace.

The writer once attended a "Spiritualist-mediumistic" meeting. The medium was relaying messages from "spirit-land," and from the dead, when her questioners from the audience used the word. She was answering questions. One young man spoke rather timidly to ask a question. "Yes?" inquired the medium. Said the young man, "Well—uh—I gotta girl. She-sa-long way from me." He paused. "Go on," prompted the medium, "what did you want to know?" The young man faltered, "Well-uh-ruh I jist sorta wanted to know—that is—I sorta wonder is she true to me?" The answer came like a flash. "Yes. She's just as true to you as you are to her."

Perhaps, fakers that they are, we can't call all of the soothsayers bad.

At this moment a thoroughly responsible newspaper (as newspapers go) carries a classified advertisement which reads:

METAPHYSICIAN

Unnatural influences. Bad luck. ——— can help you.

* * *

Can anyone say that our present civilization is far removed from the "mystery and magic" of the dark ages? And it's dollars to lemon snaps that the metaphysician bases his magic power to help upon the "Bible."

Years ago a fanatic took a shot at a soap-box orator for making an Atheistic spech. The man was detained by policemen. He missed his mark and police finally persuaded him that "God" was capable of dealing with such men as the orator.

At that same period the writer often learned greater truths concerning life and the universe from the soap-boxers in an hour or two of an evening than he learned about medicine after listening to hours of lectures.

The old biblical characters had their day—they still wield an unhealthy influence over unhealthy people—but the world has no need for worry. A few thousand years hence the various gods of today will either be forgotten or will be treated along with whatever other mythologies which may be preserved as fairy tales to be told to children and others who may find entertainment in them.

Gods may come and gods may go, but mankind will no doubt go on and on.

18. CONCLUSION

A writer, Jack Woodford, has said that there are many ways of writing books. In his bock, "Why Write a Novel," he admonishes, "Write it for the hell of it." He goes on to explain that what he means is that the writing should be done for the fun one gets out of it. Jack maintains that many bad books have been best sellers and that many good books have stuck the publisher and left him holding the well known bag for the expense of publishing and for his pains. He further maintains that books may be written in the "person" most convenient. He explains that books have broken into sex-transmutations without any explanation whatsoever as to how or why the transmutation took place—right in the middle of the book—and that books have been written so that in telling whatever he had to tell the author switched from one person to another from chapter to chapter. It must be admitted that the authors of those books either wrote the books for the hell of it or had a hell of a time getting them written.

All of this reaches a point not of confession—but of admission or acknowledgment of facts.

Admissions, like confessions, call for first person writing.

The material for this book was originally scheduled for three separate books. All of the biblical material dealt with—and much more—involves data with which I have long been familiar. When I got out my Bible and planned the title ideas I thought the writing would be a push-over. Just think of the preacher who can take one little verse as a text and can preach until he has no listeners left—the only reason for their remaining being that they feel that their backs and sitters and the benches are in one piece. As I began reading already familiar stories before beginning to write I could see no reason for repeating "begats, amens, wherefores, etc." to the confusion of my readers. When these were carefully deleted there wasn't anything like the material left I had previously believed there would be. And so—I just included the data meant for other titles in this book.

It is true that I have had a lot of fun writing it. And I hope that my readers will have a lot of fun reading it. No one has fun when he permits his toes to be stepped on. I can read with my toes tucked safely under me. Frankly, 15,000 words have been quite enough for me on

biblical subjects. Lloyd C. Douglass (a minister—active, before he became a writer) wrote a long book about the "Robe" called Christ's Robe. I read the book and I imagine Douglass would have appreciated the fact that I got so many good chuckles out of it. Sholem Asch wrote a long book called "The Apostle." I read that and had a great deal of fun reading it. Both writers were in their element—giving, actually, some interesting historical data—and no doubt enjoying their retreat from reality while writing. Their books were supposedly "history-fiction" books. They were able through the medium of the use of the word fiction, to draw freely on their imaginations. And what imaginations! I admire them for being able to construct so much out of their imaginations.

But this book—well—it certainly isn't based on fact—yet it can't be called exactly fiction. Instead of drawing upon my imagination, however, I have found that I couldn't even imagine the various biblical references as being other than legend—and sometimes the simple word "folklore" seemed to be more applicable. The various references offered a means of comparison. Through their use it was possible to point out what people often think they know about the Bible—yet do not know. People who profess to live according to the Bible would be shocked to know just how they actually *would* live if they did—and the chances are that many would not live long if they and others did actually live according to the Bible. At the same time many of the stories of the Bible are being lived in principle today.

When, for example, the Israelites were ready to depart from Egypt where they had been in bondage, the Lord, through his appointed (they were self-appointed if they were anything at all) representatives, agents and executors, told the Israelites to borrow everything possible they could borrow of the Egyptians. Naturally it was not expected that they would return what they borrowed. And it seems that the worst of it was that the Egyptians from whom they were to borrow were actually their friends—not their oppressors. That little act is repeated often today. It is possible that someone took the pattern from the Bible—yet it is just as possible that many who have borrowed from "neighbors" and then moved on never to return, never heard of the biblical pattern.

Persons desiring to commit adultery are not prompted by the stories in the Bible to do so—they are prompted by their natures, and often by the fact that they are inadequate—or just plainly that they are seeking something which they have failed to find. And no threat of punishment here or hereafter in the Bible would deter them.

Men and women do not commit murder because the Bible gave them a neat pattern and because Jehovah killed right and left—nor do they refrain from committing murder because of anything the Bible says about it.

Conceivably young persons who should be taught the actual truth about sex, but who are left to find out the best way they can—and this is nearly always a poor way and invariably below par to say the least, may, in reading much that is contained in the Bible—get some ideas—and, unfortunately, the wrong ideas.

It is true that biblical sex stories are not set forth in salacious language—yet, the misguided young mind can readily create the salaciousness.

I firmly believe that a book of this kind can be read by young minds to great advantage because I believe firmly and sincerely that it will cause young minds to inquire—because they will be able to see that Bible patterns are not according to civilization—and not up to acceptable social standards—and that the qualities and values of sex and the sexual relations of mankind are not to be found in the Bible.

Older persons—mature persons who have been misguidded by parents and others who professed to be something they were not—and who lived miserably because of false conceptions, may be able to understand

some of the reasons for their own unhappiness after reading the pages of this book, and, in turn, they may pass the advantages gained on to their own young children.

Quite frankly I believe that there was and is a need for this book Letters from hundreds of persons and my replies have indicated a need for such a book. I feel certain that some of the material I have presented has been presented by others—but in their own particular ways, and for this reason I see virtue in the manner of my own presentation. As I wrote it occurred to me that a chapter such as this could have value—that it could stimulate an interest in my readers causing them to re-read the book, and by re-reading, catch ideas, and see reasons which could readily have been passed over lightly in a first reading.

Being thoroughly serious I have had a lot of fun writing every word herein. I have been aware that readers would not all agree with much that I said. Frequently I read a great deal that I do not agree with—yet get a lot of good fun out of reading it—and by no means infrequently do I get a great deal of mental stimulation out of reading that to which I am personally diametrically opposed.

We who live today feel that we live in a great civilization for all its barbarity. Humanitarianism at least outweighs the barbarity. Whether we agree upon the savagery of countless characters depicted in the Bible, we at least agree that we do not need a ride in a "Time Machine" back some 60 centuries ago, in order to find and witness savagery.

For my part, I can take a leisurely stroll about my own community almost any day and at almost any time of day and see a great big mother or father savagely whipping the whey out of a tiny, helpless child. And, at that, most of the people are known as good people who go to church and Sunday school on Sunday to repent and pray and get forgiveness. They take their little children and those who can and cannot read get a lot of cheap pictures of God and Christ and the Patriarchs and the Disciples, with a few angels (just to make the infants want wings), and the parents being forgiven are then ready to start a new week with a clean sheet—a week in which to beat their "younguns" and raise a lot of hell otherwise so that they may go to church again the next Sunday and pray and weep and shout and sing and expand their egoes—so that there'll be no breech in the links of the chains that bind them and their ignorance together.

A HISTORY OF HUMAN MORALS

Volume IV

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Morals Among the Greeks and Romans

Candid Account of Virtue and Vice in the Greco-Roman World

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

Girard, Kansas

Printed in the United States of America

Page

Chapter I. In the Days of Homer and of Sappho 5

(1) Early Greek Life and Character. (2) Sappho and the Greek Troubadours. (3) The Moralists of Ionia.

Chapter II. The Greeks of Italy and Sicily 19

(1) Amongst the Greeks of Sicily. (2) The Puritan and the Sybarite. (3) The Flowering of the Greek Spirit.

Chapter III. Life at Athens in the Golden Age 26

(1) The General Moral Ideal and Conduct. (2) The Greek Sense of Justice. (3) The Question of Sexual Morals. (4) The Vices of the Later Greeks.

Chapter IV. The Collapse of Early Roman Virtue 41

(1) The Earlier Romans. (2) In the Age of Caesar.

Chapter V. The Truth About Imperial Rome 48

(1) The Golden Age. (2) In the Dark Days of Nero. (3) Life and Character Under the Stoics.

Chapter VI. Greco-Roman Character in the Fourth Century 58

(1) The Character of the Christian Emperors. (2) The Last Pagan Gentlemen. (3) A General Impression.

MORALS AMONG THE GREEKS AND ROMANS

CHAPTER I

IN THE DAYS OF HOMER AND OF SAPPHO

CIVILIZATION was three thousand years old when the Greeks began to build large cities and to speculate on the meaning of life and its ideals. During about two thousand years of that time man had made no progress in the solution of his broad moral problem; which is, as we saw in the first book, to extend the friendly influences of normal family life to the larger and larger social groups which were being formed. Whatever exaggeration we may see in Emerson's conception of moral law as the granite rock on which a city is built, we all perceive that character, or perfectly harmonious social behavior, is at least second in importance to the distribution of wealth and power. Yet we find moral ideals and, as far as the evidence goes, moral practices just as high in the Old Kingdom of Egypt or the kingdom of Hammurabi of Babylon as anywhere in the world in the first half of the first millennium before Christ.

In the next millennium, or from 600 B. C. to 400 A. D., which we survey in this book, we find a very resolute effort to solve this moral problem. We find the Greeks, who now lead the race, not only creating a nobler art and literature than had ever before been known, but a higher standard of character and a juster political form: we see them creating the sciences of ethics and politics in which the mind is supposed to search for the most perfect possible forms of personal and collective conduct. But before I give pictures of this creative age in its successive phases let us correct one very common and superficial error.

This Great White Race of which we boast, which we imagine taking up the unsolved problems of the race and applying to them a genius that the older civilizations had lacked, is more responsible than any other race for the slow progress of civilization. The chief reason why one age has not improved steadily on the achievements of its predecessors is the periodic invasion and destruction of the civilized area by vandals. The greater part of these vandals came from Europe. The worst checks on progress were after 1500 B. C. and after 400 A. D. In both cases the setback was due to an overflow of barbarism from the north upon the cultured cities and organized lands of the south. It is true that Arabia was a similar reservoir of barbarism in the south which constantly broke the dams and poured over the cultivated lands, but I have proved in my earlier works that in almost every case, if not every case, the

Semites more quickly adopted the civilization of the lands they entered than did the barbarians of Europe; yet both decidedly started from the same level of barbarism.

If we were to accept the conventional idea of history we should confirm this by adding that the Semites went on to invent the three highest religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, and thus led the race to a higher level. We shall see rather how the whole cosmopolitan civilization of the Greco-Roman world cooperated in solving the moral problems to which the ancient Middle Age, which I described in the last book, gave rise. As to the causes of the vandalism of the Greeks and other European invaders of civilization—I need not repeat here how the Cretan civilization was completely ruined and the Hittite and other older civilizations were checked by a heavy downpour of barbarism from the north—I will add only one consideration to those I have given in the Key. The sharpest contrast between the two areas from which barbarians issued, Europe and Arabia, was that Europe was almost one mighty forest teeming with game and its peoples were essentially hunters, killers, or fighters. Their environment created or emphasized in them the aggressive, destructive, combative impulses of the hunting stage of the race. Although the Greeks had reached the pastoral stage before they left the region of the Danube for the shores of the Mediterranean, this may help us to understand how they almost completely annihilated the high civilization they encountered, and how for many centuries they were content with a half-barbaric life amongst the great relics of the past.

The framework of the history of Greece and Rome will not be repeated here, though in this chapter I will give sketches of the life of the Greeks in the two chief early periods: about 1000 B. C., the semi-barbaric age which is generally called the Heroic Age, and about 600 B. C., when the glorious advance begins. After that I will mainly concern myself with Athens, as the Greek world spreads so wide that it will be more instructive to have a full picture of life in the chief city. This will, perhaps, enable us, especially when we have made a similar study of life and character in Rome, to answer questions which, in spite of our vast and critical literature about Greece and Rome, are still acridly discussed. For nearly two hundred years, since the classical revival and the growth of skepticism in the eighteenth century, men have disputed whether the Christian religion improved upon the moral ideal of the Greeks and Romans, and in particular whether the Greeks and Romans were less moral in conduct than Christians. We argue about it still just as Jefferson argued with his correspondents a century and a half ago. I have in earlier works given a good deal of evidence in connection with sexual conduct, but I propose here to make a full and careful inquiry on that and all other points of moral conduct and give the reader a satisfactory mental picture of how the Greeks and Romans really lived: how far they were like, and how far unlike, us.

As we now reach an age of which we have extensive literary remains and have not, as in the two previous books, to depend on the fragmentary material of the archaeologist, it ought to be possible to

form a reasonable opinion, but unfortunately the old prejudice is still active, even when the writer is anxious to avoid prejudice. A few years ago, for instance, the University of Illinois published a very useful inquiry by Professor Rachel L. Sargent into the extent of slavery at Athens ("The Size of the Slave Population at Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Before Christ," 1925). The author not only rejected the excessive figures given in one ancient writer, as I have done, but she is quite caustic about modern writers who accept them. Incidentally, however, she, in estimating the number of slave-children, refers to "the great license and corruption" at Athens, and for authority refers us to Xenophon (Pol. Ath. I, 11, and Oec. IX, 5). Now in the first of these passages Xenophon does not refer at all to sexual morals. He complains that the slaves at Athens are "uppish," and the reason he gives is rather complimentary: no one dare strike them because they dress and behave like free men and you cannot distinguish one from the other. Professor Sargent cannot possibly have looked up Xenophon herself. In the second passage Xenophon merely says that an Athenian took precautions to prevent immorality in his house; he does not say or suggest that there was great license at Athens. Thus, through the usual defect of specialism, an American university gives totally wrong academic sanction to the popular belief in the wickedness of the Greeks.

Another instance I take from an older but still excellent book, of which I have made considerable use in these chapters. The Rev. Professor Mahaffy, a very good Greek scholar, opens his book ("Social Life in Greece"—mainly on morals) with a surprisingly high estimate of the Greeks. I will quote it in a later chapter and say here only that after he had made their ideals **almost** (one could hardly expect more than this from a clergyman) equal to the Christian he attempts to tell us in what respects they were inferior. It is significant that he does not say in regard to sex. He finds first that "the general public of ancient Greece did not approach so nearly to the enlightenment of its intellectual leaders as our modern public does": which is rather foolish, since he admits that it is mainly the invention of printing that has made the difference. He is then left with only one inferiority on the side of the Greeks: certain "cruelties and barbarities in violent conflict with the humanity of a Socrates, a Euripides, or a Plato" which are found in "the ordinary life of Athens." I look carefully through his learned book for these cruelties and barbarities in the ordinary life of Athens, and I find that the only instances he gives are cruelties perpetrated (generally by the Spartans) in the course of a long and extremely bitter war—cruelties, moreover, that were, as he admits, habitual in the Christian Middle Ages—and all before the year 400 B. C.; and that Professor Mahaffy actually devotes several pages, apropos of the execution of Socrates, to showing how far more humane the law of Athens was in 399 B. C. than the penal law of any nation in the world even today! If a high authority and a warm admirer of the Greeks can be so influenced by the convention of the superiority of Christianity, we know what to expect in less liberal and less scholarly writers.

§1. EARLY GREEK LIFE AND CHARACTER

The first phase of Greek civilization, over which we need not linger, was the extension of the Cretan civilization to the men of the New Stone Age who lived in Greece, and the rise of a moderate native civilization, closely following that of Crete, with centers (Mycenae, etc.) all over southern Greece. I have described it in the Key. Upon this "bronze civilization," about or after 1500 B. C., poured the iron-armed Achaeans, or early Greeks, from the north, and by 1200 B. C. they had sacked and burned all civilized towns in the region, from Crete to Troy. But the massive ruined palaces with their richly painted walls, their superb gold and bronze vessels, their beautiful pottery and woven fabrics, and the wares of Egypt and Syria which the Phoenicians now brought for the purpose of trade, stirred them from their primitive pastoral barbarism. I explained, however, that the exceptionally mountainous character of Greece prevented them from uniting as the Egyptians and Babylonians did, and that this and the constant inroads of fresh barbarians kept them for several centuries unprogressive.

Thus about the year 1000 B. C., and for a couple of centuries before and after it, Greek civilization was at the low level so realistically described in Homer. No doubt when the poet (or poets) actually wrote, in the ninth century, some progress had been made, but old songs and stories had, as is usual where there is no literature, so well preserved the recollection of the older life that the picture corresponds in a remarkable degree to the life which we disinter from the palaces and graves of Mycenae and other old sites. Scores of petty kings raised their rude stone palaces in every area where the soil washed from the barren hills provided a rich pasture, and they were the high priests, the war-lords, and (to some extent) the judges of their people. Gold was abundant from the previous civilization, but it was a heavy and primitive life that they led for centuries, though not without some refinement from the civilization they had conquered. The banquets consisted of prodigious and monotonous quantities of flesh (very rarely fish) of the ox, sheep, and goat, with mounds of bread and an excellent sweet wine; yet guests washed their hands before a meal and sat down to carefully cleaned wooden tables in the great hall. Nor was there much drunkenness, which the Greeks in all ages condemned. Even in the Homeric age the wine was tempered with water.

I am chiefly concerned here with moral features, and they were simple. It is not quite true that, as some writers say, the religion was entirely indifferent to morals. Homer repeatedly makes his princes exclaim that the gods require some duty of them, as when Nestor, mindful of the duty of hospitality to his guests, exclaims to them:

> "Zeus and the other immortals forbid that you should leave me and go to your ships as if I were a man short of clothing, or poor, who had no wrappers or rugs for himself and his guests to sleep in comfortably."

Justice is, however, rarely made a command of the gods at this stage, though there is a passage in the Odyssey in which the poet speaks of the floods which Zeus sometimes sends to destroy unjust traders. The truth is that the gods are in Homer exceedingly faulty from the moral viewpoint. They are jealous, vindictive, and quarrelsome. They cheat and lie, and are often cruel. They are not supposed to have, whether married or no, any restraint on their sexual impulses. It is, perhaps, wrong to say that the gods themselves are immoral and set a divine example of immorality. The gods are not imagined as subject to a law which binds mortals; and this seems to me to bring out clearly the conception of duty or obligation as a social and human obligation only. The Greek has as yet very imperfectly extended the domestic law to the social group. The father is master in the home, but even if he suffers injustice from another he must himself get satisfaction, generally a payment of money. There is no written law, nothing in the nature of police or judiciary; except that appeal may be made to the king. There is in other words a strong sense of obligation within the family—and a generally excellent family life—a fairly strong sense of duty (hospitality, mutual aid, etc.) to the neighbor, but no idea of a general moral law or of duty to a human being as such. As Botsford says in his "Hellenic History": "Their moral progress, whatever it was, must be attributed to purely human effort." He adds that, while lying was common and not regarded seriously, there were "remarkably few crimes" considering the absence of a public authority.

So far we see moral ideas developing on the lines which I described in the first volume: the very imperfect new social order is forming its rules of behavior or extending the rules of domestic behavior to the larger groups. The most recent book on Greek moral ideas, F. R. Earp's "Way of the Greeks" (1929), entirely agrees at this stage. The Homeric Greeks, he says, had no general idea of a moral law. In fact, he says, until the fifth century the only thing that disposed the Greek to behave morally to a man who was not of his own community was his vague sense of "decency": which I take to mean that he was beginning to feel vaguely that what applied to the smaller social group applied also in some way to all humans (except enemies) with whom he had relations. This is a familiar moral development, and I need not do more than add a word about woman and sex.

Beyond saying that sexual misconduct seems as such to be passed rather indifferently by Homer—it is the human and social mischief wrought by Helen's adventure that makes it evil—we can gather little about the subject. It is unnecessary. The despotic father would, as in early Rome, see that his wife and daughters were "chaste," and this restricted his own conduct, since other fathers did the same. He would acknowledge no harm in relations with slaves or such public women as existed; and they must have been very few. We may be tempted to think that the mass of the people, the agricultural workers, were freer, but even in early Greece, the common man had a certain personality which he lacked in the

oriental world. The king and his council settled public matters, but any decision of importance had to be put before all the men of the community. The king summoned them for a certain day, and at dawn they made their way to the open-air assembly. They had no right to argue or object, but, if they kept silent when the king announced his decision, their disapproval was noted.

We are not surprised to find that the position of woman was good. The women of the higher minority chose their husbands, sat in the great hall with them, and moved about freely. They even ruled in the absence of the husband. A man received a dowry with his wife instead of paying for her. We can see here the influence of the cult of the mother-goddess which permeated the land before the Greeks brought their Olympian deities. There was at this stage none of that inferiority or seclusion of woman which would later cause much trouble in Athens. We see traces, too, that there was still much phallic religious sentiment in Greece, but as far as we can see, it did no more than lend a certain consecration to the familiar license of the agricultural festivals.

§2. SAPPHO AND THE GREEK TROUBADOURS

In an interesting work on "Asianic Elements in Greek Civilization" (1927) Sir William Ramsay, who is a high authority on the older civilizations of Asia Minor, tells how a Cretan sage and reformer, Epimenides, came to Athens about the year 500 B. C., found it in a most deplorable confusion, and stimulated the citizens to set up an orderly civilization. The story forcibly reminds us how backward the Greeks of the mainland remained and how even Athens depended on impulses from without. For the Athenian writers themselves always generously acknowledged their debt to Epimenides. They had almost such veneration for him as the Chinese had for Kung-fu-tse; in fact, they adorned his memory with miracles, saying that he lived on food that was brought to him by the nymphs so that he was not even troubled with the same evacuations as other people. A large part of his work was religious reform. He was a high type of Pantheist—it is from him that Paul, knowing how he was revered, quotes "In him we live, and move, and have our being" —and he tried to get the Greeks to feel, as Ramsay says, that whether or no Zeus and his divine family lived on Olympus, they were always in the presence of God. But, while he taught them to pray for health, he attended carefully to their sanitary and social conditions. He brought the first science to Athens: he was to the Athenians what Roger Bacon would be to the Middle Ages.

The story opens up to us the real stages of development of Greek ideals from the crudeness of the Homeric age to the brilliance of later Athens. Roger Bacon, we know, invented nothing: he brought the science of the Arabs to the ignorant English and French. So Epimenides merely brought to the Athenians the wisdom that their Greek cousins in other lands had learned and developed. I told briefly in the Key how it was the dispersal of the Greeks over the Mediterranean that led them at last to the path of progress. On the mainland, severed into small homogenous groups by the

mountain screens, undisturbed in their blind adherence to old religious traditions and codes, they made very slow progress. But the later immigrants had found the fertile plains and valleys occupied and had passed oversea. Indeed Greece itself, which is so largely barren, was already overpopulated, and from the stress of the economic conditions men were escaping over the blue waters of the Mediterranean, just as in the nineteenth century the surplus population of Europe fled across the Atlantic when the news of the vast free plains of America reached them. These Greeks, mingling with men of alien races and very different ideas, often settling as modest pupils in cities that were already ancient instead of coming as destructive conquerors, are the men who reverently gathered the wisdom of the older civilizations, gave it a new vitality and original development, and achieved those advances in thought and art which would make possible the Golden Age of Athens. I propose here to fill out this short sketch by an account of a few of the chief phases.

Ramsay confirms what I said when he writes that "the true source [for the Greeks] of almost every branch of literature and science and the earliest great names in every department belongs to the cities and colonies of the Old Ionians," but there is an earlier phase before we turn to the great moralists of those cities of Asia Minor which we describe as Ionian. A glance at the map will show that from the country to the north of Greece a migrating tribe would most naturally look to Asia Minor, and we saw in the last book that western Asia Minor was already civilized by Hittites, Cretans, Phrygians and Lydians. A line of cities extended along its beautiful coast and spread their culture over the islands; and into these, partly by force and partly by peaceful submission, the Greeks found their way. The central part of the coast received the Ionian Greeks, but north of them and on the large island of Lesbos were their Aeolian cousins, and here occurred the first notable advance.

Science, ethics, and philosophy were born in Ionia, but this stage of profound thought is always preceded by a naive, joyous, artistic period, and this we find amongst the Greeks of Lesbos and the northern coast. The troubadours, the great lyric poets of Greece, heralded the general advance. Here at least we can invoke the stimulating environment. There is hardly a fairer region in the world than this of the island-dotted Aegaean Sea, and to a new race just rising to the refined perceptions and sensibilities of civilization it must have seemed enchanting. It is probable that Homer, or the anonymous poets who wove the old chants into the Iliad and Odyssey, lived in the region. It was there at least, on the island of Lesbos, that the famous Sappho and other of the great lyric poets lived. I am not concerned here with their art and will say only that Sappho was admittedly the finest woman poet who ever lived. Indeed so good a judge as Swinburne pronounced her "the very greatest poet that ever lived."

But the moral reputation of Sappho suggests a world which is decidedly interesting from our present viewpoint. We saw, in fact,

that the peoples who initiated these Greeks to civilization were far from puritanical and were great lovers of luxury and sensuous pleasure. By the end of the seventh century, when Sappho lived, the Greeks equalled them in prosperity and the arts of life, and the city of Mytilene, in which Sappho spent most of her life, was radiant and wealthy. Her family was rich and noble, and the "peculiar and unmistakable perfume" of her verse is only the masterly expression of the joy of her race in their beautiful world and the emotions it inspires. Professor D. M. Robinson, of Johns Hopkins University, in one of the best recent studies of Sappho ("Sappho and Her Influence," 1925) quotes A. Symonds's description of the Aeolian Greeks of Lesbos. They poured into individual emotions, he says, all the energy that the Ionian and other Greeks gave to politics and trade and thinking. In a land of flowering vales and picturesque headlands rising from the blue water, drenched during most of the year with brilliant sunshine, their life rose to a "flame of passion" and a "furnace of sensuality." And in the case of Sappho and Lesbian women generally, Symonds and others conclude from her passionate poems to her girl-friends, this ardor took the form of homosexual love.

It is a pity that writers on sex, who never fail to put Sappho in the chapter on sexual inverts and often speak of "Lesbian love," do not more carefully ascertain that there is very little ground in Greek literature for this belief; that there is much that is strongly opposed to it; and that the great majority of modern authorities on Sappho or on Greek life reject it. Professor Robinson emphatically denies that her poetry lends any color to the suggestion. "The moral purity of Sappho shines in its own light," he says, and her verse is "never erotic." He gives a translation of what most authorities regard as a genuine poem which she addressed to her brother and was not discovered until recent times. Her brother had gone to Egypt, with which the Lesbians traded, and was squandering his fortune on a beautiful courtesan—not an Egyptian, by the way—whom he had met there. Sappho actually scolds him for his "sin" and "shame," and implores him to find some lady whom he may wed "with worthy rites." Professor Gilbert Murray agrees, and he says that Lesbian women were much respected, not charged with vice. Botsford in one of the best recent histories of Greece considers that modern scholars have quite disproved the old legend: which, I may say, though started by an erotic poet, Ovid, is mainly due to the bias and puritanism of early Christian writers.

I leave the personal question open. Sappho, it seems, married and had several children, but, possibly being left a widow, she then concentrated her passionate affection on girl-friends. She founded a sort of club or "sorority" of the women of her city, and even of distant cities, and many of them cultivated poetry. The busts which are supposed to represent Sappho show, if genuine, that, contrary to the charge of one of her ancient libellers that she was "an ugly little woman," she had that type of beauty which one instinctively calls—though it seems incongruous in this case—masculine: the type

that the Athenians gave to Athens. Lesbos was famous for its beautiful women and beauty-contests. Whether a woman of the passionate intensity of Sappho, who had, at the time she wrote, only girl friends, was likely to indulge in such practices must be left to one's general experience of life. There is nothing in her poetry—I take it that the poem to her brother is early—to prevent us from thinking it, but the common idea that the poems glorify homosexual love and that Lesbians were notorious for it is false.

What we do learn from her poetry, taken in conjunction with that of Alcaeus and other lyrists, is that the Aeolians were highly civilized, prosperous, and sensuous by the year 600 B. C. I have called them the troubadours, the heralds of the great Greek civilization, and their age is often compared to that of the European troubadours. Historians might add the parallel that, just as the troubadours of the Middle Ages merely borrowed the joyous art of the Arabs, so the Aeolians learned from their neighbors in Asia Minor. But we must realize that these early Greeks were far more advanced than the Europeans of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Constant communication with Sardis and other ancient cities and with every part of the old world by means of their great merchant fleet gave them every luxury of the time. I have no doubt that there was much sexual freedom amongst them. All over the Greek world at this time the old standards of life were challenged, and in so bouyant and sensuous a world one would expect this to lead to a refined license. But there is no documentary evidence of the extent of the license, and the particular charge that is brought against the Lesbians is false.

I am afraid that my discussion of Greek sexual morals will very largely take this form of merely disproving charges, but the reader will probably find it useful. What I want to make clear is that the common talk about "the great license and corruption" of the Greeks, which always implies that they were much more immoral than the Christian Greeks who came after them, is a very confused idea, often based upon definite charges, such as this against Sappho, that modern experts reject. There has been "great license and corruption" in every age. There is in London or New York today. There was in Rome and Antioch when they became Christian. The only question of interest is whether there was more, or much more, before the world became Christian than afterwards. We cannot prove it; and the fluency with which some writers try to decide this when, in spite of all the periodicals and statistics we now publish, they could not in the least say whether London today is more wicked than New York, or Minneapolis more virtuous than Pittsburg, ought to be a warning to their readers. Let me, before we leave this brilliant Aeolian world, give one more illustration how the confused ideas of people about ancient Greece are formed.

Professor Mahaffy is, as I said, one of the chief writers on Greek morals, and, though a cleric, he is a great admirer of the Greeks. He first says that during this lyric age there was, in the Greek world generally, a great deal of "moral turpitude." As I said, such phrases are useless, for there is in every age. It is a question

of extent. However, when Mahaffy comes to examine the passages of the lyric poets which sing the praise of wine and love, he candidly says that they show "a moral attitude which is about the same as that of average society in our own day"; and he adds that these Greeks "would have hated the heavy pomp and stupid sameness of our large dinner parties." He goes on to tell us that one of the lyrics that was most popular amongst the Greek women of Asia Minor was about a maiden of "the greatest purity and modesty": that another very popular poem on women, by Simonides, shows "a heartfelt and earnest praise of the virtuous woman"; and that a third was the poem in which Sappho rebukes a man (Mahaffy thinks the man is the poet Alcaeus, but he is now recognized to be her brother) for living with a courtesan. In short, the outcome of Mahaffy's analysis of this age (which Symonds finds "a furnace of unbridled passion") is that his charge of sexual license wholly disappears, and we have only a charge of cowardice, untruthfulness, and dishonesty. My reader will at least see how very precarious is the ground for all the fluent talk about Greek vice.

§3. THE MORALISTS OF IONIA

We may feel justified in concluding that the Aeolian Greeks who produced this wonderful lyric poetry, living in great prosperity and joy in a colonial and cosmopolitan world, witnessed a good deal of sexual liberty, but we have no positive evidence that it was as extensive as in the age of chivalry in Europe. But we have further to consider that Lesbos was a very small part of the Greek world. Lower down the coast, at the same time, was the Greek city of Ephesus where the priestesses of Artemis were, as we saw in the last book, strictly held to a vow of virginity. Now which of these two, the voluptuous Aeolian or the chastity-enforcing Ionian, is "the typical Greek"? On the Greek mainland there were other virgin-priestesses, rigorously held to their vows, at Delphi and other places, yet there were temple-prostitutes at Corinth. In Italy, in the same district, one great Greek city was so terribly virtuous, under the influence of Pythagoras, and another so terribly vicious (it has given us the word Sybarite), that they went to war to settle the matter. It is quite time we realized that there was no "typical Greek," any more than there is a typical American. In one and the same person, in fact, the Greek could be very sensuous and very intellectual. He was the severest thinker and the finest artist of the old world: the most cultivated man the world had yet seen but the first scientist, the best athlete and the best politician, and probably second to none in trade and finance.

Thus if we seem now to turn from the frivolous Aeolian Greeks of the cities of the northern part of this coast of Asia Minor to the virgin priestesses and famous sages of the Ionian cities let us be on our guard against these superficial generalizations. Probably if we had lived in the year 600 B. C. and sailed from Mytilene, the capital of Lesbos, to Ephesus, we should not have noticed much difference in the mass of the people. We are apt to underrate the intercommunication of the different parts of this ancient world. The requirements of the cattle and corn trade and the transport of armies had

put such pressure on the designers and builders of ships that they produced far larger vessels than most people imagine. It has been estimated that the ship in which Paul and nearly three hundred others, with water and provisions for several weeks, sailed for Rome (Acts, ch. xxvii) must have been a vessel of at least 4000 tons, and there must have been larger ships. Some had bath-rooms, lounges, and libraries. An immense fleet of these vessels plied between the ports of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Asia Minor, the Greek islands, Greece, south Italy, and Carthage by the year 600. The Aegaean region had become the most stimulating and cosmopolitan area in the world. The ideas as well as the wares of every country were known to every man in every city. Wharves and streets were thronged with foreigners, and travelers came in repeatedly with tales of the wonders and diversities of the older lands.

We must remember, too, that Ionia was just as much as, or even more than, Aeolia rooted in an old tradition of the dominance of woman and the cult of the mother-goddess. Its chief cities, the Greeks said, had been founded by the Amazon priestesses of Ma. Ramsay gives an amusing illustration of the way in which the ancient phallic cult found its way into Greek and Christian literature and even into modern life. Few would suspect any connection between "the scales of justice," St. Thecla, and the old feminism of Phrygia, yet it seems certain. Thecla is supposed to have been a virgin of one of the cities of Asia Minor who was converted by St. Paul and had a series of weird adventures in protecting her virginity from the pagans before she was martyred. The name is really taken from a mountain called Takali (originally Tekla), and this is one of a pair of mountains that figured on coins and looked, as their peaks floated in the air, like the scales of a balance suspended from the skies. Tekla was the spirit of the mountains and closely connected with the scales of justice; and an early Christian sect adopted the cult of her and made it the basis of a zeal for virginity. Later the Church adopted it and turned its symbolism into a series of the wildest historical statements about Thecla, the virgin friend of St. Paul.

Feminism was so deep-rooted in phallic Asia Minor that, when Paul imposed his dour view of woman on the Church, more than one heretic of Asia Minor, even of the ascetic school, attacked it. One of the most learned advocates of woman's equal right to culture was Tatianus, a Gnostic of the second century, and a Syrian ascetic. Another famous heretic of the second century, Montanus, had women prophetesses (virgin priestesses) in his church, though his teaching was so ascetic that it was the creed of the somber Tertullian. Montanus was a Phrygian. The spirit of Ma and the Amazons still whispered from the land to every body of Europeans that entered it and sought to protect women from the degradation that was coming upon her. From the Persian world, which would presently rise to power, the shadow of the harem would stretch over Greece. From Judea, with its damnable story of a curse brought upon the race by woman, a still darker shadow would extend over Europe. But neither form of corruption had yet reached the west, and in the

splendid cities of Ionia and the Greek world generally woman was still free and honored.

It is by no means so easy to trace how the ethic of the sex-relation was transformed. Swinburne magnificently expresses the popular belief, that the Greco-Roman world fought for sexual license against the advance of Christianity, when he imagines it thus addressing Christ:

> "Not as thine, not as thine, was our mother, a blossom of flowering seas,
> Clothed round with the world's desire as with raiment and fair as the foam,
> And fleeter than kindled fire, and a goddess, and mother of Rome.
> For thine came pale, and a maiden, and sister to sorrow: but ours,
> Her deep hair heavily laden with odor and color of flowers,
> White rose of the rose-white water, a silver splendor of flame.
> Bent down unto us that besought her, and earth grew sweet with her name."

It is a magnificent conception, but unhistorical. We have already abundantly seen that the Ma and Cybele of Asia Minor were being transformed into sacred virgins long before the time of Christ. Some of the older Hittite shrines, which had had thousands of women and eunuchs, had no prostitution. Sardis, which was to these Greeks what Babylon was to all Mesopotamia, may have had its gay pleasure-park, but it also had a sacrament of marriage. We saw this in Phrygia, and Ramsay finds it general in western Asia Minor. I suggest, in order to reconcile the apparent contradictions, that while the majority still held their religion of love lightly, an earnest minority regarded human marriage as a counterpart of the Divine Marriage of their mythology and therefore a sort of sacrament. The union of this element with the Greek idea of the chaste Artemis gave rise at Ephesus, as we saw, to the purest conception of the mother-goddess. Her temple was a vast nunnery, like the contemporary nunneries of India and of Egypt. It is enough that this change was proceeding many centuries before the birth of Christ.

We have very much clearer evidence, apart from sex, of an important moral element coming into Greek life through contact with Asia Minor. "'Friend of All' was a phrase taken up by the Christians but was of pagan origin," says Ramsay. In other words, the law of brotherly love was passed on to the Greeks of Asia Minor by the Lydians and Phrygians, and it was esteemed in the entire region in which Christianity would take shape many centuries later. This we learn from the epitaphs and inscriptions that have been disinterred. "Friend of All" is one of the most common compliments paid to the dead. Possibly it is often a pious exaggeration, but it shows the most esteemed ideal, the Golden Rule. The Greeks of the mainland were, we saw, very narrow in their ideas of their relation

to strangers, but in Ionia they adopted the wider brotherliness of the older civilization. Lydia, we saw in the last book, had a great trade, and pilgrimages to the various shrines of Asia Minor would be frequent. On the other hand, inns were few and poor, and hospitality to the stranger became a national virtue.

We have in this general esteem of benevolence in Asia Minor not only an important contribution to the larger moral ideal that was forming, as the growth of trade and travel and the complex mixture of races made the region more and more cosmopolitan, but we have also the source of the unions of workers of the Greek and Roman world which would later inspire the gilds of the Middle Ages. In the Lydian and Phrygian inscriptions, or in those of western Asia Minor generally, we find constant reference to "brotherhoods." Benevolence was the common ideal, but loving one's neighbor as oneself in a large social group has never been more than a pretty ideal. The family-feeling, which is the ultimate source of genuine moral sentiment, was best extended by this formation of brotherhoods, under religious patronage, and the most natural line for the development to take was to unite the workers of a particular craft in brotherly associations. There were now large industries in the Ionian cities. Miletus was famous for its fine and brilliantly colored embroidered woolen goods, Mytilene (in the island of Lesbos) for metal-work, and so on. No doubt the workers often moved about, and hospitality would be offered to them by their own craft-brotherhood. Such hospitality was, we saw in the last book, a very old virtue of Syria and Asia Minor, where some of the sacred cities had a perfect organization for welcoming and housing pilgrims. Sappho's sisterhood seems to have been inspired by this model.

We can thus fairly well trace the growth of a new and larger social ideal in the special conditions in which the Ionian civilization developed. The rapid development outran the ideal in some ways, as always happens. The new industrialists, now fully athirst for wealth, felt the shortage of labor, or wanted cheaper labor, and slavery was greatly extended. The shippers of Chios, especially, made raids along the shores of the Black Sea and brought cargoes of men to the market of Ephesus and Miletus. As the Christian civilization of America met its needs even more brutally, we have not much to say; but we shall see later that slaves were not badly treated in Greece, and the moralists came to denounce the institution.

My readers will now, in the light of what I said in the last book and what we have seen in this section, fully understand why, as I briefly stated in my history section of the Key to Culture, all the early thinkers of Greece arose in these coast-cities of Asia Minor. The men whose names are still honored as the founders of science and philosophy were middle-class men of this new Ionian civilization. The isolation from the main body of the Greeks and the contact with men of half a dozen different civilizations fostered the spirit of independence and criticism: the stimulating new conditions, the fertile and beautiful world in which they had settled and the rapid prosperity of their cities, gave them mental vitality

and originality. They were able to smile at the legends of Egypt and Babylonia, to argue about kings and gods, life and nature, as no generation had argued before; unless there was something of the kind in the lost literature of Phoenicia, which is more than possible.

I have dealt with these men (Thales and his successors) as scientists and philosophers elsewhere, and need say here only that they reflected just as deeply on the laws of life as on the meaning of nature. In every city of the coast and on the nearer islands, there were by the middle of the sixth century B. C. very large schools of thinkers and their pupils, and, while some worked out a sober and sound code of social conduct, others gave their pupils a quite ascetic code and despised sensual pleasure. Anaximander of Miletus, who wrote about the middle of the sixth century, held a monotheistic philosophy which in its ethic is as severe as that of Buddha, to which it is often compared. Almost contemporary with him was Xenophanes of Colophon, another famous coast-city of Asia Minor, and Heraclitus of Ephesus, two of the highest-minded moralists as well as most independent thinkers on philosophy and religion. At the opposite fringe of the Greek world, in Italy, was in the same period Pythagoras, whose stern moral code and system of spiritual philosophy are well known. But Pythagoras was an Ionian Greek, born in the island of Samos. How he came to develop what we might call a Pauline ethic six hundred years before Paul was born, and how it spread through the Greek world and eventually came to Athens, we shall understand better if we devote a short chapter to the western wing of the Greek civilization.

CHAPTER II

THE GREEKS OF ITALY AND SICILY

HISTORIANS frequently protest against the popular idea that ancient Greece means just the city of Athens and a few much less brilliant and less interesting city-states. I corrected that idea in the historical section of the Key, and in the later volumes of that series I enlarged on the very important part played in the development of Greek culture by the Greek communities outside Greece proper. What the historian calls "Greater Greece" extended from the cities of Asia Minor, at which we have glanced, to Sicily and south Italy, and it is in the colonial fringes of this world that most progress was made from 750 to 500 B. C., when, as we saw, a colonial Greek or Cretan sage set Athens on the upward path. From our present viewpoint a study of the settlements overseas is particularly interesting.

We saw that the physical condition of Greece itself goes a long way toward explaining why it broke into a hundred democratic communities instead of forming a single powerful monarchy. The core of the land is a vast mountain range on which the eagle nests even today, and the plains and cultivable valleys at the feet of its massive bulk are separated by spurs of the hills. But while this smallness of the isolated communities helps us to understand how they got rid of their petty kings, the isolation also led to a strong conservatism in regard to religious and social traditions. Naturally by the seventh century, when navigation was fully developed, the Greeks of the mainland were in constant communication with their brothers across the seas, but it will easily be understood that the latter, dispersed amongst alien and in some cases higher races, had a greater freedom and a stronger impulse to innovate. While, therefore, we must understand that this advance abroad reacted on life in Greece and there were internal reasons for disturbances, it was in the far larger and richer cities of the colonial world that tradition broke down first, and thoughtful men were stimulated to work out new codes of life.

§1. AMONGST THE GREEKS OF SICILY

From the remarks I made about shipping it will be gathered that ship-building was almost the most advanced of the mechanical arts of the ancient world, and it was an easy sail from impoverished or overpopulated parts of Greece to south Italy and Sicily. Descriptions of Greece itself are apt to be so florid that few readers will appreciate the joy and wonder of the Greeks when they discovered this Italian region. It was, of course, not virgin soil. The Cretans had known it for ages, and the Phoenicians and Carthaginians had followed in their tracks. But when the Greeks began to arrive, in

the eighth century, the large and beautiful island was still in the possession of the half-barbaric Sikels, who have given it its name, and these the Greek adventurers conquered and dominated. Syracuse was founded by colonists from Corinth as early as 734 B. C. But we will omit history. By the fifth century, when the Carthaginians began a serious rivalry, there was a splended Greek civilization on the island. The soil seemed marvelously rich and fertile after the meager valleys and bleak hill-sides of Greece. The natives were employed to wrest from it the vast quantities of grapes and olives and corn which left a handsome surplus for trade with Carthage (which had little agricultural land), and to rear the great flocks of sheep that provided stores of wool to the trade with Greece and Asia Minor. Syracuse, Acragas, and other cities had vast and prosperous populations at a time when no city of Greece yet had more than forty thousand people.

Life seems here to have been as free and gay as in Aeolia, and, though we have only scanty information about it, we quite understand it. The Greeks had brought with them a mythology that had, as we saw, very little to do with morals, and even this mythology now lost its sway over the educated men of the cities. We have had in modern times so much experience of colonization and pioneering that we know well how it is apt to lead to demoralization. The Greeks of Sicily had long passed this early stage of confusion, and the requirements of city-life had compelled them to realize the importance of social rules. All these developments would be profoundly interesting from the ethical viewpoint if we had full information about them. We should see a body of men like the Sicilian Greeks actually formulating for themselves, since moralists had not yet arrived and no ethical religion was brought to them, a moral-social law. It entirely confirms our theory that it is purely a question of meeting social needs when we find in all these cases that the only moral respect in which the ideal or the conduct of the community seems to the modern historian defective is in regard to sex: that is to say, the sexual law, not being social, does not get the same recognition as the law of justice or benevolence.

We have not a good description of life in Syracuse, and it was not until the third century B. C. that it sheltered such men as the famous Archimedes, but it was no doubt quite similar to life in the city of Acragas (now Girgenti), which at one time had two hundred thousand citizens. Its most illustrious citizen about the middle of the fifth century was Empedocles, a philosopher who attempted to combine the science of the Ionians (including evolution) with a mysticism of his own. Acragas was so proud of its sage that it offered to make him ruler, but he was too sincere a democrat to accept such a position. This civic esteem of a strict and high-minded moralist, the type of man who might get five hundred people to listen to him in one of our modern cities, suggests at first sight a remarkable general appreciation of virtue, yet you will often read only that the sage lashed the Sicilian Greeks for their vices, and you may even read the ridiculous old legend that he flung himself into the volcanic crater of Mount Etna.

We are again warned to check very carefully all these references to the "moral turpitude" of the Greeks. Freeman has collected in his large "History of Sicily" all the charges against its inhabitants at this time, and he remarks that "we hear more of splendor in the way of dress and furniture than of actual excess of any kind." There was much wine-drinking, for the vineyards of the land were gloriously fruitful, and there was certainly, in spite of the Greek practice of putting water in their wine, some drunkenness. I find even Mahaffy, who knew modern Greece well, explaining that, though it was usual in ancient Greece to have two parts of water to three of wine, the wine was, and is, so strong that they easily got drunk, though not more frequently than men do in a modern city. Well, I have in modern Athens drunk a pint and a half of the best wine at one meal without putting a drop of water in it. We may assume that there was, as there is today in Sicily, little drunkenness except at banquets. The rich kept great stores of wine. One man had such a reservoir of it that people said that this alone was enough to bring the Carthaginians upon them. They were extremely fond of luxury, which they could well afford, and gaiety. They had clothes of the finest texture, flasks and other objects of gold and silver, beds of ivory, and so on. The native Sikels had been well known for their boisterous enjoyment of buffoonery, including a primitive sort of comedy. The Greeks took this up and made it more refined and artistic, and from Sicily it spread to Athens.

Freeman repeats that apart from this gaiety and luxury and drinking—they enjoyed a story of a group of their rich citizens who, being intoxicated, fancied that they were at sea in a storm and flung the fine furniture out of the windows to lighten the ship—"nothing worse is said of them." Their generosity and benevolence were praised even by Empedocles. The gentleman whose wine-cellar had three hundred "bins" cut out of the rock, each containing a thousand jars of wine, had servants at the gate of the city urging every stranger who arrived to call at his house for entertainment. Another rich citizen of Acragas lodged five hundred horsemen and their horses, and gave new clothing to every guest. A third gave a feast to the whole of the citizens, each group being fed in their own street, when his daughter married. In the wedding procession every horseman of the city rode, and eight hundred splendid chariots followed the bride; while, when night fell and a signal was given from the acropolis, myriads of bonfires flamed up in every part of the city.

I have no doubt that these people were not puritans, but we have not a scrap of **proof** that they were more immoral than people are in Boston: I mean, there is no definite charge in an ancient authority that they were "very corrupt." We might do better to imitate some of their virtues and slander them less. We are told that the gentleman who gave a feast to the entire city was a simple democratic citizen acting from pure good feeling. Indeed I should like to conduct a body of Baptist ministers and their lady supporters, who think that these ancient civilizations were ruined by their vices, to this beautiful region of south Italy where superb fragments of old Greek temples still shine pathetically in the sun. "Here," I

would explain, "there were, two thousand four hundred years ago, great and prosperous and very happy cities framed in a land of wonderful productiveness. The Carthaginians, it is true, wrecked the country, but the Romans fairly restored its civilization. Then your creed was enforced on it, and it shrank into squalid semi-barbarism. Then the Mohammedans took it over, and again the island bore a wonderfully prosperous, happy, and enlightened civilization. But in a few centuries it was Christian once more, and to this day it has remained a land of dense ignorance, coarse ways, squalid poverty, and picturesque vice and violence."

§2. THE PURITAN AND THE SYBARITE

And this applies to the whole region of south Italy. If you care to glance at the map you will see how few important towns there are even today in the instep and on the heel of the foot which south Italy forms on the map. Two thousand four hundred years ago every mile of this was intensely cultivated by the city-states of the colonial Greeks, and many cities of great size and real splendor rose from the plains. The fringe of civilization extended as far as Naples (a Greek foundation) on the western coast, and an intense and most profitable trade brought all the luxuries of the world to the harbors. I need take only two cities for examination. One of them is Sybaris, which suggests to every half-informed person the very quintessence of Greek vice and voluptuousness. The other, a neighbor and rival city, is Croton, the city ruled for years by the arch-Puritan Pythagoras. As I asked before, which of the two shall we regard as "typically Greek"? But it will be more interesting to show that the real historical Sybarite is very rarely accused by any classic authority of vice—never of the unnatural vice in which south Italy abounds today—but was just a man who shocked the simple-lifers of Croton by the way he spent his ample funds on rich clothing and pleasure.

Both were large cities controlling an extensive region. The walls of Sybaris had a circuit of six miles, and its republican government ruled twenty-five other cities and people of four races. Croton was larger—its walls had a circuit of ten or twelve miles, or nearly the same as Babylon—but it probably had more open space to accommodate refugees. That Sybaris could muster three hundred thousand troops to fight Croton, as one of the old writers says, modern authorities do not believe, but there is a safe indication that it had a far larger population than Athens. On the chief festivals, when all citizens of the knightly order rode in the procession, Sybaris put five thousand superbly dressed horsemen on the street, while Athens in its Golden Age had not more than one thousand two hundred. From its rich soil and its very extensive trade Sybaris drew such wealth that by the middle of the sixth century B. C. it was one of the largest and richest cities of the Greek world. Yet the memory of it lingers only as a term of reproach for the idlest and most exacting type of sensualist! What had the Sybarites done?

We no longer write history on such a scale that the historian can personally ascertain the truth about every city he mentions, but the fact that Sybaris was destroyed in 510 B. C., before Greek his-

*torical literature begins, and destroyed by fanatics with whom no*body agrees today, ought to warn people that we know little about it, and that little is tainted. In Grote's famous ten-volume History of Greece you will find all that we know about the fatal clash of Puritan and Sybarite, and you will see that the distinguished historian, who was certainly no Sybarite in the modern sense, warmly repudiates the common belief. Such wealth as the Sybarites had, he says, could be gathered only by vigorous industry and sound organization. What the other Greeks who visited them or received their envoys meant by "Sybarite" was that they were men of splendid display and ostentation. The only sexual allusion I find is that in Suida's Lexicon (a great granary of libels, by the way) it is said that the Greeks used "Sybaritic stories" as a proverbial expression, and I am not quite clear if he means indecent stories or stories of extravagant display. I repeat that I do not believe that these Greeks were puritans, but in point of fact the ancient writers do not charge them with "deep moral corruption," but luxury and ostentation.

Did you ever hear of the Greek gentleman named Milo, the Primo Carnera of the old world, who could carry an ox and then eat it? He was one of the puritans of Croton: in fact, he, dressed as Hercules and flourishing a club, led the attack on Sybaris. And here you begin to understand the rivalry. The men of Croton were famous in the whole Greek world for their athletic training and performances, and we are told that diet was very important in their training. Possibly it was this that drew the vegetarian Pythagoras to Croton from his native Ionia; though I am disposed to think that the Ionians were too sensible to respect his weird views on transmigration, spirituality, vegetarianism, and the mathematical nature of morality. Probably even at Croton he had to keep his essential doctrines for the elect, for the various strong men of the Milo type may not have eaten a whole ox in a day, as legend says, but they must have known the Greek equivalent of a porterhouse-steak. Yet Pythagoras must certainly have been an extraordinary man. Besides his "brotherhood" of strict followers, he had such influence on the whole body of citizens as Savonarola would one day have at Florence. In the compulsory reading that I should like to see imposed by the state on every minister of the Gospel I should include an account of the way in which, more than five centuries before the time of Christ, this moralist who scorned the flesh and praised the spirit as drastically as any moralist, won the admiration and submission of so many in one of these "frivolous and sensuous" Greek cities that he and his stricter pupils controlled the city for years. How many there were in his strict brotherhoods, with their years of silence and their ascetic diet and purity of life, we do not know, but we are assured that his influence was very great in many cities of south Italy.

Luxurious Sybaris would hardly be on cordial terms with these athletic puritans of the ancient world, and at length the quarrel flamed out. It confirms the more complimentary view of the Sybarites when we read the details of the quarrel. It began with the triumph of democracy in Sybaris, when aristocratic refugees sought

shelter in Croton. The Sybarites demanded the surrender of them, which was refused, and then declared war. The people of Croton have magnified their victory by pretending that the Sybarites raised, from their cities and provinces, an army of three hundred thousand men. All that we certainly know is that Sybaris sustained a long and vigorous struggle, and, when it lost, the paragons of virtue utterly destroyed the city, even diverting the river over its ruins, and reduced its women and children to beggary and exile. One has almost an improper feeling of pleasure in reading that the citizens of Croton soon afterwards rose against their zealots and withdrew the government of the city from them.

§3. THE FLOWERING OF THE GREEK SPIRIT

These accounts of life in colonial Greece will suffice to enable the reader to realize the very great cultural progress that was made during the two centuries before Pericles inspired the Athenians to raise their city to supremacy in art and intellect. All through the seventh and sixth centuries these colonial Greeks were absorbing and refashioning the arts of the civilizations with which they came in contact, and the characteristic Greek art and literature were developing. In the seventh century the Greeks were permitted to make a settlement in Egypt, at the mouth of the Nile, and here they learned all that Egypt could teach and, by introducing papyrus to the Greek world, gave an impulse to literature. Egypt, with its vast temples and its unique life and mythology, drew Greek travelers in increasing numbers, and conversation with the more learned priests was one of the most important sources of the zeal for philosophy which now appeared in the Greek colonial cities. By this time, as we saw, the priests of the greater Egyptian colleges often lived in ascetic communities, and from their life and their very emphatic doctrine of a soul that survived the body men like Pythagoras got the beginning of their spiritual philosophy.

It is impossible and unnecessary here to survey the whole of this colonial world and its stimulating conditions. All that I am concerned to show here is that once the rough early days of pioneering were over the Greeks created a large number of cities in which, during the sixth and fifth centuries, their love of beauty strove to express itself in more perfect forms of art and their intellectual vitality criticised their own legends and those of other nations and sought a fresh and direct interpretation of nature and life. The short account which I gave in the Key of Greek philosophy and ethics will now be better understood. The historian of thought tells you how it began in those cities of Asia Minor which I described in the last chapter. Then he passes to Italy and reviews the different systems of Pythagoras (at Croton), of Empedocles (at Acragas), of Xenophanes (at Elea), and others. Next he takes us right across the map to Abdera, in Thrace (to the north of Greece), and we find one of the most powerful of the early thinkers and most sober and high-minded of moralists, Democritus, having great influence in a region which most people would imagine to have been at that time quite uncivilized. Even Crete produced its philosophers before

Athens. In almost every case the meager biographical details tell us at least that these thinkers—and the score of names we have before Socrates are only those of the greater men amongst hundreds of thinkers—were provincial Greeks who took advantage of the trading ships and caravans to travel in many lands.

No one but a student of philosophy is now interested in the various "systems" of these early thinkers, but in any history of morals we must notice their efforts to give men a code of conduct and reasons for observing it. An English student, A. E. Dobbs, reflecting on the great practical influence of the Stoic ethic in Rome and the utilitarian ethic in England in the early nineteenth century, made an inquiry into the influence of these early Greek thinkers on contemporary life ("Philosophy and Popular Morals in Ancient Greece," 1907). He found that, especially in the last phase of Greek life, they had a very considerable influence through the schools. We shall see a little about that, but Dobbs has not fully realized the significance of the influence of even early philosophers like Thales, Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, etc., who had remarkable prestige in their various cities. These men spent two centuries before Socrates inquiring, amongst other things, into the nature of rules of conduct and finding the best standards and controlling motives of life. It is something to remember that these sensuous and frivolous and artistic Greeks, these men of "license" and "moral turpitude," as they are so commonly described in contrast to the Egyptians, spent two centuries in such intense ethical inquiries as the world had never known before, even before the great age of Athenian philosophy opened, and that whole cities listened to them with profound respect.

CHAPTER III

LIFE AT ATHENS IN THE GOLDEN AGE



HERE is probably no nation of former times about which half as much has been written as about the Greeks, and there is certainly no other single city of the world that has inspired so much literature as Athens. This interest is due just as much to its intellectual life as to its magnificent architecture and sculpture, and nearly every authority remarks that the thoughts of these Athenians, even on ethical lines, were singularly like our own. Mahaffy, for instance, opens his valuable study of Greek life with two pages on the closeness of the Greeks to ourselves. Let me quote one or two sentences:

> "They have worked out social and moral problems like ourselves: they have expressed them in such language as we should desire to use. In a word, they are thoroughly modern, more modern even than the epochs quite proximate to our own. . . . In all [our] moral and social questions they would at once find their way and enjoy even our poetry and our fiction. . . . If one of us were transported to Periclean Athens, provided he were a man of high culture, he would find life and manners strangely like our own, strangely modern, as he might term it. The thoughts and feelings of modern life would be there without the appliances, and the high standard of general culture would more than counterbalance sundry wants in material comfort."

The distinguished clerical scholar then perceives the terrible implication of his statement—that, since our age is better than any that preceded it since the adoption of Christianity, the world must have been below the Greek level for the last fifteen centuries—and he finds in us certain "points of superiority." But he is not able to claim more than a "small moral advance" in our time, and he shrinks from comparing early Christian Europe with Greece. Yet I have already partly shown and will further show in this chapter that even this fine Hellenist strains or misuses evidence in attempting to show how Christ improved on the ideals of the best Greeks or to discover the vices of the Greeks.

And this is typical of literature about Greece. I ignore entirely here the works of even learned divines and their confused references to morals and ethical standards. I am speaking only of the works of experts on Greece, twenty or thirty of which lie before me. They tell you the most remarkably minute and intimate details about Athenian life. They can reconstruct the home in every part and follow its inmates to the shop, the workshop, the theater, the civic

hall, and so on. They can tell us every detail of dress, furniture, food, marriage, police, music, etc. But when you ask about morals in ancient Greece, either in the general or the sexual sense, no two writers agree. What we saw in the case of Lesbos—how one high expert sees in the verse of Sappho the lurid reflection of "a furnace of unbridled passion" and another sees in it "moral purity shining in its own light"—is only an extreme illustration of the confusion. For men like Swinburne and Symonds the Greeks were, of course, thoroughly sensuous and free in their love; because that is the state of perfection. The divine who dabbles in Greek history comes to the same conclusion; because he has to show that the world needed Christianity. Even what I may call the morally neutral expert gives us a contradictory literature; because nobody in our age really is morally neutral. Finally, the anti-Christian writer on Greece now generally says the exact opposite to what Swinburne said; because he wants to prove that Greek morality was superior to Christian.

In so far as we find this confusion in the works of genuine experts with a minimum of prejudice, it is not difficult to understand. "Ancient Greece" means a region of the utmost diversity, from Sicily to Ephesus and from the Black Sea to Alexandria, during a space of fifteen very changeful centuries. But even "Ancient Athens" implies almost as great a variety. The historian generally deals with about four centuries of its history, from about 600 to about 200 B. C. Just reflect on the mighty changes, especially of a moral and social character, that have taken place within two centuries in any city of modern Europe. The historian of a few centuries hence will be free from both the prejudices and the weaknesses of the historian of today, and it will be impossible for him to illustrate, let us say, the morals of London by one quotation from a writer of Napoleonic times and one of the year 1920. They do not refer to the same London. Yet writers on Athens or Greece generally do this quite commonly. And even when we take Athens in its various stages the experts help us little. Glotz, in a special study of moral development in Greece, finds that from the fourth century onward the Greeks, especially the Athenians, increasingly looked to sexual intercourse for pleasure, not for the rearing of families; that there was a "crisis of marriage" and a very marked decay. Mahaffy and others find, on the contrary, that this was a period of increasing refinement and moral progress.

Thus in spite of the enormous literature we have about Greece —and I have just looked over the most recent books in four or five languages—it is extraordinarily difficult to formulate a sensible proposition about Greek morals. The familiar phrase with which so many Hellenists dismiss the subject, that we must admit that there was a good deal of "moral corruption" (or lying, or dishonesty, or selfishness) at Athens in every age, is worse than useless. It is useless because there is a good deal of moral corruption in every city that ever existed. It is worse than useless because it is interpreted by religious writers to mean that there was much more moral corruption at Athens than there was in the Christian cities of the fourth century or than there is in our modern cities; yet you will

get few Hellenists of distinction explicitly to say that. Let us see what clear ideas, if any, we may get about the matter. It is ironic to reflect that most people think that these questions were settled long ago.

§1. THE GENERAL MORAL IDEAL AND CONDUCT

First let us ignore the history of Athens and consider its life in what is called the Golden Age (or from about 450 to about 350 B. C.), making some allowance for changes during that period. Next let us distinguish between the moral ideal of the Athenians and their actual conduct. I need not remark that the Athenians did not take their code of conduct from their religion, beyond believing that Zeus punished unjust and dishonorable conduct, but from their writers, orators, and dramatists. We may, if we prefer, say that these merely reflect the moral ideal, and in that case we are bound to say that our overwhelming impression is that they had a very high ideal. The historians (Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon) are all moralists, and the latest of the three is the highest in that respect. And if we choose to think that only a limited class read Xenophon, we find an even more exalted moral note in the great tragedians whose plays were performed before the mass of the people of Athens. "No modern theologian has taught higher and purer moral notions than those of Aeschylus and his school," says Mahaffy. "No poetry was ever more penetrated with the sense of moral law," says Lowes Dickinson. But there is no need to quote here. The special characteristic of the greater and more popular tragedians, Aeschylus and Sophocles, is that they paint ghastly pictures of the consequences of moral transgressions, even (as in the case of Oedipus) of **unconscious** violation of moral law. In the third, Euripides, we have, says Mahaffy, a "gentle and humane spirit," a "respect for the poor," a "sympathy for slaves," a conviction that "character is the true nobility." In short, our clerical authority (who has forgotten that in the introduction to his book he has said that in Athens the general public fell much further short of its intellectual leaders than our general public does) says that the repeated presentations of such tragedies at Athens shows "a society which in intellectual culture must have been vastly superior to the best and most critical modern audience."

Hence the question whether the philosophical moralists had an extensive influence does not matter as much as some writers seem to think. We have to take these into account, however, in asking if the highest ideals of the Greeks fall short of those of Christianity. The difficulty here is, of course, that there were a hundred moralists with different systems, but we may choose three main types. In one group we may put those (Pythagoreans, Eleatics, Platonists, Stoics, and Neo-Platonists) who taught an ascetic code, strongly insisting on such virtues as purity which had no social significance. In the next group we may put the thinkers who made happiness the norm of conduct and appreciated sensuous pleasure; and there is properly only one small school of this type, for Epicurus is far removed from it. In the third group (Ionians, Aristotelians, and probably the majority) virtue was placed in a mean between ex-

tremes, in a balanced intellectual estimate of the best form of social behavior; and with these I associate Epicurus, whose ideal was sobriety and tranquillity, which sensual pleasure would disturb. I leave the question of sex to the next section and need hardly say that in every other moral respect (justice, veracity, honesty, sobriety, generosity, etc.) the ideal of the Greek moralists, of nearly all Greek writers, was as high as the ideal of any age.

We have then to ascertain whether the Athenians as a body, either in the Periclean or the later age, fell short of their ideal in practice more conspicuously than their Christian successors did or than we do. It will be acknowledged that in all references to the vices of the Greeks a comparison is implied. No historian could possibly tell us what proportion of the Greeks were cruel, dishonest, drunken, or untruthful; and he talks platitudes if he merely remarks that these defects existed in Athens. It is the comparison of different peoples that interests us. And this comparison ought to be between the Greeks before Christ and the Greeks or other peoples after they become Christians. Not a single modern historian attempts that comparison. They generally make an unfair comparison of Greek conduct with that of modern times. The only thing we can do therefore is to glance at the statements of those expert writers who claim that this or that vice was conspicuous amongst the Greeks.

I have made a collection of such estimates, and there is hardly a point on which they agree. Mahaffy, as I said in the introduction, makes them inferior to us in respect of cruelty, but all his examples are taken from the period before 400 B. C. and refer to warfare; and he admits a great refinement and spread of humanity afterwards. Moreover, he admits that even in the earlier period, during passionate warfare, the Athenians never harmed women and children (as the Hebrews did), and they on one occasion made such an "outburst of indignation" against one of their generals who was accused of ill-treating two enemy women that he committed suicide. He adds elsewhere that two conspicuous defects were lying and dishonesty, and in this F. A. Wright ("Greek Social Life," 1925) agrees with him. Probably there is more agreement on this point than any others. But what can it mean? When one reflects that lying and cheating (within the limits of the law) are universal in our modern civilization, who is going to prove that they were worse in ancient Greece? Drunkenness is added to the indictment by some writers, but Mahaffy thinks that it was no more common than it now is, and Wright goes so far as to say that the Greek had no inclination for our modern vices of "intemperance, snobbishness, ostentation, and hypocrisy."

§2. THE GREEK SENSE OF JUSTICE

Wright's book is, perhaps, the chief recent work in which an expert on Greece yet an orthodox Christian attempts to sustain the legend of the moral inferiority of the Greeks. I will return presently to his remarks on sex and I have already disposed of his charge of having "a low standard of honesty and veracity." He adds that the Athenian had "a profound and inveterate seifishness which blinded men to the intolerable wrongs that every day they inflicted on their

women and their slaves." This is little more than pulpit rhetoric. It is based upon the utterly false belief that Christianity emancipated woman and the slave and raised the status of the worker. But as other writers indict the Greeks for their slavery and their treatment of women, let us get clear ideas in regard to both.

I have explained that the development of industry led to an increased demand for slaves and the constant wars raised the supply. But our actual writers on Greece do not admit that they were at any time as numerous as used to be supposed. I have already referred to a work in which Professor Sargent examines all the research that has been expended on the subject. She says that the inflated figures used by Van Loon and other incautious writers were refuted a century and a half ago. She concludes, as most authorities now do, that in the fifth century the slaves of Athens and its province (Attica) were about half the total population: that they fell to about one-third and then rose again to about one-half. Those in domestic service were treated considerately. They were provided with medical attendance and recreations, were often remembered in wills, and sometimes, after receiving their freedom, they came back to the master's house to spend their old age.

But I need not stress these mitigations of the greatest evil of the old world. The points that serious students of comparative morality will consider are that Stoic and Epicurean moralists condemned slavery from the third century (B. C.) onward; that Christian Europe took over the system of slavery without a blush, and Christian moralists all acquiesced in it for many centuries; and that in view of the black slavery of modern times one wonders how a Christian writer can mention the subject without embarrassment.

In regard to women the charge against the Greeks is still more incongruous, if it implies comparison with Christian times, but a few words of explanation may be useful. We have seen that down to the date we have reached women had in the Greek world generally the same freedom and independence as they had enjoyed during nearly the whole of ancient history. Botsford puts it even more strongly: "The sixth century, with the early fifth, was, in fact, the most brilliant period, at least till recent times, in the intellectual history of women." How, then, does a writer with a good knowledge of Greece come to write of "intolerable wrongs" and "profound and inveterate selfishness"? Partly, as I said, because he is borrowing the language of the pulpit. He seems to be ignorant that English and American women have only recently been relieved of wrongs that were still more intolerable, and that had lasted more than a thousand years without a single clerical protest. What happened in Greece after the sixth century was that the increasing political importance of the men, when democracy prevailed, gravely lessened the old equality of the sexes, while at the same time contact with Persia, which now despotically ruled the old feminist region of Asia Minor, led, especially in the richer class, to the virtual confinement of women to the home. That the women were on that account generally despised is untrue. In the comedians we get exaggerated gibes at women, precisely because a "woman movement" had begun

(in Euripides) almost immediately, but, as Earp says, the Greek, in confining his wife as much as possible to child-bearing, considered that she was discharging one of the highest functions of the state; and it is generally agreed that the Greek woman probably had, as a rule, no sense of tyranny or injustice. The Greek girl had a life of considerable freedom and joy, and of the blunder—as it should be called rather than crime—of the men in condemning their wives to a narrow and monotonous life, we may at least say that it took their moralists only a few generations to discover the evil, while it took Christian moralists fifteen centuries.

Much the same might be said of the limited use of torture in the legal system. I dislike introducing the comparative note in every paragraph, but it is here inevitable: For more than a thousand years torture was used in Christian Europe on a scale that would have revolted the Greeks. Nor should we forget that if we of modern times are better than the Greeks in this respect, we still linger far behind them in other aspects of legal justice. Mahaffy points out that in English and Irish law as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century (though it had probably not been literally carried out for a century or two) the sentence on traitors was that they be hanged "but not until they be dead, for whilst they are yet alive they are to be taken down, their entrails are to be taken out of their body, and, whilst they are yet alive, they are to be burned before their faces." This was done in Christian Europe fifteen centuries after the birth of Christ. But even our reforms leave us with a "gauntness and horror of our modern executions" which so contrasts with the "humane and kindly feeling" of the Greeks after passing a death-sentence that we ought to be, Mahaffy says, "ashamed of our boasted Christian culture."

Almost every weapon we fling at the Greeks proves to be a boomerang, and I will not stop to examine the charge which some bring, and others repudiate, of callous indifference to the aged. There may be a certain hardness in the earlier Athenian character, though we found unselfish good-fellowship quite characteristic of the colonial Greeks, but, to quote our clerical Hellenist once more, "to any one who compares the Platonic with the Periclean generation there will gradually come into sight a greater gentleness and softness, a toning down of the hard features, a nearer approach to the greater humanity of Christ's teaching." I hesitate to detract from the generosity of this statement by pointing out that it was precisely in the Christian period that the harsher features returned. However, "the refinement of Greek manners culminated in the gentle Menander," an Epicurean of the fourth century. And again the learned Greek scholar forgets what he has written or finds it indiscreet, for on a later page he finds Menander "the prince of pleasure-seekers" on account of his Epicurean gospel: a gospel which never taught the pursuit of pleasure. I fear that even we of the twentieth century have really not firm ground to pride ourselves on our superiority in many respects, and between us and that shining city and its enlightened citizens of two thousand four hundred years ago there lies the moral morass of the Middle Ages.

§3. THE QUESTION OF SEXUAL MORALS

Now let us candidly confront this question of sex, and let us begin with a reflection that may help us to draw some conclusion from the scanty and contradictory literature. All through this study of the morality of the ancient nations we have found men clear and consistent about justice, truthfulness, benevolence, honesty, and the social-moral qualities generally but hesitating and inconsistent about sex. Adultery is, of course, always forbidden, since it is a breach of contract or of property-rights, but beyond that there is considerable difference of sentiment and practice. This seems quite natural to those of us who hold that moral law is just social law, that amidst all their religious and economic changes men held to a code of conduct based upon their actual experience of social life. On any other theory, such as that men were guided by a steadily growing moral intuition, the fact is quite unintelligible.

This applies particularly to Greece. Its remarkably numerous moralists during four centuries, in all sorts of environments, were agreed upon all points except one: whether the sexual intercourse of the unmarried was immoral. I have shown in my works on sex how some, like Pythagoras and Plato, in fact a large number of the schools took up and developed the old idea of body and soul until they concluded that all sexual behavior defiled the spirit. A strict Stoic would frown on all sensual pleasure on the ground that it clouds and corrupts the mind. But in other ethical systems there is no ground for condemning sexual conduct that does not involve injustice. In view of this division of opinion of the moralists and the little notice that the general public would take of the more ascetic, it is clearly possible to claim that Christianity brought a new ideal. There is no need to quarrel with the claim, but we must remember two things. The first is that in so far as the Christian ideal differed from that of the spiritualist Greek moralists we all now regard it as unsound. Even a Fundamentalist or a Catholic does not admit that sexual intercourse in marriage has any sort of taint, that an unmarried person is superior to a mother, and so on. And the second point is that the Christian ideal was simply followed by a small sect which in this resembled half a dozen others. After the third century it was in practice generally disregarded, as we shall see.

The more interesting point is that the lack of a firm, consistent, and general authority in this matter in ancient Greece would seem to make it probable that there was far more sexual freedom than in later ages. But there are many things which warn us to hesitate. Greek travelers like Herodotus who find displays of sexual looseness amongst other nations always condemn them. The tragedians are very severe on all sexual irregularity. The laws of Draco punished seducers as well as adulterers. There was a general belief that virgins were at certain shrines nearer to the gods. Four-fifths at least of the Greek literature we have is quite as "moral" as ours. Aeschylus, Mahaffy says, shows "refined and delicate relations of the sexes in marriage." The plays of Sophocles reflect "a sober earnestness at Athens very far apart from the ribaldry of Aristophanes." Euripides depicts "the noblest and best of women." Botsford finds

"the same high moral standard in the perfect order of the theater," and concludes that, in general, "the moral plane of life was not mean."

If we then turn to the serious critics, ignoring the rhetoric of theologians, the evidence on which they base their indictment is not very satisfactory. The indecencies (of language) in the comedies of Aristophanes are the chief ground. Besides the criticisms which I have already noticed Mr. F. A. Wright speaks of "a coarseness, amounting often to actual indecency, in all matters of sexual conduct, and a toleration of unnatural vice." That the last part of this charge is a gross exaggeration we shall see later, and it is certainly curious that the Rev. Professor Mahaffy sees little force in the reference to the coarseness or indecency of Aristophanes. He pleads for a better understanding of the aim of the comedian, points out that "such immorality as that of the modern French stage was never tolerated among the Greeks," and in one place describes the Athenian as "the most refined and brilliant civilization the world has yet seen." I might add that Athens enjoyed Aristophanes just as much when, in "The Birds," he imagines those allegorical creatures giving notice to Zeus to quit his amorous adventures.

Few people read the great comedian and so they have an exaggerated idea of his naughtiness. I have just re-read what would be called one of the worst of his plays, the Lysistrate. There are many phrases that we could not use on the stage today. The idea is that the Greek women conspire to stop the men from warring by agreeing to refuse sexual intercourse to their husbands unless they make peace, but he used a blunt word instead of "sexual intercourse"; just as a Greek sculptor was quite naturalistic when he carved a nude male figure. We must not forget the significance of the fact that he was not allowed to be realistic in sculpturing the female form; that the same men who laughed at the broadness of Aristophanes listened with the deepest appreciation to scores of highly moral tragedies; and that the only way in which his political enemies could secure the death of Socrates was to pretend that he injured morals as well as religion.

As regards the mass of the people, therefore, we may admit that they thought and spoke very candidly about sex, which is less surprising in that age of phallic religion than in the Christian Era when men were just as candid, but if we want to say that they were more immoral than the Greeks or any other Europeans of later ages we can by no means prove it, and I should say that is quite untrue. Until quite recent times comedy was just as licentious as in Greece, and one may wonder whether it would not be the same today but for censorship. I have developed the point elsewhere and need not do so again. The other chief grounds for the claim that the Greeks were particularly licentious are statements about the educated class or the wealthy and they belong chiefly to the last phase of Greek life, so I will take them in a separate section.

§4. THE VICES OF THE LATER GREEKS

That there was a moral decay in the Greek world after the fall of Athens and the victories of Alexander the Great no one will ques-

tion, and as this is just the time when the Romans borrow the fashions of the Greeks, it is necessary to understand this phase. One of the works most used by superficial writers on the vices of the Greeks is "The Deipnosophists" of Athenaeus. It is a profoundly interesting and often obviously inaccurate account of luxury and manners at table—it is really an enormous manual of gastronomy—in the Greek world, and Prof. Gulick is at present publishing an English translation of it in seven small volumes. Now Athenaeus was an Egyptian Greek of the second and third centuries after Christ, and what he chiefly does is to compile a sort of encyclopaedia out of a vast number of Greek works, covering seven or eight centuries and the whole of civilization, which have not survived. In other words, it is a vast mixture of facts, gossip, and legend of a totally uncritical character solely for the purpose of entertaining the reader. One ought evidently to quote him with caution, yet it is chiefly on his authority that writers like Wright say that the Greeks "tolerated unnatural vice" and had a peculiar respect for the refined courtesans whom they called **hetairai.**

I have dealt with both these points elsewhere and will dismiss the first very briefly. The great majority of Hellenists now declare that the Greek praise of love of youths was aesthetic and does not justify any man in claiming that paederasty was prevalent in the classic period. Even Athenaeus gives very little evidence of it that any expert now regards as historical until after the fall of Athens. Plutarch in his "Lives" gives the same impression. He candidly describes the vices of the handsome, brilliant, and dissolute Alcibiades, in the time of Socrates, and represents them as confined to a small clique and repugnant to the majority. He says that the wife of Alcibiades was "a good woman" and she left him in disgust. It is only when he comes to Demetrius (307 B. C.), a Syrian Greek, that he finds considerable corruption (on the part of Demetrius and a few others), and he relates with pleasure how a handsome Athenian boy who was pursued by Demetrius (virtually king of Athens) committed suicide rather than yield. In a word—I give the evidence elsewhere—at no period of Greek history have we documentary evidence that paederasty was as prevalent as it has been from the Dark Ages to our own time, and I should say that it was certainly not.

In regard to the **hetairai** I would add a few points to what I have said elsewhere. Athenaeus, who devotes the long thirteenth book of his work (not yet translated: I have just read it in a copy of the sumptuous French version, with appropriate illustrations, which belonged to King George II and would please that monarch as much as it pleased any ancient Greek) to love and women, makes no distinction between very different classes of Greek women. He gives as **hetairai** (or "pals") notorious courtesans like Lois, Lamia, and Phryne, and (as far as we know) quite respectable ladies who taught philosophy and ethics. Some feminist writers, I may say, go to the opposite extreme and claim that the **hetairai** as a body were simply the intellectual "companions" of the scholars, artists, and statesmen of Athens and have been libelled by the men of the Middle

Ages because these were too sensual to understand the relation. Miss Eliza Gamble, for instance, strongly maintains this ("The Opposite Sexes") and usefully distinguishes five classes of women: married women, **hetairai**, flute-players (always loose), concubines, and whores. But her enthusiasm is fatal. She, for instance, represents the relation of Aspasia to Pericles as at least mainly intellectual and quotes a passage of Plutarch to that effect. There is no such passage in Plutarch's life of Pericles—it may be in Xenophon—and Plutarch is severe against Aspasia. He expressly says that the relation was amorous, and even (which experts do not admit) that Aspasia made money out of a small brothel.

I have suggested that these **hetairai**, who begin with Aspasia, a gifted Ionian woman, were for the most part free in their conduct, as it is said of several that they altered their mode of life when they began to teach philosophy, which was the occupation of a large number of them. That Plato, Socrates, Crates, Epicurus, etc., had amorous relations with the various **hetairai** whose names Athenaeus connects with them (six centuries after their death) there is not a scrap of serious evidence. In these and many other cases they seem to have been just what the name means, "pals." Since the practice had begun, as I explained, of keeping the wife confined to the home, her education was totally neglected, and the cultivated men turned eagerly to these highly educated and free women from Ionia and elsewhere. We are positively informed that some of them urged men to treat their wives more rationally. But to assume, as Miss Gamble does, that all these women had the sexless feeling of modern American lady-professors is an anachronism, and is inconsistent with any reading of Plutarch and Athenaeus.

They must not, however, be confused with the famous courtesans or the concubines (generally slaves). The courtesans begin with the beautiful Phryne, who overcame a hostile jury by disrobing herself in court, just before the Macedonian conquest of Athens. From that time onward Athenaeus tells us of scores of these beautiful adventuresses, flute-players, dancers, etc., who became the mistresses of princes, artists, writers, and merchants. We know how they painted, what they wore—Phryne was so beautiful that she never went to the public baths—how they altered their height or contours, and so on. Many were as witty as they were beautiful. "Isn't he small for his age?" said one, when an admirer brought her a very small bottle of very old wine. Athenaeus gives pages of their witty sayings. Readers who have seen Pierre Louys's beautiful romance ("Aphrodite") of courtesan-life in Greek Alexandria may care to know that most of the details are from this thirteenth book of the work of Athenaeus.

If we want to form a reasonable idea of the moral condition of the ancient world we do well to set aside all the flimsy and contradictory indictments of Athens in the Golden Age and realize that there was a considerable relaxation of morals after the middle of the fourth century; and it is to the period after this that such writers as Athenaeus and Polybius refer. There began an acute conflict of tendencies. The old standards of the race were naturally in decay:

the philosophers had become the oracles. But, though at this late date the schools were thronged and the moralists had a really considerable influence, they fought each other so much that a large section of the wealthier men scornfully repudiated them, and said even that they were profligates in private. It was then that mistresses were assigned to the leading moralists. The mass of the people, especially the farmers, would be unaffected, but, as in every other age, we know next to nothing about their morals. If comedy be taken as a criterion, it is certain that it became more refined. Of the women also, as a body, we may say that there is no documentary evidence of a change.

Thus the real "moral turpitude" or "gross license" belongs to the last phase and is largely due to the Macedonian kings, Philip and Alexander, and the princes who succeeded them. Alexander set an imperial example of sensuality. Then, in 307 B. C., there came to Athens, ostensibly to liberate it and restore its democracy, the son of the prince of Antioch, and his corruption of youths and matrons of the best families of Athens was notorious, though he had four choice mistresses. So great were now the straits of the Athenians that they solemnly decreed that this prince Demetrius, being a god, could do no wrong. He was finally expelled, but the wealthier men of Athens continued the most selfish practices. One calamity after another fell upon the Athenians—a brutal invasion, the Roman conquest, etc.—and "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die," really became a popular motto. Men gave the prodigious banquets that Athenaeus describes, and the guests lingered over the choicest wines of the world while girls in transparent muslins played the flute and danced. In the end a rich man often put up the girls at auction or gave them to guests. They were generally eastern slaves.

It must have seemed to many as if philosophy had failed: as if the mother-goddess, transformed into Aphrodite, was going to conquer even Greece. Woodhouse says that "until the decline of Greek civilization the cult of Aphrodite . . . was indistinguishable in point of purity and austerity from that of Zeus or Athene." In some places her priestesses had, as in Ephesus, to be chaste. Superficial people again draw a wrong conclusion from the fact that from the first the Greeks had a goddess of love. She was the patroness of the love or child-bearing of married folk. But there was from an early date one famous shrine of Aphrodite where the priestesses were prostitutes. This was at Corinth, which was in closest touch with Asia Minor. Pindar, the great poet of the sixth century, speaks of "the hospitable young women, the ministrants of Persuasion, in rich Corinth"; and by this time its trade had made Corinth very rich. A thousand women, Strabo says, waited at the great temple of Aphrodite for the seamen and travelers who streamed into the port. I suggest, as in an earlier chapter, that there had been at first temple-prostitution as a religious rite, for the prayers of the women were esteemed, but that in the course of time the priests had developed it into a sheer business. The women were slaves of the temple, and they were throughout the Greek world as famous for their

exactions (for the temple) as for their beauty. It is hardly necessary to add that these priests were not false to the principles of their primitive religion.

A superb city had grown up round the central square of Corinth, with its graceful colonnades, and its forest of marble statues, and hundreds of "purple-lined palaces of sweet sin" now witnessed nightly the scenes which Keats so wonderfully imagined in his "Lamia":

"They were enthroned, in the even tide,
Upon a couch, near to a curtaining
Whose airy texture, from a golden string,
Floated into the room and let appear
Unveiled the summer heaven, blue and clear,
Betwixt two marble shafts . . .
A haunting music, sole perhaps and lone
Supportress of the faery-roof, made moan
Throughout, as fearful the whole charm might fade.
Fresh carved cedar, mimicking a glade
Of palm and plantain, met from either side,
High in the midst, in honor of the bride;
Two palms and then two plantains, and so on,
From either side their stems branched one to one
All down the aisled place; and beneath all
There ran a stream of lamps from wall to wall.
So canopy'd, lay an untasted feast
Teeming with odors. . . .
But when the happy vintage touch'd their brains,
Louder they talk and louder came the strains
Of powerful instruments: the gorgeous dyes,
The space, the splendor of the draperies,
The roof of awful richness, nectarious cheer,
Beautiful slaves, and Lamia's self, appear.
Now, when the wine has done its rosy deed
And every soul from human trammels freed,
No more so strange. . . .
Soon was god Bacchus at meridian height;
Flush'd were their cheeks, and bright eyes double bright;
Garlands of every green and every scent
From vales deflowered, or forest trees branch-rent,
In baskets of bright osier'd gold were brought."

And so on. There is a sameness about these "orgies"—they were merely more beautiful at Corinth—all the world over; a banquet of choice foods, wines from every port, in a perfumed atmosphere, an hour or two of wine-bibbing while the girls, nude or in transparent robes, play the flute and dance, and the men and women, reclining in pairs (in Greece and Rome) on silk-covered couches strewn with flowers, sink into a languorous flood of pleasure which may end at length in boisterous intoxicated play of the young men with the slaves or the courtesans or quiet retirement from the banquet hall. The stars have looked down on such scenes,

only varying in fashions, in every age at a certain point in a nation's history: in the Rome of Caesar and Antony, the Rome of the Renaissance Popes, the Rome of Gabriele d'Annunzio, in Cairo and Damascus as in the Paris of the Louis's or the London of the Stuarts or Georges, in Berlin or New York or Buenos Aires today.

One must not imagine—I suppose most Christian folk who shudder at these things do imagine this—that St. Paul strolled one day into this enchanted city of Corinth and rebuked its vices, as the sages did in old times. The beautiful city was completely destroyed by the Romans in the year 146 B. C., and the city which Paul visited was a pale ghost of the city of Lamia. It was chiefly in Alexandria and Antioch that the new type of Greek life reached its culmination. I have described Antioch and its amorous groves in the last book, and, in order to carry on the story into Roman times, will close with a page on life in Alexandria.

So many folk of our time look back on these perfumed pages of history with equanimity, if not regret, that our moralists have had to find some more effective condemnation of them than to say simply that they are sinful. It is urged that they mean race-deterioration and the ruin of civilization. Candidly, the nearest approach to these "orgies" that you will find in a modern metropolis are in the chambers of exceptionally vigorous merchants or stock-brokers, but even in ancient history the theory of the moralist does not hold. Alexandria, which now became under the Ptolemies the most wicked city of the Greek world, became at the same time the metropolis of culture and the most progressive city on earth. The city of Cleopatra, which for most people simply marks the flow of this Greek-Oriental sensuousness into the Roman Empire, did more for science (mathematics, physics, mechanics, astronomy, and medicine) than the previous three thousand years of civilization had done, and its large school of philosophy, the Neo-Platonist, was one of the most spiritual and ascetic of all. It continued to flourish with great vigor until the bishops and monks of the Christian Church got complete power in it, and it was only then that it fell from its high rank. I have told all this elsewhere, but this combination of great intellectual vitality and accomplishment with the moral relaxation of later Greece needs to be emphasized. It will be one of the plain lessons of this history of morals that, while families or dynasties have perished from selfish indulgence, no race or city every did; for these things are always confined to a few, in so far as they are really injurious.

As I mentioned in the last book, the Ptolemies of Egypt, the descendants of that general of Alexander who got Egypt when his empire was divided, were vigorous patrons of art and learning, yet, after the first two generations, very vicious men and women. A short summary of their deeds will be enough to show what kind of royal guidance they gave the city. Even the second Ptolemy, though so generous a patron of literature that the Library at Alexandria now stored 400,000 books (possibly many copies of the same book), had about him a crowd of low-born mistresses and showered gold upon them and their families. But it was Ptolemy IV (221-203)

who fully inaugurated the scandalous reign of the later Ptolemies: a period so brutal and licentious that the life of the last representative of the dynasty, Cleopatra, which shocks so many people, seems comparatively sober and bloodless. Ptolemy IV, a dissolute youth at the time of his accession, inherited a powerful and wealthy kingdom and by his selfish indulgence began its ruin. It was not merely that he was voluptuous or sensual, as moralists complain, for Ptolemy II had been extremely voluptuous yet energetic and very successful, but because he thought of nothing but his own pleasures and interests. To secure his rule he at once poisoned his mother and had his younger brother drowned in boiling water in the bath. He then left the rule of the kingdom to an unscrupulous minister and he entrusted the control of his own life to a vicious and handsome adventurer, who, with his beautiful sister (the king's mistress) and their quite conscienceless mother, ruled the court. He married his sister, as some of the Pharaohs had done, and the unhappy young woman was a helpless and miserable witness of the extravagance of the court and the decay of the country. Ptolemy pretended to discover that his family descended from the god Dionysos (Bacchus). He had an ivy-leaf tatooed on his body, and the court addressed him as Dionysos. It was, of course, only an excuse for indulging in the wild orgies, of drink and sex, of the cult of Dionysos. It is ironic to reflect that this morbid sensualist built some of the beautiful temples in which lady-travelers today often perceive the profound religious wisdom of ancient Egypt.

Ptolemy IV left an infant son and his sister-widow, who was promptly murdered by the unscrupulous favorites. In a popular outburst some time later, however, the sordid family of adventurers, men and women, were dragged naked through the streets of Alexandria and torn to pieces. The son proved a harsh and unattractive prince, and he was succeeded by Ptolemy VI, who was one of the gentlest and most humane monarchs of that darkening age. But, although this prince reigned for thirty-five years, the selfish conduct of his predecessors had too deeply infected the life of Alexandria for him to restore it. Ptolemy VII, brother of his predecessor, at once murdered his nephew, the rightful heir, and married the royal widow, who thus became his wife, sister, and sister-in-law. There is only too good reason to believe that she, in her greed for power, consented; and I may add that her daughter, married to the Syrian king, murdered her son and husband to secure power. The new Pharaoh, whose grotesquely obese body—and he loved to dress in transparent robes—betrayed his gluttony, was as cruel and sanguinary as he was unscrupulous. He raped and then married his niece, and he is even said, though historians refuse to believe this, to have cut up the body of one of his sons, packed the pieces in a box, and sent it to the boy's mother as a birthday present. His successor, another pot-bellied glutton, had to be supported on either side when he walked, though when he was intoxicated he took a most energetic part in indecent dances. I need not prolong the calendar. These facts will suffice to show that the Greco-Roman world assuredly touched a low level in the second and first centuries before Christ, and that

the actions of Cleopatra, which I showed in the previous book to be quite capable of defense, show, if anything, that the world was returning to sobriety in the generation before Christ.

And we must remember that just this city was the great home of early science, the busiest hive of intellectual activity of the old world, the city of the Gnostics and Neo-Platonists as well as of the leading astronomers, the chief seat of the ascetic cult of Serapis, the center in which Christian theology was mainly constructed. Cleopatra was not the last of the pagan Greeks. It was Hypatia who nearly five centuries later closed the long line of Greek thinkers; and in her there perished, trodden under the unclean feet of half-savage monks, the fairest ideal the world had yet seen, and darkness gradually settled on the face of this planet. How from the disorders of the second and first century the Greco-Roman world found its own way to saner ideals we shall discover by tracing the development in Rome.

CHAPTER IV

THE COLLAPSE OF EARLY ROMAN VIRTUE

THE version of ancient history which most people cherish, which the press and the pulpit are constantly re-impressing on their minds, is that in the early part of their history the Romans were very virtuous: that when the thirst of conquest spread their rule over Greece and the east, and they borrowed the fashions of these races which were older in civilization and far superior in art, their ancient virtues and deep regard for marriage were submerged in a lawless sea of passion: and that therefore the Christian religion which taught them to curb their passions and recover their respect for marriage and the family rendered an unforgetable service to civilization. I have shown elsewhere that this is a fairy tale: that the ancient Roman marriage collapsed because it was profoundly unjust to woman, that early (or genuine) Christianity was just one of a dozen moralities and sects which arose to rebuke the confusion of the times, but that independently of them all the Roman Empire had suppressed the injurious follies which accompanied its new liberty here and there and attained a remarkably good moral condition before Christian teachers had as much influence in Italy as the Seventh Day Adventists have in America today.

The veracious story of Roman morals runs on those lines, and I will, as usual, here fill out the slight sketch of it which I have given elsewhere by a concrete description of the life of the Romans at the four chief periods of their history. We may now confine ourselves to the city of Rome, so that we have not to take into account the great variety of environments that we had to consider in the Greek world. But again we are dealing with a very long and very changeful period of time: say, from about 400 B. C. to about 400 A. D. You ask your religious neighbor what is his authority for his very dark view of the character of the Romans and, after consulting somebody less ignorant than his preacher, he comes back with a number of passages, generally misunderstood, from Plutarch, Ovid, Martial, Juvenal, and Ammianus Marcellinus. He is quite unaware that these writers cover a period of more than five centuries, and that any person could pick out twenty Roman writers in the same stretch of time whose works would make it seem that the Romans were a remarkably virtuous people. However, most of the readers of this book will have read the relevant volumes of the Key to Culture (No. 17 for history and No. 28 for the sequence and character of the writers), and the best service I can do for them is to describe in detail the four chief stages in the evolution of Roman morals.

§1. THE EARLIER ROMANS

Let us first take the Romans of the third century B. C., whose robust virtues, it is generally said, had not yet been emasculated by

contact with the east; and let us take them in the early part of the century, for the example of the Etruscans to the north of them and of those Greek cities of south Italy which I described was beginning to make many of them wonder if their tribal traditions were really the perfection of wisdom. To the Greeks, apart from the ascetic philosophers, virtue at this time meant an intelligent adjustment of the impulses of the individual to the needs of society, or a common-sense view of the correct way to live. To the Romans morals meant "custom," and the "virtue" which these customs aimed at maintaining was the Latin word for "manliness." In other words, the Roman ideal of conduct was really at the lowest level of civilization. Domestic benevolence was, it is true, already extended to other men of the same village, clan, or tribe, as two centuries of fighting had drawn them closer together, but their conception of domestic benevolence was extremely imperfect. The last vestige of the primitive equality of the sexes had disappeared, and the man had a tyrannical power.

The time came when two young folk were to be mated, once the girl had reached her thirteenth year and the boy his fifteenth, or soon after. There was no romance about it—the republic wanted soldiers—but there was more ceremony and seriousness than there often is in a modern marriage. The augurs carefully chose a lucky day, and, when it arrived, the girl offered her child-garments and toys to the domestic gods, who had a shrine in every home. Then she was clad in the ancient type of tunic, over which a red veil was thrown; and a wreath of flowers and a woolen girdle completed her bridal costume. Before the priest (a civilian), and probably in the public hall, in the presence of ten witnesses and a number of friends, the boy and girl broke and shared the sacred cake (probably stamped with a phallus), and perhaps a sheep or an ox was sacrificed. Then they passed to the house of the bride's father, where music and dance and feasting filled the day. At dusk the girl kissed her mother, and, the whole crowd accompanying them with torches and flutes, singing naive descriptions of the purpose of marriage that would make modern ears burn, the couple went to the young man's home. The bride anointed the lintel with sacred oil and, falling on her knees beside the bed, which was set up in the central court or hall of the house, she prayed the gods to send her sons.

But this solemn ceremony had a dark side, though for some centuries, until contact with other people taught the Roman woman to compare, she was unconscious of the injustice. The rudimentary Roman law took no further interest in her or her children. From being the slave of her father the bride had become the slave of her husband and must obey every command. In time the power of the husband was tempered by calling a council of her relatives if she was accused of a grave charge, such as adultery, child-murder, forging keys, or drinking wine, for each of which she might be put to death by the husband. It is disputed if the husband could divorce her at will—there the interest of the state intervened—and for centuries, we are told, divorce was unknown. In fact, Roman public opinion saw to it that husbands rarely abused their power, and the wives

were generally well and affectionately treated. Yet it was an entirely unjust arrangement. The woman had no rights and no personality. She could sit or recline at dining with her husband and his friends, and she could go with him to the games on public festivals. But he was the political and military unit, the absolute master of wife and children. Each new-born child must be brought to him, and he could say that a female child must be destroyed or exposed in a public place in which slave-rearers would find it.

When we read about the sobriety and chastity of early Roman life we must understand these things. Several centuries of such subjection to the husband that he could kill her if she drank wine or he suspected her of adultery had certainly created a virtuous type of woman. For the man the moral yoke was, and remained even in the Christian fifth century at times, easy. He could keep a concubine, and her children were legitimate; and there was nothing in Roman morals to prevent him from having intercourse with his slaves or, when they arose, frequenting the brothels. With this latitude of conduct a Roman could afford to cultivate other virtues, but when, about the year 200 B. C., his women began to hear of other civilizations in which a woman was not condemned to spin and weave all day, with her slaves and the children, in the central hall into which the rooms of the house opened, a spirit of rebellion spread. Already by the year 215 the passing of a law to raise war-funds apprises us, incidentally, that the women were acquiring property of their own; and when, at the close of the war, the men refused to annul the law, there was a spirited demonstration by the women in the public square of Rome which put considerable pressure on the Senate and strangely anticipated scenes of modern times.

§2. IN THE AGE OF CAESAR

There is no need to trace all the steps in this revolt against the older tradition. In 204 B. C. the cult of Cybele was, as I said in the last book, introduced into and established at Rome, and it brought with it a breath of oriental feminism as well as scenes that did not confirm the sentiment of chastity. Twenty years later the cult of Bacchus was introduced from Greece and was secretly celebrated with great license everywhere. Conservative Romans avowed that the end of the world was near when they heard of Roman women at these secret orgies drinking great quantities of wine and, lightly clad in loose fawn-skin, dancing the wild bacchanal dances. The cult of Isis from Egypt was introduced, and, though few irregularities are known in connection with this, the cult encouraged the new self-consciousness of the Roman women. All the cults and practices of the world were now being represented at Rome, and the old parochial morality was undermined. Rome still, it is true, reacted with very virtuous indignation. The licentious cults were bloodily suppressed —ten thousand men were imprisoned or executed—or checked. As late as the time of Christ the priests of the temple of Isis were crucified and their temple destroyed because they had helped a noble to use their services to corrupt a young matron.

But the conservatives and moralists of Rome made the mistake

of endeavoring to hold women to the old form of marriage, which put her under the absolute authority of the husband, and refusing her the share in public life which she loudly demanded. Roman women were not content, like Greek women, to see their husbands turn to cultivated Greek or charming Syrian companions because they themselves were dull from lack of culture or confinement to domestic work. The cosmopolitan life which, especially after 200 B. C. when the conquest of Greece began, began to pour into Rome crossed the thresholds of the old placid homes. Greek philosophers and rhetoricians, Syrian slaves and slave-dealers, Chaldaean astrologers, Egyptian doctors or charlatans, gave the city a stimulating variety; and one of the most interesting novelties to the women was that in most of the countries from which these more civilized strangers came woman had a large measure of freedom, property, and independence. An increasing number of women refused to marry in the old solemn fashion or took care to evade its consequences. The law was that the power over the wife did not pass to the husband until a year after the marriage, and not then if the wife had been absent from the home for three successive nights. They began to take advantage of this by staying away three nights; and, as the power over them then remained with their fathers, they used another legal subterfuge and had it transferred at marriage to a friend upon whom they could rely never to claim or exercise it.

It would be surprising if in this emancipation from an ancient tyranny many women did not go to the opposite extreme, but there is another element to consider. The older Roman families were being gradually extinguished as the fathers and sons perished in the endless wars of the Republic. A new generation—the merchant, the big land-owner, the adventurer who remained at home to amass wealth while the patriots went to their death, the successful officer or general, the grafter or sycophant—replaced the old patricians and even the farmers. The prodigious numbers of war-captives and the vast conquered territories meant great estates cultivated by slave-labor, lucrative governorships of provinces and other offices, new temptations on all sides to graft and greed. The wealth of Rome rose rapidly, and in the prospect, which seemed to open out, of an unlimited wealth and luxury by bringing the whole world into subjection, the intoxication of the minds of the Romans increased. The old Roman ideal had, on the normal lines of moral evolution, entailed strict justice and benevolence to the men of one's own race but no obligation to others, since they were all actual or potential enemies. Hence there was bound to be a long period of exploitation, of slavery on a colossal scale, of callousness about bloodshed, of delight in the brutal sport of the gladiators.

Men of every class, patricians and plebeians and middle class, were morally corrupted by the deluge of unwonted luxury. The citizens of Rome sold their suffrages, for the higher offices, to the highest bidder. Until the third century, for instance, there had been only one public holiday a year. Now they multiplied rapidly and grew from one day to five or seven days. The new rich, intriguing for offices which would mean more abundant exploitation, gave the

crowds free shows and banquets that rose in cost from a few hundred dollars to even hundreds of thousands of dollars. There was after the year 150 B. C. no powerful enemy threatening Rome, so the old bond of union existed no longer and the virtues it had inspired almost perished with it. Religious skepticism inevitably spread, and sober moralists had not yet arisen to point out that the law of justice that had been put in the mouth of an imaginary Jupiter was a sanitary law of social life. Social standards were dimmed, and virtues which had not even a social significance were not likely to flourish. The conflict of ambitions let loose flaming passions, and vindictive executions, civil wars, and massacres of the supporters of a rival began more and more frequently to stain the Roman chronicles.

It would be a foolish mistake to refuse to admit that at this time —I am surveying, broadly, the period from about 190 B. C. to the end of the old era—the Romans were, in the comprehensive sense of the word, demoralized. Such a phase occurs in the history of almost every civilization, as we shall find in the various civilizations of Europe when, in the later Middle Ages, they awoke and began to accumulate wealth. Instead of disputing the fact the serious student will note that in the circumstances of the second and first century B. C. this demoralization was inevitable and intelligible, and that such danger to the state as is involved was perceived by the thoughtful minority, so that Rome recovered (as I will tell in the next chapter) its moral standards, without the help of any religion.

It will now be apparent why I stigmatized the popular conception of the moral history of Rome as a fairy tale. Apart from certain short periods of relapse later under vicious or insane emperors all genuine indictment of Rome by competent historians (such as Mommsen or Friedlaender) refers to the time I have covered; or, on the most conscientious estimate of the facts, we may say that the first emperor, Augustus, and his wife made a very earnest effort at reform and did effect a great improvement, but the three weak or vicious emperors who followed Augustus permitted a relapse until about 70 A. D. This means, first, that a general demoralization, in a real sense of the word, is found only in two centuries out of the eight or nine centuries of Roman history, and, secondly, that Rome reformed itself and became a great civilization at a time when its Christian community was merely a group of a few hundred Greek-speaking people in one obscure suburb. And to this I may add, in anticipation of the next book, that when the Christian religion did obtain influence, in the fourth century, no reform of morals, in any sense, followed.

How necessary it still is to make these points clear is proved by almost every reference one meets in current literature to pagan morals, which chiefly means Roman morals. A flagrant instance will be found in a life of Caesar that appeared last year and was strongly recommended by reviewers ("Julius Caesar and the Grandeur That Was Rome," 1928, by Victor Thaddeus). The title is arbitrarily ironical, and the book is written in a mood of the most narrow-minded malignity. The distinguished Christian historian of Rome, Dean Merivale, says that "the greatest name in history" is

Julius Caesar, yet in this book he is presented as a typical degenerate of a thoroughly corrupt age. The author knows Rome, and his book would be useful but for three defects that mar every page. The author not only incorporates every bit of discredited gossip but he freely uses his own imagination until it is impossible to separate fact from fiction: he almost completely ignores the good features of the time: and, worst of all, he deliberately represents that this is a normal picture of Roman character instead of being, as it is, a selection of the chief defects of an abnormal period.

I am not here concerned with moral values but must point out that the moral prejudice—the determination to prove that sexual license always leads to enfeeblement and decay—has done almost as much as religious prejudice to distort the facts of Roman history. Both Mommsen and Merivale, who find in this period "a general relaxation of public morality" (which no one questions), point out honestly that there was no decay of vigor. On the contrary, the strongest men of Roman history, which is generally understood to be a chronicle of strong men, lived precisely in this period; and the strongest of them shared the license of the time. Sulla, for instance, was the most commanding of the oligarchs who ruled Rome until 78 B. C. He was unscrupulous and sanguinary in his methods. He had, says Mommsen, a passion for wine and a greater passion for women. He knew nothing of old Roman dignity and loved to carouse with actors and courtesans. He used Roman wealth to indulge in oriental luxury to the full. But, Mommsen adds, "he lost neither bodily nor mental vigor." He was a great general and a genius at political organization; in fact, "one of the most marvelous characters of history."

And the second, perhaps the greatest of these strong Romans of the demoralized period—all sensual and erotic, all hard and ruthless with enemies, unscrupulous in the attainment of wealth and power, and disdainful of religion—was Caesar. His bitter enemies told stories of him that any conscientious man will leave open, but he certainly shared the amorous license and love of sensual pleasure of his time. Some of the mistresses assigned to him by Thaddeus are not admitted by serious historians, but Plutarch is authority enough for his many love-affairs and general lack of moral feeling. The chronicle of the time is full of such instances. Naturally I do not share the sentiment of those who shudder to find that divorce now became frequent, for a people without divorce consecrates domestic unhappiness and hypocrisy. But we gather the general spirit of the time when we read that Caesar and Antony married four times and Pompey five times: that Cicero lightly divorced his wife, his daughter divorced two husbands, and so on.

Let me add two final points for the understanding of this interesting period. I have said that it was precisely the stern old Roman marriage, which some seem to admire, that led to looseness. Although certain legal privileges were still connected with this old type of marriage and many contracted it, the state had in its own interest to recognize less ceremonious unions as marriages. This was done at first chiefly by giving legal recognition to a union en-

tered into voluntarily by the parties and lasting one continuous year. At the end of the year the union was a legal marriage. This at first gave the husband the old despotic authority, and here again the conservatives, in resisting the emancipation of the women, merely increased their tendency to liberty. It is thus quite possible that in some cases of what look like liaisons, as I said in the case of Cleopatra in the last volume, the parties, or the woman, regarded it as "marriage by use," as the law called the new form of marriage. But I would not stress these matters. Certainly there was a great development of free love in Rome in the first century B. C.; just as certainly it was one of the richest periods of Roman history in strong men and great generals.

The second point is that the real immorality of the age was the prevalence of public corruption, graft, bribery, etc., about which we moderns had better not say much, and, especially, of the readiness to shed blood or (in the games) witness the shedding of blood. A good deal of the life of the wealthy men of the time over which moralists shudder is merely a vulgar display of wealth to which we might find parallels without going into antiquity. The wealth of these capitalists of the first century did not approach modern fortunes—the wealth of the richest, Crassus, is given by Mommsen as about $5,000,000—but it was enormously beyond any earlier Roman experience and it led to reckless display. It coincided with the discovery of the luxuries of the eastern world, and men began to vie with each other in securing them. Fabulous prices were paid for luxuries that required costly transport (anchovies from the Black Sea, rare eastern fruits and wines, etc.), for the bringing of snow to cool the wine in summer, for the skilled cooks of the east—a small capitalist might build a country villa for $4000 and a rich man pay $5000 for a cook—for silks (contact with China was now established) and Phoenician purples, for bronzes, ivories, massive silver plate, carpets of gold brocade, and so on. Rich men gave banquets with so many costly dishes that a guest merely tasted each, yet became gorged, and at the close there were, as in the east, hours of wine-bibbing, flute-playing, conjuring, dancing of nude girls, while the guests, often in transparent silks, lay in pairs on the ivory or bronze-framed couches, and slaves rained perfume or flowers from the fretted cedar roof. Now also began the building of marble pleasure-palaces in the cool country or on the Bay of Naples. Often they had great salt-water tanks in which oysters and fish were kept fresh to the last moment. These things concern the economist rather than the moralist. The only luxury that need be noticed here is that there was a busy traffic in handsome boys. There was in this century certainly a good deal of paederasty amongst the rich.

We may keep our heads even when we read of the Lucullan banquets—Lucullus, by the way, was rather exceptional in being a slothful type of sensualist—of the time. Men who have large fortunes spend them as they will, and the general fashion seems, as I said, to have been consistent with great vigor. Merivale gives an example of this mingling of corruption and vigor in the last great revolt of the slaves in 73 B. C. In south Italy they formed an army

that some estimated at a hundred thousand and threatened Rome. Crassus crushed them with great energy and truculence—there was savagery on both sides, and the revolt largely explains the later harshness in the control of slaves—and, using his triumph, as was usual, for his personal advancement, he, on his return to Rome, fed the whole of the citizens for three months. The scramble for wealth led to a great deal of bribery of the people, faction-fights, murders, civil wars, and so on. It does today; but somehow we do not hear the word "debauchery" except when these things are discovered in ancient Rome.

CHAPTER V

THE TRUTH ABOUT IMPERIAL ROME

WE have now reached a point where we may survey the entire Greco-Roman civilization, and it was unquestionably wicked. Most of the countries we previously studied were now incorporated in one vast empire, and the streams of culture and commerce flowed so freely from point to point that very similar moral features were found in most of the cities of this mighty civilization. I have very candidly and fully described these features, in Antioch and Alexandria as well as in Rome, the three metropolitan cities of the world. That many features of this ancient life were ugly from every point of view, and a great reform was needed, we all admit. We need not think that we recognize Sadism, as Thaddeus foolishly does, in the Roman enjoyment of gladiatorial displays, nor talk hypocritically about a "selfish scramble for wealth" which one finds even amongst modern preachers and moralists. We may or may not frown on the sexual freedom that largely swept away the old Greek and Roman standards (mainly restrictive rules for women, remember), but if we care for truth we will not say that this led to race-deterioration, for just in this period of corruption Alexandria led the world in scientific, and Rome in political, constructiveness. Yet we shall all agree that there was a callousness, a readiness to shed blood, a lack of social sense, a general blurring of norms of conduct, from which the world needed to be redeemed.

We have seen the natural development that led, one might say inevitably, to this condition of moral confusion. It is repeated scores of times in history, in the Christian Era as well as the old era. The next step in any sensible study of morals is to discover whence the remedy came. In serious history there is no dispute about the fact that the remedy was found by the more sober Romans blending the best principles of the Stoic and the Epicurean ethics; and this is in a sense amusing for, as historians hesitate to mention, both philosophies were dogmatically materialistic. The familiar type of spiritual or moral enthusiast who tells his admirers how the materialism of the Romans threatened the extinction of civilization and how spiritual religion came as a blessed redeemer of the race seems to

be totally ignorant of the facts. The disorder of the Greco-Roman civilization of the first century B. C. was corrected, and a social order finer than any the world had yet known was set up, in the first century A. D. No authority on Roman history questions that. And since the old Roman religion had few elements of moral value and was not now literally believed by educated people, and no other religion had much influence in the first century A. D., it is absurd to invoke religion. At the most we might admit that a few of the men who cooperated in restoring Roman life were adherents of the cult of Mithra or the reformed cult of Isis, but the simple historical fact is that they overwhelmingly found their guidance in the Stoic or the Epicurean ethic or, in most cases, a common-sense blend of the Stoic doctrine of the law of nature and the brotherhood of men with the humanism of Epicurus. Very few Romans ever entertained the spiritual philosophies of Pythagoras or Plato or even what we might call the semi-spiritual philosophy of Aristotle.

§1. THE GOLDEN AGE

First let us get the facts correctly. In an effort to convey to the reader a full appreciation of Roman demoralization under the new wealth I have ignored many sound elements that existed in it at all times. Plutarch's lives describe almost as many high-minded Romans as purely selfish Romans in this period. In the Key to Culture (No. 27) I told of the work, in the second century B. C., of the Gracchi, sons of the noble Cornelia, who fought for a lofty humanitarian ideal in the worst part of the period, and they had many supporters. They got their ideal from their Greek teacher. At a later date Cicero, though not personally a sufficiently strong character to defy the worst elements of the time, taught the highest Greek moral code, including the brotherhood of man, in his moral treatises ("On Duty," etc.), and his letters introduce us to quite a large circle of sober-minded Romans between 60 and 40 B. C. The lives of Cato the Younger, of Brutus, and of several others in Plutarch's series, show that in every generation there were numbers of men and women who were inspired by the Greek philosophers. Everybody knows how a handsome and dissolute young Roman, Clodius, bribed a maid to admit him, disguised as a female musician, into Caesar's house, for an intrigue with Caesar's wife, during a religious celebration that was strictly confined to women, but few seem to know how many strict followers of the Greek ethic there were in Rome at the time.

The mischief is that the general public takes its ideas on Roman morals from amateur dabblers in Roman history who are steeped in prejudice and are quite ignorant of the successive phases of Roman life. Most people imagine that the worst period of Roman vice was the Golden Age, the reign of the emperor Augustus, the period in which the birth of Christ is placed. It would not matter much if we admitted this, since Christianity had no influence in Rome until several centuries later, but it is an error. The reign of Augustus, the first emperor, was one long attempt to restore higher standards of conduct, especially in sexual relations. He and his friends became

genuinely alarmed at the decay of the old Roman families, which, since Rome was now at peace, they attributed to a self-indulgence that refused to be burdened with children. Augustus therefore enacted severe penalties against adultery, rewarded the married folk who reared families, and fought the prevailing luxury by sumptuary laws and setting an imperial example of sober living. His empress, Livia, was a woman of high and strong character, and her influence may very well have counted in persuading Augustus to abandon the loose ways of his adolescence and devote himself to reform, but there is no historian who does not recognize that the emperor was genuinely zealous for reform.

Merivale suggests that in the grave disorder which Augustus brought to a close when he became emperor many must have looked back with regret on the sober earlier days, and that this feeling "served in some measure to purify the turbid elements of which at this period the mass of the Roman people was composed." The temples of the gods had fallen into decay; the solemn old ceremony of marriage was rarely witnessed. Possibly the gods were angry and had sent civil strife and other calamities upon the people. It was, at all events, the policy of Augustus to restore the old religion and infuse into it a strong moral and patriotic sentiment. The patricians resumed their priestly duties, and the people, who had not been affected by Greek skepticism, were taught to regard Rome as the darling of the gods and entirely dependent on their good-will. Augustus and the patricians and rich men who gathered round him restored the temples of Jupiter and Juno, especially the gold-roofed temple which dominated all Rome from the Capitoline Hill.

Jupiter and Juno were, childish as a marriage of deities seems to us, the divine model of the Roman family, and Augustus sought very vigorously to restore this. He at once offered rewards and privileges to parents who reared children, and, when this did not suffice, he (in 18 B. C.) decreed severe penalties against men who did not marry within five years of attaining maturity. Bachelors were declared incapable of inheriting property, and childless married men forfeited one-half of their legacies. Divorce was made more difficult, and very severe penalties were laid down for adulterers (17 B. C.). Those who were denounced to the authorities for adultery and were convicted of it were heavily fined and banished to small islands in the Mediterranean. During the whole of his long reign Augustus vigorously pressed this attempt to restore the ancient discipline, and his personal example after his accession was faultless. He and the empress Livia had a modest mansion, and all Rome knew that the stuff of the emperor's robes was woven by Livia and her maids. He walked freely about the streets of Rome, talking familiarly with those he knew.

However refractory the Romans may have been to his efforts, it is clearly a perversion of history to talk of the profound corruption of Rome at the beginning of the Christian Era and ignore the fact that during forty years (29 B. C. to 14 A. D.) the city was dominated by an emperor and empress of the severest ideals yet of considerable popularity. Next in prestige in the city was the emperor's intimate

friend and counselor, the famous patron of literary men, Maecaenas, and this wealthy, energetic, and high-minded patrician gathered about him a group of writers who cordially supported the aims of the emperor. When we call the period the Golden Age we refer chiefly to its literature, and four out of five of the great writers helped the reform. It was then that Vergil wrote his austere and patriotic epic; and, if there is no austerity in the poetry of Horace, it is nevertheless a very temperate epicureanism that he professes. For those who clung to the old frivolity Ovid wrote his erotic poetry, but he was in the end banished far away from Rome.

In the year 2 B. C. Augustus gave Rome a terrible proof of his earnestness. For some years his brilliant and charming daughter Julia had been one of the most audacious leaders of the fast set of young nobles. We do not today believe every story that was current in that gossipy age, and in fact the worst thing that you will read about Julia, even in Merivale, is based on a quite wrong translation of the text of the historian Dio Cassius. It is usually said that, to show her contempt of her father's puritanism, she had intercourse with her lovers, by night, on the very platform in the Forum from which his decrees had been delivered. What Dio says is that she "caroused and drank" with them; and even that is rumor. However, she was clearly addicted to much more than the frivolity for which her father often scolded her, for, in spite of his passionate love of his daughter, Augustus condemned her to a painful exile for life in an island off the coast. Rome stormed the emperor to forgive her, and he swore that fire and water should meet before he did so. It is said that the Romans flung torches into the Tiber to release him from his oath, but the brilliant young princess spent the rest of her life on the miserable island and, when there was a plot to release her, in a worse prison in south Italy. Her group was truculently broken up, one noble being executed and several banished. This is the world that is so commonly described as abandoned to an unbridled sensuality.

§2. IN THE DARK DAYS OF NERO

It is usually said that the efforts of Augustus and Livia were futile, but the only serious evidence is that there remained numbers of people at Rome who evaded the laws. No one can imagine that this severe imperial control of the city for fifty years—for the succeeding emperor, Tiberius, with whom Livia cooperated, sustained the policy for several years—could fail to have considerable influence. The long peace and the imperial attitude encouraged idealists; and the number of their pupils greatly increased. Thus by the time of Christ, or the time when Christ is said to have begun to preach, there were ascetic moralists in all parts of the Empire. Apollonius of Tyana preached his austere gospel in every part of the Empire, and he was so esteemed that he was credited with raising people from the dead. Plutarch, in the Greek world, was teaching so ascetic a morality that some of the Fathers declared that he had heard the Christian gospel. Seneca also was supposed to have learned from a Christian source, but he was also learning his ethic in the schools of Rome even before Christ began to teach. Within the

next generation appeared Musonius, Epictetus, and other moralists who, like Seneca, explicitly condemned all sexual intercourse outside marriage, and demanded the same standard of conduct for both sexes. A good summary of this growth of moralists and ascetics in the first century will be found in Dr. John Oakesmith's "Religion of Plutarch" (1902).

These moralists naturally reached, through their schools of philosophy and their lectures in public halls, a minority of the educated class at Rome. We shall see presently that that is quite enough to determine the character of a civilization, but there were two very serious limitations of their work. They were at this period mostly Stoics and too ascetic. On the other hand, Augustus had, in pressing his reforms in one direction, left other evils all their influence. He was, so to say, emperor only by sufferance of the Roman people and dare not refuse the price for which they had surrendered their democracy. Thus the games of the amphitheater became actually worse and more numerous, and this and slavery were the worst sources of contamination. The condition of the slave, we shall see, the moralists soon began to improve, but Seneca was almost the only man of the first century to denounce the gladiators.

It is difficult for us to see these things through Roman eyes, but unquestionably the passion of the Romans for the bloodshed of the arena was debasing. When ninety thousand of them spent a day in the Flavian Amphitheater (or Coliseum)—it is significant that this was built by Vespasian and Titus, so that until after the time of Nero no such vast edifice for sanguinary sport existed—eagerly following the deadly combats, thrusting up their thumbs to instruct a man to dispatch his fallen foe, while a great silk awning kept the sun from them and fountains refreshed them, the experience was positively vitiating. Women, even of the richer class, made idols of the more powerful gladiators (and of actors and charioteers). Men, in the worst periods, enlisted in the ranks of the combatants. This and the theater were the greatest hindrances to reform. In the theaters, which were generally pantomimic (without words), there were restrictions, it is true, for indecent exposure was never allowed, but the gestures were very free. These things, and the crude songs of wedding days, the wild exuberance of certain religious festivals (of Cybele, of the goddess Flora, etc.), and the general lack of definite moral standards outside the schools of the philosophers, left the mass of the Roman people always disposed to excess.

Then came three or four disastrous reigns. Tiberius was a strict and melancholy man, the last type to be popular at Rome, from the start. He became disfigured by eczema, bitter and morose, and retired from Rome after a few years; and stories, which we may reject, were current that he had turned to orgies of vice and cruelty. Livia died in 29 A. D., and demoralization set in like a flood. The next emperor, Caligula, was a weak-witted youth who surrendered to the most vicious parasites. One of his banquets cost $400,000. He is said to have dissolved pearls in vinegar and drunk them—these stories of Caligula and Cleopatra are either false, since it takes very strong vinegar hours to melt a pearl, or the pearls were swal-

lowed whole and would pass through the body—and to have had gold shaped like food served at table. The galleys he had at the coast, with ten banks of oars, were decorated with gold and jewels, and their decks had colonnades and vines. He trod the streets dressed as a god, as Jupiter (with a golden beard), as Apollo (with a golden halo), and even as Venus. His horse also he declared divine, and he made nobles pay millions of dollars for the honor of being high priests of its cult. He would compel the best men and women to attend his banquets and to indulge in a promiscuous orgy (on pain of death) at its close. In short, he was clearly insane, and, though the Romans assassinated him after four years of unparalleled extravagance, he had undone fifty years of reform.

His uncle, Claudius, succeeded him; and he was, unfortunately, an uncouth, gluttonous, weak-witted man whom everybody despised. His young wife was the notorious Messalina, whose name has become proverbial for the most licentious type of woman. Parasites ruled the emperor and empire, while his wife, once he was stupefied at night with food and drink, left the palace and painted the city red. There is a well-known story in Juvenal that she used to spend the night in a public brothel and return to the palace "tired yet not sated." We cannot take history from a reckless satirist who lived half a century later, but there is other evidence that she did fit up one of her rooms like that of a courtesan and exact preposterous sums from the nobles. She loathed people of strict life and forced noble ladies to imitate her, richly rewarding husbands who consented and having reluctant husbands murdered. Large numbers of the fine type of men and women who had appeared in the period of reform were beggared or executed. When one man hesitated to end his life rather than submit to her, his wife stabbed herself and handed the dagger to him, saying: "It doesn't hurt." Six years of this, until Messalina was herself executed, further degraded Rome, and Claudius then married the mother of Nero.

She was, I have shown in my "Empresses of Rome," not a bad type of woman for so difficult an age, though I by no means endorse the verdict of Baring-Gould that she was "queenly, honorable, and pure." Ambition made her at times unscrupulous, but she shrank with horror when she found what a monstrosity she had brought into the world. Nero is now admitted by all to have been insane, and there is no need to dwell on his conduct. One picture will suffice to show how it affected Rome. He announced that he would give a banquet on a raft on Lake Agrippa, and the citizens crowded to see it. The huge raft was drawn by vessels plated with gold and ivory and manned by the most notoriously dissolute young men he could select. Dining rooms, taverns, and brothels had been erected on the shore of the lake, and Nero compelled even noble dames to surrender themselves in these to the general public. He created a palace more gorgeous and gigantic than any yet known—so massive that the porch lodged a statue of himself a hundred and twenty feet high—and in this he installed as his wife, married to him in a religious ceremony, a notorious paederast. He had nude children tied to stakes in the garden, and he would don the skin of a wild beast

and rush on them. And the city "teemed with funerals," Tacitus says: the funerals of the sober men and women who still survived in large numbers to frown on his insanities. His old tutor Seneca and his wife opened their veins in the bath and passed away. Rome slew Nero at last, and it is remarkable that there was enough virtue left for a rebellion.

But I am not yet at the end. After a few temporary emperors—one of them managed to spend $35,000,000 in a few months—the sober Vespasian and Titus came to the throne. It is an elementary fact of Roman history that they began a stern reform of the city, but unfortunately they lived in the purple only a few years, and the half-insane Domitian succeeded Titus. Both he and his wife belonged to the licentious nobility which the reign of Nero had created, and, as there was now a strong sentiment against such things in Rome, they executed an appalling number of good citizens who might conspire against them. For fifteen further years virtue and sobriety were bloodily extinguished in Rome; extravagance and license were heavily rewarded. During nearly fifty years unbalanced sensualists had spent something more than a billion dollars in the deliberate debauchment of Rome and had extinguished hundreds or thousands of the best stocks in the city. We are quite prepared to believe that when the first Christian community gathered in small tenements on the other side of the Tiber, to discuss theology over the bread and onions and beans, with a sheep's head for a dainty occasionally, of the lower Roman worker, they found Rome very wicked indeed. We should search history in vain for a parallel to this half-century of deliberate corruption of a people.

§3. LIFE AND CHARACTER UNDER THE STOICS

It is more material to realize that, while this half-century destroyed all the work of Augustus and Livia, it was followed by a complete and remarkable restoration. There was in this, of course, much more than the influence of philosophy. Vespasian, who began the work of invigoration, and Trajan, who solidly established it, were soldiers, not scholars; and Hadrian, who completed the restoration of Roman society, was by no means an ascetic pupil of the philosophers. The main factor of the restoration is the infusion of strong provincial blood into the veins of Rome. For centuries the city had defied and exploited the provincials, but, as it grew feebler, the provincials asserted their rights and were admitted to Roman citizenship. Vespasian was an Italian, of peasant stock: Trajan and Hadrian were Spaniards, and by no means of a noble or effeminate strain: Antoninus Pius came from Gaul, and Marcus Aurelius was in part of Spanish blood. The administration, military and civil, was now filled with sober provincials of the same type, and the foolish excesses and tawdry license of the preceding reigns were contemptuously ridiculed. No one supposes that there were no longer perfumed mansions on the hills that witnessed exotic banquets and morbid practices. Juvenal's charges refer to the earlier age, which we have described, but the Epigrams of Martial, who now flourished, are one of the richest quarries of stories of aristocratic vice, and the loose stories of Apuleius must have had countless delighted readers.

These, however, are exceptions. The great historian Tacitus is a stern moralist: the orator Dion Chrysostom preached the highest social ideals yet known: and the letters of Pliny introduce us to an admirable circle.

Indeed, if we gathered the dissolute nature of the preceding half-century from the conduct of the emperors and empresses, we must now conclude from the conduct of what are called the Stoic emperors that hectic vices and extravagant display were now confined to an unappreciated minority. Trajan was a bluff, unconventional, shrewd man who liked to drink deep and pass rough jokes, but he and his wife lived quietly and labored hard to reform the state. Corrupt officials were deposed and a more vigorous and healthier service established. The empress Plotina's relations with the handsome young officer Hadrian gave rise to gossip, but Dio says that "she so bore herself throughout her whole reign as to incur no blame." The palace, an extremely modest edifice, for Nero's Golden House had been destroyed at his death, knew neither scandal nor rich banquets during the long reign. Trajan nursed the imperial resources and spent them on works of art or of mercy. Hadrian was a different type of man: brilliant and cultivated, skeptical about all religion, probably a paederast and certainly an epicure. Yet he did magnificent work for Rome, especially in the relief of distress of every kind during the twenty-one years of his reign. Antoninus Pius was an admirable man, and Marcus Aurelius was, as everybody knows, an ascetic and mystic.

Such was the group of men who for the next ninety years ruled the Greco-Roman civilization, and every historian speaks of it with high admiration. Gibbon thus characterizes it in the third chapter of his great work:

> "If a man were called to fix the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous, he would without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus. . . . The labors of these monarchs were overpaid by the immense reward that inseparably waited on their success: by the honest pride of virtue and by the exquisite delight of beholding the general happiness of which they were the authors."

A later and more critical scholar, the Christian historian Ludwig Friedlaender, the highest authority on the social life of the Romans ("Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire," English translation in four volumes 1909), says of this period (III, 280):

> "An age which raised itself by its own effort to higher and purer views of morality than all the ages which preceded it, which not only produced a Musonius, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius, but in which these preachers of a gentle, truly human system of ethics were generally admired and their doctrines generally adopted, cannot have been an age of utter moral decay, as it has been so often called."

And the highest recent authority on that particular period, Sir Samuel Dill ("Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius," 1904) calls it an age of "almost unexampled peace and prosperity, a period of upright and benevolent administration and of high public virtue."

This appreciation of the Stoic age is common among the expert authorities, yet you will not have failed to notice a peculiarity in the words of Friedlaender. It is an age in which men, by their own efforts (that is to say, without any religious influence), reach a higher moral standard than the race had yet known and when the doctrines of the moralists were "generally adopted," yet, the learned writer says, it is often called an age of "utter moral decay." I cannot help thinking that for once the historian is noticing inexpert references to Rome which ought to be beneath his attention, but there is here a point of some interest. Beyond question this Stoic age, as we call it, was the highest in social virtue that the world had yet known. Italian archaeology has fully confirmed the ancient Roman writers in that respect. It has enabled us to realize that there then spread over Italy a wave of charity and philanthropy to which even the Greek world shows no approach. The emperors and the wealthy sought out distress in every part of the country and spent vast sums in relieving it. This is now so well known that any man who repeats the old myth that the Romans had to wait for Christian lessons in charity, sympathy with the weak, and unselfish action is talking nonsense. And since it was the Stoic doctrine of the brotherhood of man which admittedly inspired these generous philanthropies and the redress of legal injustices (especially to women and slaves) we call this "the Stoic Age." I have given the facts in Little Blue Books 1218, 1222, and 1227.

Yet it is misleading to speak of Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius, the men who inspired most of this work, as Stoics. None of them shared the mystic and ascetic views of Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, and we are once more reminded how a people can attain a very high moral ideal, in regard to all conduct that is social, yet be uncertain or heterodox in regard to sex. It does not, of course, follow that Rome had to wait for the Christian teaching about sex, for Seneca, Musonius, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius taught as ascetic a doctrine in that respect as any modern Church. Yet it would be interesting to inquire to what extent this general moral improvement of Rome was accompanied by stricter ideas about sexual relations. It is useless to quote the references of Juvenal and Martial to women who had eight or nine or ten husbands. Not only are all their statements suspect, but we know that the general respect for marriage was restored, and the facilities for divorce were much the same as we shall find them later under the Christian emperors.

It is, as usual, impossible for a conscientious historian to make any comparison of sexual conduct in this age with the same conduct in later ages. If you read Martial alone, you get an impression of quite exotic vice; but he is speaking only of a limited set. Friedlaender has a very extensive inquiry into the point (I, 241-67) and only succeeds in showing how impossible it is, as he in the end admits, to generalize. He brings together every text that impugns

the virtue of the Romans at this period; and, unfortunately, he includes Juvenal and Ovid, who do not refer to this period, and Martial, whom he pronounces unreliable. He gives the usual stories of women enrolling themselves as prostitutes to escape the marriage laws; yet there is only one case known, and it was very long before the time of the Stoics, and the practice was at once forbidden. He then reminds us how the satirists and moralists love to tell extreme cases and ignore virtue, and how little scrupulous they are about the truth of their stories; and he shows that tomb-inscriptions of the time constantly describe women as "honest, chaste, and obedient." One epitaph of a consul to his dead wife runs: "Why mention domestic virtue and chastity? . . . This is common to all honorable women." Dill also is impressed by these inscriptions. When he notices Juvenal's attacks on women of the patrician class, of which he knew nothing—and in any case he fumes as much when a woman learns philosophy as when she has a lover—Dill warns us:

> "In his own modest class female morality, as we may infer from the inscriptions and other sources, was probably as high as it ever was, as high as the average morality of any age. There were aristocratic families, too, where the women were as pure as Lucretia and Cornelia or any matron of the olden days. The ideal of purity, both in men and women, in some circles was actually rising." (p. 76).

Let me remind you that Juvenal's class, the workers, means four-fifths of Rome. However, like Friedlaender, I should prefer not to generalize. Yet some of the facts are remarkable. Dill mentions an inscription that has been recovered at Veleia, a small Italian town where Trajan founded an orphanage. From this we learn that of three hundred orphans only two or three were illegitimate: about one percent. Now as late as 1880 the ratio of illegitimate births in Catholic Austria was 14.5 percent, in Bavaria 13.5, in Saxony 12.9; in fact, more than 10 percent in most of the countries of Europe. The Papal States had a very bad record. Yet I should regard the Veleia rate as very exceptional in the Roman world. At the most we may conclude that strict domestic virtue was quite common in the Stoic age and was generally recognized as the ideal. The idea that many have, that there was no check on sensual or sexual impulses in the Roman world, is grotesquely untrue at this period.

There is, in fine, an aspect of this period of high social virtue that claims special attention. The religious or intuitionist moralist will admire the splendid justice and benevolence of the first three "Stoic" emperors yet regret that they, apparently, rejected the strict Stoic teaching in regard to pleasures of sense and sex. There were in all parts of the empire, as we saw, prophets who preached this ascetic standard, and the fourth emperor, Marcus Aurelius, urged it upon his people by the full force of his example and his pen. What was the result? He alienated large numbers from the Stoic philosophy who had hitherto been attentive to its more sober and humane principles. It was after the death of Marcus that corruption invaded

Rome once more, when Commodus and his concubine, the first imperial friend of the Christians, restored all the vulgarity and wildness of the days of the Caesars. But the degeneration set in under Marcus Aurelius. The court very largely scorned him, and his wife was loose. His son grew up in infamy. Clearly it had been the blend of the best elements of Epicurus and Zeno that had saved Rome. The ascetic ideal, for which some imagine Rome waiting, brought back the old demoralization within ten years.

CHAPTER VI

GRECO-ROMAN CHARACTER IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

AFTER the close of the Stoic series of emperors in 179 A. D. the empire entered upon a long period of disturbance with such changes of aspect under good rulers and bad rulers that a large volume would be required to describe the development. At one time, under Elagabalus, we find the Romans gazing on such openly paraded exhibitions of morbid sexuality as we found under the insane or half-insane Caesars. At another time we find it under the model rule of Alexander Severus, who even honored a bust of Christ in his private chapel. But we may not unprofitably pass over this century of confusion, until the strong Diocletian restores the empire once more, and concentrate on a question of peculiar interest.

This question is: What was the moral condition of the Greco-Roman civilization at the time when Christian teachers began to have an influence on it, or on a considerable proportion of its citizens? The man who would form a sensible opinion on the question as to what Christianity contributed either to ethical theory or to the improvement of general moral conduct must be quite clear on this point. The picturesque vices described, whether faithfully or imaginatively, by Juvenal and Martial, have no bearing on our estimation of what Christianity did for Europe: still less relevant are the paederasts of the days of Caesar or the brutalities and dishonesty of the last century of the Republic. From the greater part of those ancient vices and injustices the Roman civilization had purged itself by the year 150 A. D. The moralist may find a shuddering interest in the sadistic orgies of Nero, the insanities of Caligula, the sexual hysteria of Messalina, or the idiotic performances of Elagabal, but he cannot use them to persuade us that, in the common phrase, the Roman Empire was utterly corrupt and debauched, and a new religion alone could save it. The plain reason is that no religion did effect reform in any of these ages of demoralization, yet Rome was reformed. I assume that no serious person will question that before the fourth century the Christian religion had no influence on more than fifty thousand people (that is the maximum and an exaggerated estimate) out of the million citizens of Rome; and they were isolated from its public life, and their body never included one really influential Roman. The only instance we have of contact between

the Church and the government before the last part of the third century is that once, in the reign of Commodus, possibly the most brutal of the emperors, the bishop of Rome was ushered through some back door by a eunuch into the presence of the emperor's wild and utterly dissolute mistress—and she remained the same until her death—and received certain favors from her.

In any case, what interests us is not whether the Christian Church of the first and second centuries induced a small proportion of the inhabitants of the Greco-Roman world to reform from vice and brutality, to cultivate chastity and brotherliness. It did, of course: as did also the Mithraist or the Manichean, the Isisist or the Neo-Platonist religion. What interests us is that there is a persistent and apparently ineradicable tradition in our literature that the Greco-Roman civilization of the fourth century was comprehensively corrupt and debased, and that the establishment of the Christian faith as the religion of all was followed by at least a marked general moral improvement. The first part of this tradition, the extent of the corruption of the Roman world in the fourth century, we examine carefully here. The next part, the supposed improvement, we will consider in the next book.

§1. THE CHARACTER OF THE CHRISTIAN EMPERORS

I have in previous works had occasion to speak a little about the character of the first Christian emperor, Constantine, but as he was not a formal Christian, or not baptized, until near his death, his crimes may not seem to be significant. It will be useful here, therefore, to give a short account of all the emperors of the fourth century. We have, as people do, largely judged the character of the Romans by the well-known facts about their rulers, and we may use the same standard here. Did the new Christian emperors rise above the high level of Augustus, Vespasian, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Alexander Severus, Septimius Severus (who tried to extinguish adultery), and Diocletian? Did any sink to the lower level? And what was the proportion of virtue and vice amongst them?

Let me first give some sort of statistical view of the respective length of reign of good monarchs and vicious monarchs in the pagan empire: that is to say, before the accession of Constantine. During the two hundred and ten years from the accession of Augustus to the death of Marcus Aurelius, the period we surveyed in the last chapter, the good emperors held the purple for one hundred and sixty years and the definitely bad emperors, of evil influence, for about fifty years. Good and bad empresses are in about the same proportion. In other words the court which autocratically ruled Rome during two-thirds of the first two centuries of the empire had, and was faithful to, an ideal of sobriety and public service and during more than half the time the rulers were men of great eagerness to prevent excesses and promote the welfare of their people. This is the chief period in which people find their evidence that Rome was "utterly corrupt," yet until modern times I doubt if you will find a royal or imperial chronicle as good as this in the history of any European country after the year 300 A. D.

It is not possible to give as precise a statistic for the years 180 to 310, as the empire was during a great deal of the time in confusion and some of the emperors are not well known. But it is admitted that Septimius and Alexander Severus, Valerian, Aurelian, and Diocletian were good monarchs and unselfish rulers, so that, if we add the shorter reigns of a few good men who rose to the purple, even in that turbulent period Rome was governed at least half the time by worthy men; and the longest reigns were the best reigns. In a word, from the founding of the empire to the accession of Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, power was in the hands of good men during two-thirds of the time: a fact which will, no doubt, surprise many people who think they know much about pagan Rome.

And it is quite certain that there was no improvement in the emperors after the accession of Constantine. Of that monarch I need repeat only that, while we must esteem his work as a whole, it is now admitted by nearly all historians that in a fit of temper he ordered the brutal murder of his son (by a concubine) and his wife, and therefore he has not as clean a record as two-thirds of his pagan predecessors. His death was followed by an orgy of murder in the imperial palace, where all were now Christians, for a parallel to which you will have to search the most degraded periods. After this ghastly massacre of two uncles, seven cousins, and a number of their supporters, Constantine's three sons shared the power. Within three years two of them were at war with each other—and then there were two. The survivor of the quarrel, Constans, was so blatantly addicted to homosexual vice (and other vices) that his own officers slew him in disgust. Then there was one. This one, Constantius, after a civil war which cost the empire 54,000 men, was chaste but murderous, and he caused terrible distress by imposing the Arian heresy on a reluctant Church. He appointed his cousin Gallus to rule the eastern empire, and this prince and his Christian wife gave Antioch three years of such vice, greed, and cruelty as it had not seen for ages, so that Constantius had his royal cousin murdered. It is interesting to note, in passing, that it was this thoroughly depraved pair, Gallus and Constantina (daughter of Constantine himself and as degraded as any woman in Roman history), who sanctified the wicked grove of Daphne at Antioch by building a Christian Church in it. Twelve princes of Constantine's house had now been murdered in less than twenty years, and a hundred thousand men had fallen in civil wars. The dynasty ended in the one monarch whom historians can entirely respect, Julian, an apostate and a pupil of Greek philosophy.

The Constantinian blood being extinct, the Christian officers, Valentinian and Valens, were elected by the troops. Valentinian was so barbaric in nature that, the contemporary historian Ammianus Marcellinus tells us, he kept two great bears in cages in the palace, near his own room, and fed them on the flesh of his very numerous victims; and his sexual conduct embarrassed his bishops. He died from a burst of rage, and, as Valens, a quiet and decent man, was already dead, boy-emperors rose and fell, quarrels and petty wars seethed round the throne, and the barbarians swarmed over

the frontiers of the empire. The only strong and capable ruler of the time was a general, Theodosius, who was chosen to rule the east; and against even his name stands the terrible blot of the massacre, for an affront to his dignity, of more than ten thousand of his own Greek subjects in one day at Thessalonica. Boy-rulers, who remained weak and useless to the end, then held power to the fall of Rome, while the princesses, when they were not saints, gave the world lurid scandals. One of them had such marked nymphomania that she offered her love to the king of the Huns who had precipitated the ruin of the empire; and the barbarian condescended to add the name of this princess of Rome to the long list of his wives. I will describe in the next volume how court-life developed in the undisturbed east. The story of the Christian emperors of the west from the accession of Constantine to the fall of the Empire is deeply stained with scandals, bloodshed, and criminal selfishness.

§2. THE LAST PAGAN GENTLEMEN

I am to some extent anticipating the theme of the next book in thus running over the series of the emperors, but it seemed important, or probably of great interest to the reader, to contrast at once the two series of emperors. But, while the emperors were all, except Julian, sincere Christians, the mass of the people remained pagan until the last part of the century. To confine our inquiry and make the research more profitable, let me say that the city of Rome was (as I have proved elsewhere and is not seriously disputed) predominantly pagan as late as 380. It will be enough to repeat that in 384 St. Augustine first visited Rome, and he tells us that "almost the whole of the nobles were still pagan," and he saw the crowds enjoying the spring-festival of the goddess Cybele on the open streets. It is, at all events, not questioned that the educated Romans of that period were unaffected by any influence of Christianity, and we therefore see in them the last phase of the evolution of Roman morals, the world which the Christian Church really took over from the old religion.

We are fairly well informed about the state of Roman society at that time. The struggle against the encroachment of Christianity had drawn together the leading Romans, and one of their most respected representatives, Symmachus, Prefect of Rome, has left us a large collection of his letters. Although letters were then rather elaborate literary compositions, these personal messages very faithfully apprise us of the sentiments of the writers and receivers, and we clearly see that their standard of character was equal to the best of the Stoic age or, indeed, of our age. The leading men and women of Rome in its last pagan generation are obviously people of admirable character. The ideal is, as we should say in modern language, the gentleman: temperate, honorable, devoted to public interests, refined, normally domestic.

This impression is fully confirmed by another work of the time in which one of the many cultivated Greek teachers at Rome, Macrobius, in a work which he calls "Saturnalia," gives us a series of imaginary conversations of Symmachus and his friends at this time.

He makes his characters discuss the older times, the extravagance of which I have described, and reflect that these things are now entirely out of fashion. They have been "corrected by the sobriety of our own times." Syrian dancing girls are no longer seen at banquets (he means of the men he is describing), and exorbitant prices are no longer paid for cooks and delicacies. "These insane expenditures are unknown in our day," he says. There is no longer heavy drinking after dinner, and there is none of the old harsh attitude toward slaves. It is exactly what we feel in reading the actual letters of the men he describes; and he would probably have been greatly astonished if some Chaldaean diviner had told him that men in Britain would be reading the actual letters of these men sixteen centuries afterwards.

Moralists sometimes remark that these later Romans were more temperate and refined because they had not the money that their predecessors had had, but the best recent experts estimate that the wealth of the richer Romans has been greatly exaggerated. I quoted an estimate of the fortune of the richest Roman in republican days, $5,000,000 (some estimates run to $8,000,000). Wealth increased in the first century of the empire, but private fortunes were never anything like what they are in modern America. Friedlaender, perhaps the best authority on such matters, says that no Roman fortune ever reached twenty million dollars, and only two approached that sum. He agrees with Hock that "ancient luxury was far more limited than modern" and "cannot be compared with that of our own day." In fact, Friedlaender repeatedly urges us to realize that the Roman world, even in its richest days, was much poorer than our world; and he was referring to Germany thirty years ago, not America today. The popular idea of the big Roman capitalists and what they wrung out of the labors of countless slaves is quite wrong. And it is a mistake to think that men of the senatorial class were impoverished in the fourth century. The Prefect Symmachus had three houses in Rome, fifteen villas in the country, and about $300,000 a year; and there were richer Romans, some of whom are estimated to have had, at this period, $900,000 a year.

If I followed a fashion that is very common, I might restrict myself to this picture and say that these refined, temperate, honorable, and humane patricians are really the Rome which Christianity took over. But there is another picture in the "Chronicle" of a sturdy old general of the time, Ammianus Marcellinus. When he settled down in Rome after his arduous campaigns in defense of the threatened empire, the sight of fops and dandies in the Forum, effeminate young men who ought to be at the front, maddened him, and in his Chronicle he gives us very valuable pictures of contemporary Rome. Unfortunately most writers are content to quote Ammianus and ignore Macrobius and Symmachus, so they keep up the fiction of an utterly corrupt Rome.

If we put together the two pictures, and reflect that, while we may implicitly trust a scholar like Macrobius, writing tranquilly in his library, whereas a disgruntled soldier is likely to exaggerate, we get the true picture. There was still a "smart set" amongst the

patricians. There are "three thousand" dancing girls (how many in private ownership he does not say) in the city, and there are bloated capitalists who have "thirty secretaries" at hand in the dining room to take down the weight of the peacocks, pheasants, or rare fish that are served up. Their bands have "lyres as large as chariots," and the drunken sots have gold dust strewn on the marble floors so that they will not slip. And they fly about the streets in ivory-plated chariots, and are clad in the most exquisite silks, and so on. Even women paint their eyebrows and eyelashes and lips—some of them chew wood before they go out to increase the saliva and make the mouth fresh and moist—and have weird and wonderful headdress and gold-cloth tunics. In other words, Ammianus, a soldier, knows that the empire is dangerously threatened and he hates these new rich and their pomp, and especially the young men who ought to be leading troops in Germany.

But Ammianus says very little about vices of his contemporaries, and we may be quite sure that he would if he could. I am not in the least going to suggest that these patricians of the more luxurious sort were puritans. It happens that the only explicit information we have about Roman morals, in the sexual sense, about this time is St. Jerome's account of the morals of the Roman priests and Christian women. It is almost worse than any description of pagan morals, but it belongs to our next book, and I quote it here only to say that I do not suppose that the Christians were, class for class, worse than the pagans: not, at least, if we set aside the priests. We will, however, not take up that comparison here. It is enough that, while Ammianus complains of the luxury and effeminacy of one set of rich people, and Macrobius shows us a very temperate and refined world (which is confirmed by the contemporary poetry of Ausonius and Claudianus), Jerome lets us see that sexual life was still very free in the middle and lower classes.

§3. A GENERAL IMPRESSION

To the end, therefore, we find it very difficult to make any generalization about Roman morals. Friedlaender, unfortunately, does not distinguish between the different stages of Roman life, which we now see to be very important; and, in any case, he heaps together so many proofs of both vice and virtue that he finds it impossible to make a general statement. Sir Samuel Dill, whose work on the Stoic period I have noticed, has made another valuable study of this period ("Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire," 1899). In the first chapter of the second book he sets out to answer this question, "Was society so corrupt and effete as it has been represented?" To that question he easily answers no. There has been gross exaggeration. But he also finds it difficult to generalize. He is clear, at all events, that "upper class life" is "not so dark as in the days of Lucullus or the days of Nero," and it was "hardly worse" than in England under George II and George III. Dill analyzes also the writings and letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, of the fifth century, and finds the same lesson. I should deduce it also

from the pagan-correspondents of St. Augustine. Gaston Boissier, the chief French authority, says much the same as Dill.

We are surely justified in concluding that the Roman world, instead of sinking deeper and deeper, as the popular account represents, gradually improved and was at its best in the fourth century. We have not at this time, it is true, the philanthropic zeal of the Stoic period, but we must remember that the more acute needs of the empire had been met. By 350 there was free education for the children of all, free medical treatment, free recreation, and free bread; and presumably the charitable institutions of the Stoic age were still active. On the other hand, one of the most tainting influences remained in Roman life. The Christian emperors sustained the brutal games of the amphitheater for more than a hundred years: until, in fact, the general impoverishment of the empire greatly reduced their importance and made it possible to suppress them. The more demoralizing old religious festivals also remained until near the end of the fourth century. The mass of the people were familiar with the large phallic emblem in the temple of Priapus, still sang their very candid songs at a wedding, still enjoyed the frivolous comedies and very free gestures of the mimics, and so on. Probably if there had been such a thing as the cinema in those days, and we could put on our screens pictures of actual Roman life sixteen centuries ago, we should declare the Romans more immoral than ourselves; but even this must be qualified by pointing out that our censors and police make the picture of our life more discreet, whereas in Rome there was little check.

On the whole, therefore, I am inclined to agree with Dill, that the general level of life might be much the same as in England a century to a century and a half ago, though I should claim that in the Roman upper class there was a stronger sense of social justice and a larger proportion of temperate men. And we may extend this comparison to the whole Greco-Roman civilization. Carthage and Antioch seem to have been at much the same level. Alexandria, Athens, and the cities of Asia Minor were, perhaps, a little better, for there was still considerable zeal for philosophy in them. Broadly we may say that Rome gives us the moral level of city-life in the Greco-Roman civilization between 350 and 390, when the transition to Christianity took place. The conscientious student will reflect that, while the Romans had, by their blend of Stoic brotherhood and Epicurean common-sense, considerably raised or broadened the moral ideal, less progress had been made by the ancient world in four millennia than we should expect. The games of the amphitheater, the exposure of unwanted children, and slavery were great blemishes that disfigure this civilization and prevent us from declaring it, as some moderns would do, superior to ours. But we shall next see that, if the standard of conduct and the general behavior have risen above this Roman level of the fourth century, this was done neither in early Christian times nor the Middle Ages. It is peculiar to our own age. The moral level which had been irregularly and unsteadily rising until 400 A. D. began then to sink and did not rise again to the Roman level until the nineteenth century.

A HISTORY OF HUMAN MORALS

Volume VII

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

The Moral Life of China and India

An Outline of Their Lives from Early Days to Recent Times

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

Girard, Kansas

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS.

Page

Chapter I. The Early Development of Chinese Character..... 5
(1) Before History Began. (2) The Early Civilization. (3) The Chou Dynasty. (4) The Age of Reaction.

Chapter II. The Age of Philosophers and Moralists.....15
(1) The Sages of China. (2) The Early Empire. (3) Under the Han Emperors.

Chapter III. The Golden Age 24
(1) A Phase of Barbarism. (2) At the Height of Civilization. (3) In the Time of the Lady Yang.

Chapter IV. The Evolution of Hindu Society.....35
(1) New Light on the Origins. (2) The Vedic Period. (3) The Growth of the Phallic Element. (4) The Mission of Buddha. (5) In the Days of Chandragupta.

Chapter V. In the Golden Age 48
(1) A Buddhist King. (2) India Rises as Europe Sinks. (3) Contact With Other Civilizations.

Chapter VI. The Ways of the Turks and Tatars.....58
(1) The Civilizing of the Turks. (2) The Taming of the Tatars.

THE MORAL LIFE OF CHINA AND INDIA

CHAPTER I

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF CHINESE CHARACTER

IN ANY continuous story of the development of civilization the historian ought to pass from Europe after the decay of the Greco-Roman culture and take up the evolution of ideals in Asia. The fact that silk, printing, paper, the mariner's compass, powder, and other chemical and mechanical inventions, to say nothing of ideas of astronomical instruments, came to medieval Europe from China ought to remind any person that for some centuries the theater of progress had passed from Europe to Asia. This historical situation I described in the Key to Culture. Just when Christian Europe was at its lowest level of culture there was a continuous line of high civilization from southern Spain to China. The material splendor of this Asiatic civilization, as we may fitly call it, since even in Spain its brilliance was due entirely to the Arabs and Jews, is not questioned by any historian, but it is customary to attempt to redeem the credit, or extenuate the disgrace, of Christian Europe by indicating grave moral defects in the Mohammedan and Asiatic countries. We saw in the last two books that even in this respect the southern peoples were far superior to those of Europe, and we have now to inquire whether the Hindus and Chinese were really lacking in ideals which Europe possessed, even if for some centuries it failed to observe them.

The study is interesting from a broader viewpoint. The contacts of India and China with other civilizations were effected over so vast a space of uncivilized land and were so often interrupted that we may on the whole regard them as native developments without foreign influence. Europe, into which every ancient people had, through Rome and Greece, poured whatever knowledge and skill it had acquired during nearly four thousand years of historical life, ought in the early Middle Ages to have been the richest center of ideals and progress on the earth. China and India, so little affected by the western merchants who visited them in certain periods and still less disposed to send their students to the west until recent times, ought, on the now generally recognized principle of social progress—that it depends mainly upon the clash of differing cultures—to have made far less advance. Yet I have shown in earlier volumes as regards intellectual and material progress, and will here show in regard to moral progress, that both countries were at least from the seventh to the sixteenth century, superior in most respects to Christian Europe. If we care to consult facts rather than theories and prejudices in regard to the origin of ideals of conduct the study of moral development in China and India ought to be particularly instructive.

There are, in fact, many other respects in which the study of

the evolution of character in India and China is particularly interesting. A high recent authority on the Chinese pronounces them "a frugal, peace-loving, hard-working people," yet "the least religious people in the world." This seems to promise some useful light on the question of the relation of religion to morals. The interest increases when we reflect that, while this quotation refers to the mass of the people, it is undisputed that the educated class is as a body entirely destitute of religious belief yet has one of the highest standards of social conduct in the world. On the other hand, the Hindu nation is extremely religious yet generally regarded as not morally equal to the Chinese: the Hindu educated class has, and has had for ages, a refined and subtle religious philosophy yet has an admittedly lower standard of life than the corresponding body of educated people in China. I have summarily stated these facts in earlier works and will here give sufficient details about the life of the Chinese and Hindus in the different phases of their development to establish my conclusions, and, as far as it is possible, explain the peculiarities in their respective developments.

§1. BEFORE HISTORY BEGAN

Prehistoric science has made many interesting discoveries in the last few years, and some of these will have to be taken into account when we come to deal with early India, but there is no change in our scanty knowledge of the origin of Chinese civilization. We have discovered that a very early type of prehistoric man lived in what is now the region of Pekin, probably between quarter and half a million years ago—at the moment of writing the discoverer of the remains estimates their age at about a million years, but I anticipate that this will be considerably reduced—but at the most this merely extends to an earlier date the occupation of China by its prehistoric and uncivilized inhabitants. For the origin of civilization itself we have no more knowledge than when I wrote the Key. Some think that a rudimentary culture—agriculture, cattle-rearing, weaving, etc. —was brought into China by a body of migrants from western Asia: others think that, as is obviously possible in a region where many tribes of differing culture would come into contact, this was developed in China itself. I recommended the first of these two theories, and the recent discovery that there was actually a civilization in north India more than five thousand years ago seems to make it more plausible than ever.

Apart from speculation we have, as usual, two ways of investigating the early moral and social evolution of the Chinese: to study the habits of the Mongol peoples who have retained primitive ways or to extract what facts we can from the mass of Chinese legends about their early life. Both methods are uncertain, but there is a fair agreement between the results. It is the familiar story of broadening the virtues of the best family-life to embrace a larger social group, as villages grow into towns and scattered populations concentrate into nations, so that we need not linger over it. Such primitive Asiatic peoples as the Kalmuks and Tunguses give us, perhaps, a good idea of what we call the pre-civilized stage. Reclus is, no

doubt, generous when he says of the Tunguses (of whom the Manchus are a branch):

> "Full of vivacity and natural impulse, always cheerful under most depressing conditions, respecting both themselves and others, of gentle manners and courteous address, obliging without servility, unaffectedly proud, scorning falsehood, and indifferent to suffering and death, the Tunguses are unquestionably an heroic people."

But the general characterization of those Mongol peoples who have not yet, as one authority puts it, "taken to drink and religious influence," is little less generous. They are pastoral peoples and very scattered, but very courteous and hospitable (even to strangers); and ideas of personal property are so confined (to one's horse, saddle, wife, clothes, weapons, and tent) that there is less occasion for quarrel than amongst people who own land. The chief defect is ferocity in war whenever, as in the case of the Tatars and Huns, any of these people were drafted into the armies of imperialist conquerors. This does not surprise us. The ideal of social conduct does not apply in such a case. On the other hand, where a higher religion than the primitive nature-worship of Asia has been adopted, we find all sorts of alterations of the natural moral development. In both Thibet and Burma, for instance, we see the effect of Buddhism, but in the former case it is a spurious Buddhism, a system of ritual and priestly exploitation that has done nothing to improve the people. In Burma, where Buddhism is purer in this respect, its highest counsel, universal love, has given a peculiar charm to the people. There are parts of Thibet where the people are actually fond of drinking blood and even give their children and horses a mixture of cheese, butter, and blood. In other places the Thibetan people have a theory of their origin which does not flatter their character. They descend, they say, from a king of monkeys (hence their religious faith, kindheartedness, and intelligence) and a female demon (hence cruelty, lust, the taste for blood, and greed). Isolation and priestcraft afford a more natural explanation of their mixed qualities. In Burma, on the contrary, we find general refinement and "a bright, genial disposition, natural kindness, and extreme friendliness toward strangers." Every Burmese boy is educated in a Buddhist monastery and is for some years a monk, so that priests and monks are not, as in Thibet, isolated from the mass of the people and regarded as a superior and exploiting caste. In other words, the natural social development has been usefully stimulated by the best element of the teaching of Buddha. There is general honesty and good nature. Women are very free, and there is a note of independence and democratic equality everywhere. But the good sense of the people has accepted Buddhism only in so far as it accords with the obvious laws or desirabilities of social life. The ascetic element is ignored and there is considerable liberty in sexual relations.

§2. THE EARLY CIVILIZATION

What we can gather from the earliest Chinese books agrees very well with what we learn from the habits of the primitive Mongols.

The chronicles which pretend to describe events earlier than the first millennium before Christ are full of legends and we must be cautious about taking details from them, but most writers agree that the general picture is reliable. Miss Edith J. Simcox has collected from these early writings a full picture of the life of the people in the second millennium before Christ. "In China four thousand years ago as now," she says, "the common people employed themselves, and as a natural consequence they formed a standard of comfort fully equal to that reached under the rule of the most liberal and benignant of masters." They lived for the most part in villages of about two hundred or more inhabitants, and there was no feudal system. We cannot be sure in what age the organization of this society began, but it is clear that in the earlier period the Chinese farmer was his own master, or had at the most only three days of forced labor every year. A headman over every twenty-five families assigned the taxation, directed the sowing of the rice, and kept an account of the life of the people. Every three years he sent to the governor of the province a list of those who showed capacity above the average, and honors were awarded on this basis.

The earliest Chinese poems, which minutely and charmingly reflect the early life in the country, suggest a very orderly and not unpleasant life, entirely free from the horrors of the feudal system. There was no costly priesthood or monasticism to support, and the tribute to the distant monarch was not grudged, as it was generally believed that the early kings had conferred all the benefits of civilization upon the Chinese and given them most beneficent laws. The kings never hunted if there was danger of injury to crops, and at the close of one of the great royal hunts it was customary for the game to be divided amongst the people. It was permitted to take fuel from the woods and forests, but there were regulations to prevent the extermination of the forests; just as the size of the fish one might capture was restricted, and it was forbidden to take eggs or young or destroy the nests of birds.

There seems, in other words, to have been a fully civilized and socially well-ordered life in China long before 1000 B. C. In regard to sexual morals—and it is useful to remember that the Chinese had no sort of a revealed book or religious ascetic code—Miss Simcox (in her work, "Primitive Civilizations," Vol. II) says:

> "The classical collection of popular poems does not contain the slightest hint of an approximation to indecency and only a few very simple versions of the world-old village idyll of unfortunate or unauthorized courtships. . . . The Chinese Burns never approximates to the laxity of speech or morals usual with the popular muse elsewhere."

We must remember that the older Chinese poetry was censored by Confucius, and no doubt he threw out many poems that offended his strict taste, but it is generally agreed that there was a certain delicacy of sentiment that makes even early Chinese life superior to that of the common Greeks and Romans, to say nothing of Europe during the Middle Ages. In Ch. Budd's excellent translation of a

selection of Chinese poems there is one of very early but uncertain date in which we read of a happy girl of high birth—relatively to rural life—who goes out from home in the morning with a silk basket, woven by herself, to gather mulberry leaves for her silkworms. She wears a purple embroidered bodice and a silk shirt edged with amber lace, and a large pearl hangs from each ear. Lo Fu is a dainty wife of seventeen, admired by all, and, as she feeds her silkworms, a high official happens to pass and see her, and he asks her to share his wealth and power:

" 'You have a wife,' she answered coldly,
'And most foolish are, I fear:
I,' she added, firm and boldly,
'Also have a husband dear.' "

Lo Fu's husband rises until he commands a thousand men, yet she continues to spin her own silk and to cultivate virtue. From all which we gather that there were in early China, as elsewhere, roving men as well as virtuous maids and matrons. The chief distinction is the delicacy of sentiment for all the high appreciation of love and of the beauty of nature. Gowen and Hall in their standard history of China tell us that what Mr. H. G. Wells says of China fully applies to it in the first millennium before Christ:

> "China produced a profusion of beautiful art, some delightful poetry, astonishing cookery, and thousands of millions of glowingly pleasant lives generation after generation."

There seems in this earlier period to have been more liberty accorded to women than later. There was little polygamy, though concubines were admitted, and the popular poetry scolds the man who turns from his wife when she is old to younger women, or the miser who allows his bride to work during the three months of the honeymoon. It scolds also those who use the delicate yellow for linings and the vulgar green for the outer robes.

It might be interesting to work out the connection of this early refinement of the Chinese with the fact that they made and wore silk as early as the second millennium before Christ. It would hardly be fanciful to suggest that the soft fabric, cheap enough to be very extensively used for clothing, is one of the reasons why Chinese life was distinguished from early historical times by the daintiness which is familiar to everybody in its later porcelain and painting. But another definite reason for the good qualities which so early developed in China is the dislike of militarism. Instead of being, like the Romans, surrounded on all sides by hostile or rival tribes, the Chinese seem in pre-imperial days to have had so little need to defend themselves that the military profession was held to be the lowest in the community. Brain-workers or officials and scholars came first, and then, with the sound economic sense which the Chinese early developed, they put the agricultural workers, the chief producers of the nation. Artisans were in the third rank, merchants

(not being producers), housewives, and servants in the fourth: a mistake, as far as wives are concerned, which may have helped to put woman in time in a somewhat subordinate position, though nearly thirty thousand women are honorably recorded in Chinese annals. This ideal, which is patently due to circumstances, gives certain peculiarities to Chinese character from the start. Hindu annals, for instance, or what we regard as historical records in the Vedic poems, open with praise of war and warriors, of the storm-gods and the fire-god and the roar of the mighty forces of nature. They reflect the conquest of the mountains and then of the aboriginals by the Aryan invaders, and they become the inspirational literature of the Hindus for ages. But the Chinese have forgotten the conquest, if there ever was one—it seems more likely that the invaders, if there was an invasion, penetrated peacefully—and their earliest literature glorifies kings who invented the arts of peace and puts in the last place in the social order "those who live by violence." The land was fairly uniform, and there was not, as in Greece, a rivalry of farmers on the bleaker pastures of the hills and more fortunate farmers in the valleys. All the conditions favored the growth of an ideal of peace, good fellowship, and cooperation in production, extension of the family sentiment to all members of the race, love of nature, and, as far as one could afford, of beautiful things. We must suppose that behind the more or less idyllic life depicted in the early poems there was plenty of human nature in its more perverse or more peevish moods, but all the authorities seem to agree that for a nation in the dawn of civilization the general level of taste and conduct was high.

§3. THE CHOU DYNASTY

The older Chinese annals say that the line of beneficent monarchs came to an end about 2000 B. C.—probably very much later—and wicked women, slaves or concubines began to lead the monarchs astray. The seductive woman is a common "awful example" in Chinese history, and the stories are not taken literally, but they imply that a phase of demoralization set in. One wicked monarch and his lady friend used to make a lake of wine and drive into it their subjects, at the beat of a drum, three thousand at a time, and they and the court would howl with laughter as the intoxicated survivors staggered out. Another, with a wicked mistress, was abnormally cruel. He is said to have had the heart cut out of one of his ministers to see if it were true that the heart has seven openings. He employed his subjects for seven years in building a pleasure-palace with a wonderful park, and Gowen and Hall say that the new palace witnessed "unhallowed scenes of nameless orgies": in other words, a great deal of drinking and gaiety and some abnormal forms or excesses of sexual enjoyment. This royal mistress, a famous beauty but probably not Chinese, is said to have added a few new tortures to those practiced in the country. Her favorite was "the copper pillar," or forcing victims to crawl across a copper column laid as a bridge and greased and heated. This, by the way, partly answers a question to which I could not find the answer in my previous discussion of China: the origin and antiquity of torture. It is clear that

torture was used more than three thousand years ago, but the origin of its use in so generally refined a country is still obscure.

The cruelty of this royal pair provoked a rebellion, and, the king burning himself and his treasures in his royal palace—a deed that seems to have been transferred some centuries later to Sardanapalus of Assyria—the Chou Dynasty began to rule, in the twelfth century before Christ. Rural life continued on the old lines, but towns multiplied and trade and industry advanced. Gilds of artisans and of merchants were formed, and it was at this period that the body of literary or scholarly officials, which is so characteristic of China, developed. There were as yet no elaborate examinations, but the tests for an official position were education and conduct, and youths of all classes might compete. Every family was eager to have one son in the respected rank of officials, and one result was a greater spread of education than is usual at so early a stage of civilization. In time, under the Chou Dynasty, it was understood that there was a primary school to every village of twenty-five families, a secondary school for every five hundred families, and a college to twelve thousand five hundred families. A boy began to attend school at the age of eight, and the evidence seems to imply that the young were taught and the aged maintained in the same building. Girls, not being entitled to official positions at this early date, were naturally not as a rule set to learn the cumbrous picture-writing. They married young—Gowen and Hall say that no youth could marry until he was thirty and no girl until she was twenty, but I have quoted a poem about a young wife of seventeen—and were henceforward very industrious and very loyal housewives. A young man approached the parents of the girl he desired with a present of a pair of wild geese. If they were accepted, his suit was favored, and the matchmakers came to terms. The betrothal gift usually consisted of ten pieces of red silk or cloth, and wild geese were again presented at the marriage, but the ceremony varied considerably in different parts of China. Childlessness was a ground for divorce, and there were six other grounds.

Gowen and Hall sum up the characteristic virtues of the Chinese in this early phase as "industry, orderliness, reasonableness, group-fidelity, respect for the dignity of one's fellow men, and the avoidance of strife." This is, in effect, the verdict of all authorities, and it is as good a characterization of a people as any we have at a time when the historical era has scarcely opened. One does not follow the learned authors so easily when they sum up the characteristic vices of the early Chinese, and one suspects that, in order to weaken the comparison with Europe they have made a strained effort to discover defects. The vices they enumerate are "acquiescence in bad conditions, lack of general social conscience, callousness to distress outside the group, opportunism, and guile." The first two are not only common and natural conditions of primitive and isolated civilizations—they might be affirmed of the Egyptian and Babylonian peoples for three thousand years and of the people of Christian Europe for at least twelve centuries—but most other writers actually find a wider democratic sentiment in China than elsewhere. Boulger, a high authority, says of the Chinese under the Chou Dynasty:

> *"What the people judge worthy of reward and what of punishment indicates what Heaven wishes to reward or to punish."*

Other writers agree that the old Latin maxim, "The voice of the people is the voice of Heaven," applies better to ancient China than to any other ancient civilization except the Greek. There seem to have been a large number of monarchs of the Chou Dynasty who were fathers of their people, or were regarded by the people as simply the ablest to rule. One of them said:

> "If within the four seas there be distress or poverty your heaven-conferred revenues will come to a perpetual end."

On the other hand, "callousness to distress outside the group" has not much significance in regard to a people with few or no contacts outside their own group. "Opportunism and guile" are more intelligible. Men of imperfect social sentiments—and most of us at times incur that description—who live in a society in which violence is strongly reprobated and rare naturally lean to guile. The evolution of the "wily Chinese" is not unnatural. The chief defect which I find in this early civilization is the absence of revolt against the use of torture and militarism, which seems strange in an unwarlike people. Eunuchs are found very early in Chinese history, and we are told that they began as men who had suffered the legal penalty of castration for certain crimes. Other mutilations were sanctioned, and occupations were found for the mutilated men in a manner which so often suggests in the Chinese a blend of sagacity and childishness. Criminals whose feet had been cut off were employed as keepers of parks and woods, because they would not be able to chase the game. Those who had lost their noses were employed as guards at distant frontiers, where there were no small boys to jeer at them. This legal penalty of mutilation was abolished in the second century B. C., when Confucianism began to have an influence, but the persistence of the use of torture in so refined a civilization has always seemed to me unexplained, nor can I suggest any explanation beyond acceptance of it as an essential part of the social system from time immemorial. To the bulk of the Chinese until recent times some of them became familiar with European and American systems it must have seemed that torture was quite indispensable in dealing with crime.

§4. THE AGE OF REACTION

In the old legends we have beautiful pictures of the earlier Chou monarchs as builders of civilization and then of "the destroyers of civilization," the naughty ladies of the harem who lead the princes astray. As we are familiar in every part of this history with the deterioration and decay of dynasties, when sons consider that all necessary work has been done by their fathers or may be left to ministers, we may decline to put so much blame on royal women; and this note of the older Chinese literature helped to bring on the

comparative subjection of women, though the aim of the writers was merely to warn princes of the perils of their position. A more serious reason was that the founders of the Chou Dynasty had rewarded those who supported them in seizing the throne with lands and lordships, and had thus created a landed aristocracy. It is misleading to say that this inaugurated a feudal system, since it suggests that, as in Europe, the mass of the agricultural workers became serfs. On the contrary, they were, as we saw, independent farmers, obliged to give their labor for public work on only three days of the year. But such an aristocracy naturally degenerates into a conflicting body of ambitious individuals. Moreover, from the tenth century B. C. onward the uncivilized tribes in the west began increasingly to harass the Chinese, and these nobles became military commanders. The inevitable result was that they often used the forces under their command to war against each other and against the throne.

The confusion increased when the Chinese began to overpopulate the region in which they originally settled and migrate to north and south of it. I refer to the Key for details of this development. It took many of the landed nobles still farther away from royal control, and there were times when, under a weak monarch, the country was split into between one and two thousand areas under independent rulers. The fine old standard of the ruling prince was lowered, as the petty ruler or adventurer is more likely to exploit. Invaders and brigands throve on the weakening of the central power, and the armies of rival princes were little minded to spare the fields of the farmers or the stores of the merchants. It is important to know of this period of confusion into which the country fell because it explains to some extent the intensely conservative note in Chinese tradition. Isolation is, as I have said, one very satisfactory explanation of what we may call the rigid, if petty, crystallization of Chinese culture round a national nucleus. Up to the time we have reached no scholar in China was aware that there was any civilization on the earth except that which the Sons of Heaven had given to the fortunate people of China; though the country was not yet known by that name. But this natural conservatism was strongly reinforced by a consciousness of the anarchy which the country had suffered by departing from the traditions of its fathers. This was to be the dominant note of the moralists or sociologists who were soon to formulate the creed of China.

We must, however, not suppose that there was such anarchy as was caused in Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries. Some recent writers suggest that possibly Kung-fu-tse exaggerated the confusion in order to emphasize the use of his teaching. One may not care to go so far as that, but there are plenty of incidents in Chinese history which show how the finest standards of early days survived. When Kung-fu-tse was as yet only three years old, and even the older Lao-tse had no influence, a ruling prince, Ling Wong, one of the five strong monarchs who now virtually divided China between them, seduced the wife of one of his generals. The general had the prince assassinated and took his place. The royal historiographer conscientiously entered the assassination in the annals and was exe-

cuted for doing so. His successor maintained the record and went the same way. A series of historians, we are told, were thus martyred for their strict discharge of their duty, and at last the literary class as a body compelled the prince to yield.

Another adventurer insolently wrote to ask the emperor what was the size and weight of the Nine Tripods, secretly treasured at the palace, on which the destiny of the empire was said mysteriously to rest. The reply was:

> "When virtue is brilliant the tripods are heavy: when the reverse they are light: Heaven blesses intelligent virtue: on that its favor rests. Though the virtue of Chou is decayed, the decree of Heaven is not yet changed. The weight of the Tripods may not be inquired about."

In the mass of the people there was little change, and the changes of dynasties which the historian records are apt to make us lose sight of the fact that a nation remains unaltered to the extent of at least ninety per cent. For the enormous majority of the people the farm was the unit, and, except when brigands or armies harassed a district, the life of the village or cluster of farms—for isolated farms were rare—under its headman flowed on in the traditional way. Most of the towns also would suffer little change. Under the beneficent rulers a good deal had been done in the way of controlling prices and markets, town-planning and so on, and the social structure thus created would only be destroyed in places and temporarily. In short, China had made very considerable social progress in the thousand years before Kung-fu-tse, and it was largely in an effort to preserve the benefits of this that it became conservative.

CHAPTER II

THE AGE OF PHILOSOPHERS AND MORALISTS

WHEN China was, in the nineteenth century, compelled to open its ports to Europe and America, strange and contradictory stories were told about the character of the people. Americans who were very eager that Europeans should understand that New York is not America—they would have been outraged if a visitor had considered the squalid life near the docks of New York or San Francisco typical of America—brought home from China a version of the national character which was based chiefly on observation of low Chinese life at the Treaty Ports. When the interior of the country was opened to travelers and a more sympathetic generation was permitted to see behind the disdainful reserve of the oriental and learned to read Chinese, estimates of the national character tended to pass to the opposite extreme. Emerson was then considered one of the highest products of American thought, yet a United States Consul in China wrote to the historian Motley: "There are twenty thousand Emersons in this country"; and he might have added that the finest sentiments they expressed were more than two thousand years old in the life of the country.

Such statements were resented by the supporters of foreign missions and all who clung to the fiction that there were, owing to the influence of Christianity, precious elements in the European-American civilization which could not be found in alien lands, and various efforts were made to belittle the moral code of China. Most of these are strained, and some ridiculous; and the more plausible of the objections—that the Confucianist idealism is confined to the small educated class and that it contains no inspiration to progress—lose their point when we consider the circumstances of its origin. I may say at once that Kung-fu-tse never imagined that he was giving a code of conduct to the whole of China, much less all of the world, for all time. He was, twenty-four centuries ago, endeavoring to meet the needs of a definite and very distressed situation in China, or in a very much smaller region than the China of a later day, and, since it was not a democracy and could be changed only by its rulers and their officials, the sage addressed himself mainly to these. As to progressiveness, the outstanding historical fact is that just when the Confucian teaching came to be adopted by rulers and officials China entered upon its most brilliant and most progressive era. I may here usefully fill up the slender outline of this instructive development which I gave in the Key.

§1. THE SAGES OF CHINA

More than fifty different principalities divided between them the territory of the ancient kingdom when, in the second half of the sixth century B. C., the first sages began to expound theories and principles of life. Of the elder of the two, Lao-tse, I do not propose to say anything further. It is of interest only to note, in connection

with our ethical speculations, that the moralist who associated his code with mysticisms and intuitions had very little influence until, in a later age, his teaching was distorted and falsified by identifying it with spurious Buddhism and other popular superstitions. Some time after his death an emperor adopted his principles and used to expound them to his court; and he found it necessary to decree sentence of death for any courtier who yawned. Few educated Chinese ever adopted it, and what is now called Taoism is a superficial ceremonious religion that rarely affects character.

Historians who appraise a moralist, not by the prettiness or eccentricity or spirituality of his teaching, but by the measure in which he has succeeded in influencing life and promoting sound social conduct, pronounce Kung-fu-tse "the greatest of men." He was a scholarly civic official, near the end of the sixth century B. C., who was painfully impressed by the contrast of the disorder of his age with the picture of happy tranquillity and order which he found in the old historians. Setting aside all theories and religious speculations, he asked himself simply why life had once been so orderly and agreeable and why it was now so distressed. The main reason obviously was that in earlier ages the rulers had been, so the annalists said, honorably concerned above all things about the welfare and happiness of their subjects, and their ministers and officials had been honest, just, content with the fixed reward, and conscientious in the discharge of their duties: now the rulers were greedy of wealth and power, selfish, and indifferent to the welfare of their subjects, while their ministers were largely men who flattered, encouraged, and imitated them. Hence Kung-fu-tse, instead of searching for some mystic principle which should compel men to be just and honorable, as Lao-tse did and so many modern moralists do, pointed out the simple fact that the cost of selfishness and injustice was the misery of millions of people.

When it is objected that the teaching of Kung is unsentimental and aristocratic, as is often done, the critic seems to forget that, to have any influence at all, he was bound to appeal not only to the sentiments but the democratic sentiments of the rulers. There were at the time five powerful rulers, and each of these aimed at supremacy. Historians say that a statesman appealed to the rivals to make peace, lest the strongest of the five devour all the others, with this little parable:

> "I saw this morning on the beach a mussel open its shell to sun itself. Immediately an oyster-catcher thrust in its bill, and as promptly the mussel closed up and held the bird a prisoner. 'If it does not rain soon,' said the oyster-catcher, 'there will soon be a dead mussel.' 'And,' replied the mussel, 'if you don't get out of this soon, there will soon be a dead oyster-catcher.' Meanwhile up came a fisherman and bagged them both."

How could a philosopher approach these men? In point of fact, neither religion nor any other appeal has ever turned aside ambitious princes from their blood-spattered paths to greater power and

wealth, and the appeal of Kung was as futile as any. He had a few thousand followers but to the end of his life he failed to secure a prince. But his appeal was democratic and sentimental. "Within the four seas all men are brothers," he said, and benevolence is the first virtue. It was a purely emotional appeal, and under an autocracy the emotional appeal generally fails. Yet in the better conditions of a later dynasty the appeal succeeded and it has influenced more millions of lives than any creed.

Most of the criticisms of Confucianism are even worse than this. In the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, to which we ought to be able to look for our most scientific and impartial account, a missionary is permitted solemnly to assure readers that Confucianism is inferior to Christianity because it "fails to satisfy the cravings of man's spiritual nature": in particular because it says nothing about sin. One is tempted to retort that apparently this spiritual nature must have been omitted from the Mongol section of the race since Confucianism has satisfied all its educated people for two thousand years, while the Buddhism which this writer contrasts with it as successful because it does appeal to the spiritual nature is a ritual system of a very material character. It is more usual to say that Confucianism is "external," while Buddhism and Christianity are "internal." The words seem impressive, but, if it is meant that Kung-fu-tse found the reason for correct conduct in the external events of the social order, we have exactly the reason why he has been so successful in securing consistency of conduct. Against all these strained objections of missionaries and rival moralists let me give a page of a work which many Chinese scholars believe to have been written by Kung-fu-tse himself. Most of what are called the Confucian books or the Chinese Classics are, as I have explained in the literary section of the Key, written by his pupils in various ages, but the Zu Hsing was either written by the sage himself or it very closely follows his teaching. In the chapter entitled "The Conduct of the Scholar" there is what seems to me the best summary of the ideal:

> "The scholar, wherever he resides, ordinarily, or for a time, is grave, as if he were apprehensive of difficulties: whether seated or on foot, he is courteous and respectful: in speaking his object he is, first of all, to be sincere: in acting he wishes to be exact and correct: on the road he does not strive about the most difficult or the easiest places: in winter and summer he does not strive about the temperature or the light and shade. . . . The scholar does not consider gold and jade to be precious treasures, but lealheartedness and good faith: he does not desire lands and territories but considers the establishment of righteousness [in the Chinese sense] as ' 's domain: he does not desire a great accumulation of wealth but looks upon many accomplishments as his riches: it is difficult to win him but easy to pay him: it is easy to pay him but difficult to retain him. . . . Though there may be offered to the scholar valuable

> articles and wealth, and though it be tried to enervate him with delights and pleasures, he sees those advantages without doing anything contrary to his sense of righteousness: though a multitude may attempt to force him, and his way be stopped by force of arms, he will look death in the face without changing the principles which he maintains. . . . The scholar may have a house in only a mau of ground, a poor dwelling each of whose surrounding walls is only ten paces long, with an outer door of thorns and bamboo, and openings in the wall long and pointed; within, the inner door stopped by brushwood and little round windows like the mouth of a jar [in a word, the cottage of a peasant]. . . . Gentleness and goodness are the roots of humanity: respect and attention are the ground on which it stands: generosity and large-mindedness are the manifestations of it: humility and courtesy are the ability of it: the rules and ceremonies are the demonstration of it: speech is the ornament of it: singing and music are the harmony of it: sharing and distribution are the giving of it."

All this shows how foolish it is to speak of Confucianism as external, materialistic, or a mere police-code. Other passages represent that a sound mind is the basis of sound conduct, and it was on that ground that, as Epicurus would later do in Greece, Kung-fu-tse told his followers to ignore religion and to cultivate science; which is the real "defect" that most of his critics have in mind. Elsewhere correct conduct in the home is said to be the basic requirement, and these domestic sentiments are to be extended to all. It is in accordance with this (which I have given as the broad aim of moral development) that the books elsewhere declare that benevolence is the first requirement, integrity (or sincerity and consistency) of mind the second, correct external conduct the third, knowledge of affairs and good faith in conducting them the fourth. Reverence is in another place given as "the all-embracing rule of conduct," and, as is well known, Kung on one occasion summed up all his teaching in one word, when he was asked if it is possible to do so, "Reciprocity" (literally "As Heart"), which some quite arbitrarily declare to be the Golden Rule in a merely negative form. On every page the starting point is internal, and on every second page it is the sentiment of benevolence, or the desire for the happiness of all men.

The real defects of the Confucian ethic are that it is rather too ascetic—the educated Chinese have not followed it in this—and that it contemplates only an early and rather primitive social order. The latter is, of course, a defect only when one represents the system as fitted for our own or for all time; and in regard to the first we must remember that Kung is one of the few moralists who did not talk about the flesh, lust, sin, and chastity. Apparently he would allow a prince or governor as many concubines or mistresses as he liked so long as he cared for the happiness of his people. His philosophy and that of the Ionic and Epicurean philosophers of Greece evince an anticipation of modern thought in the millennium before Christ, and

educated China, from the second century B. C. onward, clung to that truth through all national reactions.

I have elsewhere shown that from the fifth to the second century B. C. philosophical speculation was almost as rife in China as in Greece, but in China it was almost entirely free from mysticism and theology. Egoism, or "each for himself," was taught by the philosopher Yang: the opposite extreme, love of all men, was urged by the philosopher Mih. The great sociological teacher Mencius, or Meng-tse, brought thoughtful Chinese back to the teaching of Kung and developed its democratic and humanitarian implications. For details see my earlier books. A good and more extensive summary of this philosophic era will be found in Miss Edith Simcox's "Primitive Civilizations" (Vol. II).

§2. THE EARLY EMPIRE

Writers on China or on Kung-fu-tse always remark that the philosopher failed for several centuries to influence the country, and they also remark that he never attempted to introduce any new doctrine. The statements seem to be contradictory, but if we carefully consider both we get the historical truth. In effect what Kung said to the rulers of his time was that they ought to lay aside the personal ambitions which led to devastating wars and return to the placid benevolence (legendary or real) of the earlier kings of the Chou Dynasty. He failed to induce them to abandon their ambitions, as all moralists who have attempted the task—and in the Christian Era few even attempted it—in such conditions have failed, and the struggle went on until the friends of China prevailed and created what has since been known as the Chinese Empire.

This was in 249 B. C., and a well-known event of the first Emperor's reign shows that the teaching of Kung-fu-tse had been very widely accepted by the official class. This was the persecution of Confucians and the attempt to destroy all Confucian literature. It would be flattering to the followers of the sage to believe that, as legend says, they had protested against certain unjust acts of the prince, but it seems more likely that he broadly resented their conservatism. It was he who began the Great Wall of China and made very successful efforts to preserve the country from invasion. He was a powerful autocrat, and he disliked the democratic note, or anti-autocratic note, in the Confucian teaching. Another ancient version is that his Confucian ministers expostulated against the flattery of his courtiers. He compelled even the scholars to take part in the great public work which he had instituted. The large class of scholarly officials resisted him, and it is said that four hundred and sixty of them were executed. He ordered the confiscation and destruction of all their books, and there was an heroic resistance. Some writers treat the account as a legend and conjecture that the Confucian books were really written after this date, but most historians admit it, and we must conclude from it that by the third century B. C. the Confucian teaching was very generally accepted by educated people. It is a unique and very instructive historical fact that a large educated class has thus remained entirely devoid

of religion for more than two thousand years, and, if we strike a balance of qualities there has been no more refined and consistently honorable class in the record of civilization.

What happened in China at this period has so many parallels in history that we easily understand it. The vast majority of the people of the older kingdom, the sphere ruled by the Chou kings, maintained their customary life, and the new peace enabled them to develop their better qualities. But the very strength that was required to unify and pacify the empire implied an uncultivated if not half-barbaric ruler and ministers. An unscrupulous eunuch was all-powerful at court. He got rid of the emperor's eldest son by forging a letter, in his father's name, directing him to commit suicide. He then carefully trained the younger son in the habit of complete submission to himself. The annalists say that he would make the youth a present of a stag and say, "This is a horse." If any courtier were imprudent enough to protest, he was executed, but the man who cheerfully said, "Sure it's a horse," was promoted. When the emperor died the eunuch kept the secret so long that the body putrefied, and the minister arranged for a convoy of rotten fish to travel near the corpse and cover the secret with its stench. With the body of the emperor he had a hundred maids, including ten daughters of the emperor, buried alive in the superb mausoleum. The floor of the imperial tomb was a bronze map of the new empire with rivers of quicksilver. The roof was decorated with the heavenly constellations, and engines that would shoot arrows or stones at an intruder were pointed against the door. For greater security the workers were buried alive in the tomb, and the entrance to it was covered with soil which was planted with grass and shrubs.

When we read of these indications of childishness or barbarism, we must remember that Chin, from which the new dynasty and its ministers came, was not part of the area covered by the old culture which Kung-fu-tse had codified. It is, in fact, instructive to note that these new barbaric rulers of China were guided by what is called the more spiritual and emotional teaching of Taoism and were despised by the Confucians. But the dynasty lasted only a few years after the death of its founder, and in the second decade before Christ a very powerful emperor completed the consolidation of what we may now call China. The new Emperor patronized letters and in the earlier years of his long reign favored Confucianism. From this date, the beginning of the great Han Dynasty, the Confucian philosophy displaced religion in the minds of the immense majority of the literate and official class, and the student of ethics would do well to note that the era which opened was one of the most progressive and most brilliant in Chinese history. The extension of the empire westward, or the expeditions which pushed into central and western Asia to exterminate the nests of the Huns and other invaders, brought the Chinese at last to the knowledge that theirs was not the only civilization in the world. Buddhism was introduced and relations were established with India. Through Persia and the Macedonian kingdoms the Chinese merchants even got into contact with Rome, and there was a considerable commerce.

I repeat that the isolation until this period explains the few serious defects we have found in early Chinese character and makes all the more remarkable the very great progress that had been made. We saw how profoundly different the situation was in the west, where, at least from the year 1000 B. C. onward, there was no city that was not in touch with at least half a dozen different civilizations and did not know something of the history and wonders of Egypt and Mesopotamia. China had hitherto been as isolated as the American civilization was until the Spanish invasion, and any person who reflects must admire the genius which in such circumstances evolved one of the most refined and intellectually the most advanced civilizations of the ancient world.

§3. UNDER THE HAN EMPERORS

The new contacts certainly helped in the restoration and further development of Chinese civilization but the chief inspiration, on the social and moral side, was the general acceptance and discussion of the Confucian philosophy. The period just before the beginning of the Han Era is graphically described by the ancient historian Szu-ma Chien, who lived about that time. There was, he says, so much civil strife and invasion by the Huns that production almost ceased. It was left to old men and children while the stronger men fought. Horses became so scarce that even the emperor could not get a well-matched set for his chariot, and the nobles rode in bullock carts. Amongst the literary class pessimistic philosophers appeared for the first time—Chinese philosophy generally has an optimistic estimate of human nature that distinguishes it from all others until the eighteenth century—and economic ideas were so disturbed that scholars and merchants were, on the crude theory that they were not producers, sent to build the great wall. Freedom of discussion and the return of prosperity altered all this. By the year 130 B. C. the royal treasury was full, in spite of the lightness of taxation, and the granaries overflowed until the grain was left to rot on the fields. "The village elders eat meat and drink wine" once more, says the historian. The wealthy in the towns sought more and more luxury, enlarged their harems and stables, and called for beautiful vases and furniture for their houses. Paper was invented and books increased. The Imperial Library soon had ten thousand volumes, of which two-thirds dealt with philosophy, mathematics, and medicine. In less than a hundred years China emerged from its Middle Ages and could challenge comparison with the Greco-Roman world in its finest phases.

I have elsewhere described the literary and artistic brilliance of China under the Han Dynasty, and will confine myself here to considerations of character. It goes without saying that the transition to an imperialist age, with great wealth and craving for luxury, brought, as it always did, certain defects. In the period of depression large numbers of the poor had sold themselves into slavery, and from this cause and from war slavery, which had hitherto been very scanty and was plainly opposed to the doctrine of brotherhood in the Confucian books, became more extensive. That there was more sensual-

ity and freedom we may take for granted, but the popular poetry still reflects a world in which amorousness was often rebuffed. A poem that obviously belongs to the earliest part of the Han Dynasty describes the beautiful young wife of the owner of a wineshop, still in her teens, serving the customers:

> "Attired in flowing skirt, and girdled loose with girlish wile,
> Embroidered vest and wide-sleeved outer robe of ancient style."

She has jade and pearl ornaments in her hair, and all the men sigh at her dainty service. To the wineshop comes a dashing officer of the emperor's suite, and the wine is brought to him in a tasseled jug and some carp on a golden plate. He tries to bribe the young wife with a mirror or a red silk shirt, but it is useless. She says:

"This time you have loved in vain, my gallant Fung Tse-Tu."

The historian of the time tells of some demoralization amongst the rich, which the moralists deplored, while of the mass of the people he says that "there had gone abroad a spirit of self-respect and a reverence for the law, while a sense of character and of duty toward one's neighbor kept men from disgrace and shame." The rich themselves were often checked by the Confucian officials. The governor of a province in which dwarfs were found sent to it for "natural products of the country, including some dwarf slaves." The reply was:

> "Your servant finds in the Canonical Books that in offering products one must give what is there. In the land of Taochou I find some dwarfish people but no dwarf slaves."

I have given several instances of the integrity of these Confucian officials and may add one from a later date which shows the consistent tradition of the class. The Emperor Tai-Tsung of the seventh century, a very good monarch, asked the President of the Tribunal of History of the Empire if he could see what was written about him in the archives. The President very courteously replied that he could not, as the royal historiographers had conscientiously to write down the good and the evil, and no emperor was permitted to see what they wrote. We may ascribe it to their influence that as early as the middle of the second century B. C. the sentence of mutilation for crime was struck out of Chinese law, and the penalty for criticizing an emperor was abolished on the express ground that criticism of a ruler was healthy. Education was very eagerly promoted, one empress founding a school for children of both sexes. Large numbers of women appear in the literary and artistic records, a pronounced difference from the Roman and later European world.

In moral and social respects, in other words, the Chinese people remained conservative, and, with a full appreciation of such defects

as I have noticed, one must admit that as a body they touched a level of excellence which has not been surpassed until modern times. This we attribute to Confucian influence only in the sense that Kung-fu-tse gave literary expression to the high traditional code of conduct and made a sort of patriotic religion of it. Taoism was by this time so corrupt that we cannot imagine it having a deep influence on character except in the case of a few mystically-minded Chinese who penetrated to the original teaching of Lao-tse. Buddhism, on the other hand, made little progress at this period, and those who fancy that it would have more moral influence than Confucianism may be invited to reflect that its spread was followed by the prolonged period of demoralization which I will describe in the next chapter. China was essentially humanist, and on humanist principles it had, without the advantage of a contrast with foreign cultures, developed a standard of life that surpassed all contemporaries in refinement and was second to none in genuine moral qualities. I am trying to guard against exaggeration, but the many incidents and details I have given seem to prove that in most respects the Chinese civilization was higher than any we have yet surveyed in this work.

CHAPTER III

THE GOLDEN AGE

THE only serious criticism of Chinese culture that can up to this stage ask our patient attention is that while it rapidly inspired a fine civilization in circumstances which usually mean slow growth, it proved in the end unprogressive, and it left men tolerant of such evils as legal torture and infanticide. Most civilizations have a defective moral sense in one or other direction, as the European-American civilization had until less than a century ago about black slavery and religious compulsion, and it is far from my aim to claim complete consistency for the high Chinese standard of life. These defects, however, in the case of China are very plainly to be connected with its isolation. Indeed, the moralist who severely condemns the exposure of children may justly be invited to work out first what would have been the consequences if an attempt had been made to rear every child that was born; and I have already pointed out that torture was, down to the end of the period I am now considering, used all over the world and would honestly seem to a Chinese gentleman the only effective way of dealing with crime.

In regard to progressiveness, let us be clear that until, let us say, a century and a half ago the Chinese level of life was as high as any in the world. It is the remarkable progress of Europe and America during the last hundred years, when Chinese life has (until quite recently) remained stationary, that has raised this question of the rigidity of the oriental and progressiveness of western civilization. Since this progress in the west is entirely due to science and has been accompanied by a steady decay of religious influence, it is quite unreasonable to connect the matter with difference of religious creed, and we need not consider it here. Until a few centuries ago the advance of science in its elementary stages, which is necessarily very slow, had taken place almost entirely outside Christendom, and we shall see later why modern European and American peoples have so rapidly developed a scientific culture while the Chinese were more interested in art and literature.

§1. A PHASE OF BARBARISM

The real progressiveness of Chinese culture is seen in the repeated restoration of the country after a prolonged period of confusion and semi-barbarism. A long dynasty like that of the Han emperors inevitably ends in weakness and anarchy. We have already understood this. The early monarchs confront formidable tasks which draw out all their energy and ability; the later monarchs find no need for close attention to the army and public affairs and leave these matters to ministers, and these take advantage of the relaxation of the imperial eye and devote themselves selfishly to pleasure. It is not that they have become sensual, for most of the vigorous Chinese

conquerors were very sensual, but that they have lost themselves entirely in the pleasures of the table and the harem.

The Han Dynasty fell in the third century of the Christian Era, and the history of social life is not interesting and is scantily recorded until the seventh century. It was chiefly in these periods of confusion and civil warfare and invasion that the Chinese lost their original sense of human values and began to admire the military hero: quite intelligibly, as in such phases of history the military commander is very apt to be the most useful member of the community. One very much appreciated story in the annals of the time tells of a young woman whose father was ill when he was summoned to the army and he had no son. The woman took her father's horse, spear, and bow and joined the troop. She kissed her parents while they slept, the legend prettily says, and set out in soldier's dress. None knew that she was a woman, and she fought so vigorously that she was brought into the presence of the emperor and directed to choose her reward. She asked only for a fleet camel to take her home, dressed again as a woman, and reached her home—still a virgin, the story is careful to say—so quietly that none knew that she had been in the war. It was not until some of her late soldier-comrades visited the village that her heroism was made known. The Chinese annals are particularly rich in such stories of high character instead of self-tormenting ascetics.

Another type of story of this period tells of men of the humblest classes who rose to the highest positions. A good deal of genius seems to have been discovered in this way, if we may believe the legends. On the other hand, men and women from the fringes of the empire, often with half-barbaric ideas, rose to power and further adulterated the life of the people. One such princess, raised from obscurity to the palace, introduced the unhappy custom of binding the feet to make them as small as possible. At times the adventurers protested bluntly against the defects which had crept into Chinese life. One of them is said to have found ten thousand eunuchs at the palace and put them all to the sword. The worst part of the period was the fourth and fifth centuries. A recent Chinese writer, Li Ung Bing ("Outlines of Chinese History," 1914), calls this "The Period of Darkness." Curiously enough, although he seems to have Buddhist sympathies, he confesses that this was just the period when Buddhism obtained its power and that the philosophers of the time blamed it for the decay of China. He denies this but admits that the emperors who patronized Buddhism were generally very inferior men. "Many of them," he naively says, "were great murderers." It rather confirms the complaint of the Confucian writers of this Chinese Dark Age, that the weakness of Buddhism was that it taught men that they could escape the penalties of crime by building temples and monasteries.

This long period was, however, by no means wholly dark, and stories of heroism and virtue show that the mass of the people generally remained at the old level of life. Even Buddhism added one or two good elements, but it was not consistent. It is generally and rightly credited with a good influence on art by inspiring a more

sympathetic attitude toward animals and nature, but we find the Buddhists at one time forbidding the people to have animals embroidered on their silk stuff lest the scissors of the tailor should cut some poor dog or antelope in halves. On the whole Buddhism helped to soften character. Much good poetry also was written, and at times it gives us glimpses of the refined and tender amorousness of so many of the people. One little poem represents a maid sighing for her lover:

"I'll keep an evening vigil
Beneath the cedar tree
That stands outside the porchway.
My love may come to me."

The red lotus lilies are out in the south pond and the lady puts some of their seeds in her bosom:

"For the core is red as blood,
As the heart of a true love
When love is at the flood."

The dark comes on, and the wild geese are flying home, and the maid says that she will raise the curtain of her room "and show my lamp's pale light." There is still a winsome delicacy in the verse even where it tells of love apart from marriage.

§2. AT THE HEIGHT OF CIVILIZATION

In the seventh century China began to recover. First, as usual, comes the strong man who ruthlessly represses disorder and enforces work. Yang Ti, when he had pacified China, employed two million men to build a great palace and carry out works of public utility, and they were so drastically worked that four or five out of ten died. Even women were forced to labor, so Yang Ti was hated, although he did much for China. He had an army of a million men, and his ideas of art were so imperfect that in his palace he gave the plants winter dresses, of flowers and leaves, of silk. Yet he in his way appreciated learning, founded many colleges, and fostered art and letters. The poets of the time are, for Chinese poets, very free in their praise of wine. One sage is said to have had always with him two slaves when he went abroad, one to carry a bottle of wine, the other a spade to bury him if he fell.

On the basis of this prosperity and security, and because there now began a stimulating exchange of visitors with India, was established the Golden Age of Chinese culture, under the Tang emperors (618-905 A. D.). The second ruler of the dynasty, Tai Tsung, a zealous Confucian, is one of the greatest of Chinese emperors. He was a good soldier and consolidated the empire, and to the end he kept his artistic and sensual tastes within close bounds. He found three thousand pretty ladies at the palace on his accession and courteously dismissed them, and his beautiful wife Chang Sun very zealously assisted him in his efforts to restore the full refinement and integrity of the country. He reduced the number of princes so

as to lessen the constant danger of intrigue and purified the administration. The critics who complain that Confucianism raised no protest against the traditional inhumanities of Chinese law should read how this most strictly Confucian of all emperors anticipated modern sentiments. Ninety-two death-sentences in the code were changed to imprisonment or fine and seventy-one for the graver offenses to exile. There is a story that in one prison Tai Tsung found two hundred and ninety men under sentence of death, and that he sent them all, on parole, to work in the fields. It is said that every man returned at the close of the day. It was Tsung who laid it down that no emperor must ratify a death-sentence until he had fasted and reflected on the matter for three days. When ministers pressed him to enact more severe laws against robbers he replied:

> "If I reduce expenses, lighten the taxes, and employ only honest officials, so that the people have food and clothing enough, this will do more to abolish robbery than the employment of the severest punishments."

In another direction also the emperor Tsung proved himself the most enlightened monarch in the world at the time; for it was the early Mohammedan period (630-650) when the Caliphs were still harshly orthodox and toleration was quite unknown in Christian Europe. So great a religious freedom was granted in China that sectarians fled from Christendom and Islam to it. Magi came from Persia, where the Mohammedans had won power, and Nestorian monks came from Syria, and members of a new kind of Manichaean religion came from the Byzantine Empire. There was now a more stimulating clash of cultures than China had ever known before. The emperor himself read the Christian Bible and received the missionaries sympathetically. Buddhists from India and Jews added to the exchange of ideas, and the intellectual life of China rose as rapidly as that of Europe, under the opposite policy of bigotry, fell. A sort of imperial university was founded, and as a memorial to his wife, when she died, the emperor added eighteen hundred rooms for students to it. The number of pupils at this one college reached ten thousand, at a time when there was probably no elementary school in Europe with a hundred pupils, and the period of higher study was ten and a half years. The imperial government bore the expense.

I have, however, elsewhere described the brilliant artistic and intellectual life of this period. I may point out once more against those who exaggerate the share of Buddhism in the great progress which China now made that the scholars of the country actually prayed the emperor to suppress that religion in the national interest. There were, they pointed out, a hundred thousand monks and a hundred thousand nuns, so that if the emperor would order them to marry he would have another hundred thousand families contributing to the population. They further urged that Taoism ought to be suppressed as its doctrine of the immortality of the soul diverted people from a proper attention to their duties and interests in this

life. Tsung was not willing to depart from his policy of tolerance, but these repeated incidents of Chinese history could usefully be quoted in our modern controversies about the relation of beliefs in spirituality to civilization.

The popular poetry, as usual, gives us pleasant pictures of the life of the mass of the people during this prosperous and sparkling period. One, "A Happy Farmer," naively describes the holiday life of the majority, the agricultural workers. The farmer says:

"I have a hundred mulberry trees
And thirty mau of grain,
With sufficient food and clothes
And friends my wine to drain."

He is very proud of his autumn brew of aster wine, and of a summer's evening, when work is over, his wife welcomes his guests and his children help to entertain them. They "saunter to the park" and there, under the shade of elm and willow, "as blithe as soaring lark," spend hours singing and drinking his wine; and his last thought, as he lies abed, is that he still has a dozen jars of aster wine to share with his neighbors. What a contrast to the "redeemed" world of Europe these happy and delicate poems and this splendid school and artistic life present! There are, of course, sad poems: the lament of the maid whose lover has gone to the war, the farewell of the soldier, and so on. But all literature and pictorial art bring before us at this time a world of general happiness, delicate sentiments, charming brotherliness. For a time at least even the defects of callousness to the suffering of criminals has been eliminated. In such periods, we are aware, the painter and poet conspire to represent life as idyllic and conceal from us the misery or the tragedy here and there, but no one who knows the history and literature of China in the seventh century will not perceive that it was far the most highly civilized region of the earth.

§3. IN THE TIME OF THE LADY YANG

I have said little about sexual conduct as there are no general statements that would enable us to say that the Chinese were either stricter or laxer than other people. If we put together the language of the poets (of most periods) and of the historians (who, being Confucians, are always moralists) and the lack of an ascetic note in ethical literature we seem justified in concluding that the bulk of the people were as strictly monogamous as in any other civilization of history. In most cases where an attempt at seduction is described the poet or other writer seems to tell with pleasure that the lady declined. We may gather that there was nothing like the freedom of conduct which we found in the Arab-Persian civilization. There is a far less proportion of erotic poetry, and it is, as a rule, rather of the type that a modern writer would call "spiritualized": a curious phenomenon in a country where the ruling ethic has been for two thousand years "materialistic." We must remember, however, that every man who could afford might have several wives or concubines, and that the brothel has never been regarded in China as a "house of

ill fame." I do not find references in the earlier literature to the practice which is today in vogue in Japan and China, of quite respectable girls earning a dowry or the money to support their parents in brothels, but no doubt the custom is very ancient.

A peculiar weakness of the Chinese, as of the Arab-Persian civilization, was the custom of having a large number of concubines in the houses of princes and wealthy men. The sober and conscientious type of prince regarded these generally as proper manifestations of his wealth, but the weaker prince was apt to lose all sense of duty and to permit all kinds of very mischievous intrigues of favorite mistresses and eunuchs. We saw the disastrous consequences in the Byzantine as well as in the Arab and Persian empires. The evil began fairly early under the Tang Dynasty, once the sober Tai Tsung had passed away. There is a poem called "Beauty's Fatal Snare" (in Budd's selection) which tells how the Prince of Yueh ruined his rival, the Prince of Wu, by making him a present of the beautiful Si Shi. He soon became so lost to public affairs that his land was easily taken from him, and he committed suicide.

When Tai Tsung died—and the grief was so genuine that even the foreign envoys pricked their veins with knives and sprinkled the bier with their blood—one of his concubines, the mother of the son who succeeded him, ruled China for many years. She had been drafted into the imperial harem at about the age of thirteen, when a mature Chinese girl can be very beautiful and dainty, and had won great favor. Following the new custom she was, at the death of the emperor, compelled to take the vows in a Buddhist nunnery, but her son, doubtless at her instigation, recalled her, and she seems to have been a terrible ruler. It is said that she had the legitimate queen mutilated and killed, but Mr. Li Ung Bing protests that these are Confucian libels, and that Wu Chao is "among the great women of the world.". She was, at all events, not a follower of Kung-fu-tse, but a resolute feminist. She admitted women to the civil service when they passed the same examinations as men. Flatterers seem to have turned her head, for in later years she ordered men to call her "the Holy Mother" and "the Divine Majesty." In her divine character she one day commanded the peonies to bloom prematurely, and she had all the peonies in the capital uprooted for disobedience. These may be fables. She ruled China vigorously for twenty years but in the end fell to a military conspiracy.

The next empress tried to imitate her, and she and her husband were poisoned, and a puritanical reformer, Hsuan, came to the throne. He closed all the silk factories of China and forbade the ladies of the court to wear jewels or embroidery. A frost held exquisite China in its spell for a few years, and then the Lady Yang, the Chinese Cleopatra, came upon the scene. A Chinese lady, Mrs. Shu-Chung, has lately published in English a short study of this famous beauty ("Yang Kuei-Fei, or Yang, the Imperial Concubine, 1924), and it gives a charming picture of life at court in the eighth century. She was the daughter of an officer and was at first prettily named, in the Chinese way, "Jade Circlet." By the age of sixteen she had not only the most beautiful face and figure in China, but she

had mastered the Five Classics as well as music and the usual accomplishments. Mrs. Shu-Chung quotes a stock description of Chinese beauty to describe her appearance:

> "Her face was a mixture of glowing sunrise, clouds, and snow. Her eyes were like sparkling wines. She had a rosy mouth, gleaming teeth, long ears and a tip-tilted nose. Her jet-black hair shone like a mirror, and her skin was glossy and smooth."

It is, at all events, true that the Lady Yang was "the most famous beauty of China," and at sixteen she was selected for the harem of Prince Shan. There, in the wonderful palace with red-lacquer pillars and crimson doors, with couches decorated with gold lace and pearls and embroidery, the walls adorned with the most beautiful curtains, vases, and pictures, Yang grew up to mental maturity. Three years after she entered the prince's palace the emperor's favorite concubine died, and, though he had still thousands of beautiful girls, the chief eunuch had the empire searched for its most exquisite maid. A girl of sixteen was chosen, but a courtier told the emperor of the beauty, vivacity, and accomplishments of Yang. The prince was persuaded to divorce her, and, as a matter of form, she entered a nunnery, to reappear presently as imperial concubine and for many years virtual ruler of China. The Confucian writers do not spare these "destroyers of empire," and we are told that Yang had her chief rival banished, and, when the emperor drove her from court for her sauciness, she quickly found her way back.

The picture has assuredly its shades, yet the reader will find the account, largely in the ancient language, in Mrs. Shu-Chung's book an exquisite narrative. Yang was very fond of wine and often took too much of it; and she would dance on the table and compose wonderful songs. She brought her sister to court, and we at last see that there is a good deal of free love in China. Poets flocked to the court and literature was greatly patronized. Li Po, the greatest poet of the time, who finely sang the praise of wine, was intoxicated when he reached the court, to which he was summoned, but he was taken at once to the presence of Yang, and her ladies held the silk while he wrote verse. The second greatest poet said of him:

> "As for Li Po, give him a jugful of wine
> And he will write a hundred poems."

There were great painters also, and distinguished statesmen and philosophers. There was constant intercourse, by sea and across Asia, with India and Persia. It was one of the most sparkling and progressive periods of Chinese history over which the Lady Yang presided; and her imperial husband remained her slave for twenty years. But there was painful truth in the complaints of the Confucian moralists. China had not yet found the new sage who would combine intellectual wisdom with love of beauty and sense. While the emperor dallied in his harem, corrupt officials allowed the army to deteriorate, and there was a rebellion in which Yang's latest lover

was implicated. And the soldiers now demanded the death of the favorite and all her relatives, and the beautiful Lady Yang said her prayers to the Lord Buddha for the last time and hanged herself on a pear-tree in the court of his temple.

So China lived while Europe lingered in its most squalid days. Some compare this age, alike in its outward splendor and hidden decay, to the reign of Louis XIV in France. There was a half-century of trouble and foreboding, but when at length a strong monarch called for a report of the situation, it was found, or affirmed, that it was the Buddhist religion, not the new luxury, that was destroying China. In the year 811 the officials reported to the emperor that there were eight hundred thousand soldiers, and that quite half of the remainder of the population were merchants, priests, or other types of non-producers. But this emperor was an ardent Buddhist, counting a supposed finger of Buddha his greatest treasure, and he refused to act. When a Confucian scholar submitted to him that this Buddha was simply a barbarian of the western lands, the man was exiled. Three-tenths of the population continued to feed seven-tenths. At length, about the year 850, a Taoist emperor listened to the economists. Generals were deserting the army, ministers and princes the court, merchants their stores, to become monks in the Buddhist convents. It is a piquant chapter of history. Whereas we read constantly of the ruin of civilization by sensuality, the statesmen of China reported that the country was being ruined by asceticism. The emperor closed no less than 44,600 Buddhist temples and monasteries and compelled 265,000 monks and nuns and 150,000 slaves of their premises to return to secular life and help to pay the taxes. Their property was confiscated.

The Arab and Jewish traders, some of whom spoke Persian, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Spanish, Slavonic, and Chinese, have left us many impressions of their visits to China at this time. Each traveler, they were astonished to find, was given a free pass for himself and his goods and could travel in safety. "Justice," they say, "was administered with great strictness at all tribunals"; which certainly could not be said of the Arab or Christian worlds, apart from Spain. Both parties to a suit were warned that they would be flogged if they committed perjury. In case of shortage of food the royal stores were opened, and food was sold to the people at a moderate price. What chiefly astonished these visitors from Persian and Arabian cities, where repulsive beggars swarmed, was that "scarcely a single one-eyed or blind person is to be seen or anyone subject to the like afflictions." The prosperous villages were so close together on the vast fertile plains that for hundreds of miles one could hear the cocks crow from one village to another. From a census taken in the next century it seems that the population of China had already reached the figure of between eighty and ninety million people.

But an Arab visitor of the next generation, in the same ninth century, tells a different story. Civil war and anarchy have "made an end of the justice and righteousness there formerly practiced." There are invasions and massacres, and civil life is terribly disturbed. The great Tang Dynasty was, after nearly three hundred

years of beneficent rule, ending ingloriously. I have already indicated the causes, as distinct from the rhetorical phrases of the moralist and the theologian, of these falls of dynasties, and I need not repeat that they generally leave the life of the great mass of the people, impoverished perhaps, but as robust as ever. We see in Chinese history what was really happening. Weak monarchs had yielded power to the eunuchs, and they filled the ninth century with intrigues to put a docile prince on the throne and advance their relatives. They began at this date to adopt sons whom they could promote to high office and thus strengthen their own positions. In the year 891 there were at court or in the army about six hundred adopted sons of eunuchs. In 900 they imprisoned an emperor in his palace. Occasionally an emperor or an empress—there was another strong empress in the eleventh century—would enter into alliance with the generals and check the eunuchs, but this was generally a period of decay and confusion. The leadership of the world had passed to the Mohammedans of Persia, Egypt, and Spain.

Another dynasty, the Sung Dynasty, filled the gap from the tenth century to the conquest by the Tatars in the thirteenth century, but its chief work was a revival of art and letters which I have described elsewhere. It began inauspiciously, but the story is instructive. Fifty years of petty princedoms followed the fall of the Tang emperors, and then the soldiers chose a popular general and made him emperor of China. He was pleasantly intoxicated at the moment when they put the yellow robe on him, but he proved a humane and conscientious ruler. He insisted that no member of the deposed royal family should be put to death and that there should be no looting. More than this, he founded new schools and favored art and scholarship. Experts tell us that some of the best Chinese painters belong to the Sung period, and there were many distinguished Confucian writers. We must not imagine, when we read of these periods of darkness in the Chinese Middle Ages that the country approximated in any degree to the barbaric condition of Europe.

Unfortunately, decades of weakness had lowered the defenses against the barbaric tribes beyond the Great Wall, and from the tenth century onward the Tatars made bolder and bolder inroads. At last that terrible genius, Jenghis Khan, appeared in the Tatar world, and a foolish Emperor of China sent him a letter of expostulation, adding that the Khan must read it on his knees. Jenghis, when it was translated to him, spat in the direction of China and set his men on the twelve hundred miles trek across the Gobi Desert. For five years they devastated China. It is said that ninety cities were destroyed so completely that a horseman could ride over their sites in the dark without stumbling. The astrologers at last convinced Jenghis that his destiny did not lie in China, but his son returned to the attack and his celebrated grandson, Kublai Khan, completed the conquest of China and inaugurated the rule of the Mongols.

For details I must refer to the Key, but it must here be emphasized that China at once civilized its barbaric invaders. They were more terrible than the Goths and Vandals of Europe, and no doubt

the common soldiers remained barbaric, but it is, in view of the history of Europe, very instructive to note that Kublai Khan and his ministers quickly became eager to sustain and promote the high culture of China. The monarch who had lived almost in savagery twenty years earlier proved one of the most broad-minded and tolerant of the age, a most benevolent and constructive ruler, earnestly devoted to the welfare of the people and the promotion of learning. We shall see a little more about his character and work in the last chapter. What mistakes he and his successors made in the government of China, chiefly in replacing Confucian scholars by Tatar military governors, belongs to history. It is enough that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when Europe was still heavily laboring to shake off its barbarism, China still remained at a high level of culture, refinement and material splendor.

It will thus be seen that if our historians properly broadened their outlook in describing the life of the Middle Ages it would not be possible for any historically instructed person to be seduced by theological or ethical fantasies about the evolution of civilization. Not only did the spirit of the ancient civilizations breathe new and splendid life into the institutions of the Arabs and Persians, but several thousand miles away from the Mediterranean a completely isolated people builds by its own human efforts a social state which is more conspicuous for refinement than any on earth and as generally fine in character and conduct as any. I have not noticed the ascetics of Chinese history, but if any person imagines that China differs from Europe in the lack of "saints" a little reading of Chinese history will soon disillusion him. The Confucian code itself is austere, and many great Chinese scholars and ministers followed it in this respect, but in the Taoist and Buddhist world there were swarms of what are called saintly men, from men of the highest character and benevolence to severe self-tormentors in the cause of virtue. It would be particularly interesting to know if Chinese monasticism led to such widespread hypocrisy and corruption as monasticism did in Europe. The material is scanty, but, as in the periods of severe Confucian attacks on the monks which I have noted, one hears nothing about vice and hypocrisy, as one reads on every page of the medieval history of Europe, we may safely conclude that even the degenerate form of Buddhism that was imported into China never led to the squalid scenes that were witnessed all over Europe.

I write this in the saloon of an Atlantic liner, and it chances that just as I choose this quiet corner on the Sunday morning, it has occurred to the officials that the saloon is the best place for "divine service." So these last few pages have been written, ironically enough, to the strains of the doxology and other ancient chants. I do not chide my fellows for hypocrisy, though it seems to me only a few hours since, far into the early morning, the same voices rang, since it was the gala night of our -- yage, with chants that were very profane. But can any person doubt that these few score people, who represent tens of millions in Europe and America, are steeped to the lips, in spite of the college education which most of them have had, with an utterly false version of the development of ideals? It is to

sustain this that the writers of historical manuals are still gravely unjust to every non-Christian civilization. Impartial history not only shows the highest and soundest ideals of conduct emerging from the experience of man in every part of the globe, but it shows that there must have been something in the religion of Europe in the Middle Ages that detained it in squalor and ignorance while all these other nations became so refined, so eager for knowledge, so helpful to the distressed.

CHAPTER IV

THE EVOLUTION OF HINDU SOCIETY

IF THE social history of China is little known to the general public, that of India is still less known, and the most grotesque ideas of the moral development of the Hindu people are generally entertained. Few dream that at a time when the ancestors of the European nations and of their American descendants were still fur-clad savages with the manners of Patagonian Indians, the Hindus had attained a civilization only inferior in some respects to that of the Greeks: that the real significance of Buddha, whose name is so glibly repeated by everybody, is that a large part of India anticipated our solution of the religious and philosophical controversy by more than two thousand years; that, in spite of all that is said about Hindu sensuality and sexuality its ancient civilization rose higher and higher precisely at the time when Gregory the Great was concluding from the squalid desolation of Europe that the end of the world could not be far off.

My readers know this in a general way from the Key to Culture, and I will now fill in that outline with more intimate descriptions of the life and character of the people in the various phases of the development of the civilization. Here the question of sex-morals will prove of particular interest. General moral principles are so uniformly developed in all the greater nations, and observed with just as much or just as little fidelity, that this work would become monotonous if in each case I traced the growth of the sentiment of justice, of benevolence or of veracity. We shall note how with the full development of Hindu culture the people are not in these respects inferior to any others. But in the Key to Love and Sex I have repeatedly referred to India as a land where ancient phallic ideas lingered in the fully developed life and there was more sexual freedom, more candor about sex, than in any other great civilization; for the reader must understand from the start that long before the beginning of the Christian Era India enjoyed a great civilization.

The contrast to China is particularly instructive. I have in earlier works explained how fallacious it is to appeal to climate and geography in interpreting these sexual differences. The average Chinaman has just as robust a sex-life as the average Hindu of the central plains, and there is not the least difference between the life of the more voluptuous princes of northern China in their splendid and spacious harems and that of the princes or rajahs of the perfumed palaces of India. Yet in India religion itself is deeply tinctured with sex, art is more candid in representing sex than in any other civilization, erotic prose and poetry are more abundant and outspoken than elsewhere, courtesans have reached more honorable positions than in any other land, and the song and speech of the people seem to make of sex a theme that hardly needs to be treated

with reserve. Some of the erotic literature of India would be as inconceivable in China as the naive sex-representations lavishly carved on the walls of some of the Hindu temples. In a less extreme way the personalities of Buddha and Kung-fu-tse, the rigorous anti-sensualist and the sober sage who rarely mentions either sex or religion, symbolize the different attitudes of the two great Asiatic peoples. And since both have developed their ideals out of sheer human experience and suffered little or no contamination from foreign influences, it will interest us to learn, as far as we can, what it was that gave this peculiar ethical tincture to Hindu thought and life.

§1. NEW LIGHT ON THE ORIGINS

Within the last few years we have made interesting discoveries in India which must here be taken into account. It is, in fact, only since I wrote the volume on India in the Key to Culture that these archaeological finds have been properly interpreted and made generally available. There is no need to enter into detail here, as archaeological remains alone rarely throw much light on the ideals and conduct of a people. It may be broadly said that what we have discovered is that the civilization which in the fourth millennium before Christ was rapidly developing in Mesopotamia, as we have long known, extended across the present wastes of Kurdistan and Turkestan to the north-western parts of India. It is even the opinion of some experts that about 3500 B. C. civilization was more advanced in India than it was in Mesopotamia. The sites of large cities have been traced, and the material culture was at least equal to that which I have described in an earlier book of this series as discovered at Ur: excellent pottery, picture writing, beautiful metal work, and so on. We must definitely say that, whereas until a few years ago we had regarded the Aryan invaders as the authors of Hindu civilization, it is now clear that they were half-barbaric conquerors of a people with a culture higher than their own; though, for some unknown reason, the advance was suspended in India after the year 3000 B. C., while the same civilization continued to make progress in Mesopotamia.

There is one respect in which the early civilization of India is interesting, apart from the connection of the various centers of ancient culture. As I have elsewhere explained, what is now a barren region between Persia and India was in those days a well-watered and fertile country. Sites of towns and villages have been unearthed along the route from Mesopotamia to India, and, while the latter were more favorable localities for development and naturally became the centers of a higher culture, it is clear that the section of the human family which gave birth to civilization stretched from Egypt and Asia Minor to north-west India. I would extend it westward to Crete, though many regard the Cretans as migrants from Asia Minor. Why there should be the most progressive branch of the human family in this part of the earth, and how we may plausibly regard the founders of the Chinese civilization as a fragment of the family which wandered across India, I have explained in the Key.

For my present purpose the interest of the new discoveries is that they suggest that this earliest Hindu civilization chiefly, on the religious side, cultivated the earth-mother goddess and was probably phallic. We find the same small statuettes as in Crete, and there is thus a remarkable continuity from Crete, through Asia Minor, to India. Here we have one reason for the religious divergence of the Hindus and the Chinese, and especially for the remarkable difference in regard to sex-morals of the Hindus from the Persians, to whom they are most closely related and with whom they formed one common family in Asia Minor in the third millennium before Christ. The development is still obscure, as our knowledge ceases with these remains of 3000 B. C., until we pick up obscure traces of Hindu life in the Vedas. But it seems clear that the Aryan invaders, forcing their way through the mountains between 2000 and 1500 B. C., with their Aryan deities of sky and sun, fire and the elements, really fell upon a civilized, if somewhat decayed, people who still worshipped the goddess of love and deified fertility. In the blend of the two cultures, to which native India contributed far more than we used to think, the phallic element seems to have been adopted by the conquerors; and the luscious fertility and fierce vitality of nature in their new tropical home would dispose them to locate a deity in the earth and regard sex-life as one of her beneficent manifestations. So little do these moral developments depend on moral intuitions or divine revelations, so much on the coloring agencies of the environment.

§2. THE VEDIC PERIOD

In recent times, when western education has made a new generation of Hindu scholars, some of them have gone so far as to denounce the whole story of an Aryan invasion as a myth concocted to explain why the early Hindu literature is written in a language, Sanscrit, which is closely related to those of Europe. It seems to them derogatory to the native genius of India that civilization should have to be imported into it by Aryans. We must now grant these writers that, while the invasion of India is an unquestionable historical fact, the Aryans found in their new home a civilization which was far higher than their own. They were still in the primitive pastoral stage in which I described the ancestors of the Greeks, Romans, and Persians. Mr. Romesh Dutt, it is true, claims that they were higher than other branches of the Indo-European race in the sense that their conduct in war was more humane. They did not, he says, kill captives or non-combatants or lay waste the territory they occupied. But this statement is taken from Vedic literature of uncertain date and we may just take the invaders of India as ignorant pastoral farmers, every man a priest and warrior as well as a rearer of cattle, chanting their wild poetry as they marched through the mountain passes and poured down upon the plains of northern India.

For the same reason it is impossible to extract much from the Vedas about the life of the native people whom the Aryans conquered. A Hindu student, Mr. Srinivas Iyengar, has written a small work, "Life in Ancient India" (1912), in which he professes to ex-

tract from the ancient literature a definite and flattering account of the civilization of the Hindus before the Aryans arrived, and much of the description must be admitted. There is no longer any reason to hesitate to admit a high culture in the cities of India before 2000 B. C., when, possibly, the earliest invaders reached the region. We read of kings clad in golden mail or gorgeous robes of state, of beautiful carpets and most skillful metal work, of chariots inlaid with mother of pearl. We find eunuchs guarding the royal wives, princes going to the hunt on elephants or horses, and richly carved wooden palaces; the carving, it is interesting to note, including many figures of nude girls. We read of large cities, their streets filled with horse-chariots, their people divided into rich and poor, their merchants using pieces of gold for coinage. There is much gaiety and splendor, much glorification of the fermented juice of the soma (the wine of ancient India), much ceremony in the temples.

There is no reason to decline to admit that the Aryans did in fact fall upon a world quite as well ordered as this, for in material culture it is scarcely beyond the ruined Indian cities of a thousand years earlier, but the description is taken from the Vedic literature itself and can rarely be attributed to a particular date. Some authorities say that, since the Vedas are poetry, we know nothing about the life of India until the fourth or third century B. C., but we may accept the broad picture of life in the first millennium as historical without going into particular periods. By the year 1000 B. C. the invaders had settled, and Mr. Romesh Dutt calls the period from that date to the year 320 B. C. "the Rationalistic Period" and "the most brilliant period of Hindu history." It was a time of increasing refinement, of advanced art and literature, of very considerable and subtle philosophical speculation as well as a beginning of science, of the composition of innumerable rules of life (the Sutras), and of the organization of society on a normal basis of justice. The land was broken into many principalities, and there was much fighting and confusion, but there were long reigns of just kings. One of them is recorded to have said: "In my kingdom there is no thief, no murderer, no drunkard . . . no adulterer, much less an adulteress." Mr. H. G. Keene in his "History of India" is unjust when he dismisses the whole of this period as one in which the majority were "gentle and laborious" and the minority "a graded society of self-satisfied Pharisees." There is much evidence that the Brahmans taught and often secured social justice, and their blunders will be considered presently. First let us see how sexual rules and conduct developed in this important constructive period, and in this we have the assistance of many recent Hindu writers.

§3. THE GROWTH OF THE PHALLIC ELEMENT

The period which I am now covering includes the appearance of Buddha, and we should like to know why the Indian moral reformer adopted so very different an attitude from that of the Chinese reformer that a Confucian scholar could speak disdainfully of Buddha as "a western barbarian." Temperament has much to do with such matters, but those who consider it an adequate explanation to say

that Buddha had a more profound moral insight than Kung-fu-tse merely mean that his ideas are more closely allied to their own. The difference between the two worlds upon which the great Asiatic sages lived will yield us a more satisfactory explanation.

In many respects the Hindu social world was at this time not unlike the Chinese. Child marriages were yet unknown, and the young folk seem commonly to have chosen their mates. Polygamy was recognized, and young widows were free to marry again. It seems to be generally agreed amongst the experts that the practice of **sutti**, or widow-burning, which appeared later was fraudulently imposed upon the people by the Brahmans; for the purpose, some high authorities do not hesitate to say, of securing the property of the widow. In a certain text of the sacred books a widow is bidden to go "to her house," and it was necessary only to change the Sanscrit word "agre" into "agne" to turn this into a command that she should go "to the fire." "This," said the great Sanscrit scholar Max Müller, "is, perhaps, the most flagrant instance of what can be done by an unscrupulous priesthood."

Mr. Iyengar in his account of life about 1500 B. C., riskily extracted from the Vedas, finds many references to irregular sexual conduct. There is question of women who go astray, of maids who have no brother to guide them, of the wife of a ruined gambler who becomes a prey to the lusts of men. One entire hymn or chant is devoted to the story of a lover who tries to charm the household and the dogs of a certain lady to sleep in order that he may steal in to her, and there are frequent references to bastard children. There is, in other words, much more freedom of conduct than we found in China in the same period, and it is just what we should expect from the phallic religion of the native civilization. Yet the tone of the Vedic writer is always censorious of vice and strongly approving of female chastity: in which we may recognize the voice of the Aryan. A common measure is reached in the recognition of prostitution, which seems to have flourished with full approval in the older civilization. We read of the ladies being rich in jewelry and making much parade in the streets in their chariots. There can be little doubt that the Aryans soon adopted this view, that professional women were a social necessity, and prostitutes quite early were regarded as merely one of the entertaining classes of the community, as we shall see presently.

In a more elaborate study of social life as it is recorded in the Vedas ("Some Aspects of the Earliest Social Life of India," 1928) Mr. S. C. Sarkar, a Hindu writer, has a very interesting account of sexual life before the time of Buddha; indeed, half his book is devoted to that side of social life. He says that even connections of brother and sister were "normally recognized" in Vedic times: a point which has been overlooked by writers on incest. Relations of father and daughter were, he says, generally condemned but frequent and at one time recognized. In the earliest period there were cases of polyandry, but this practice was early abandoned. Polygamy, on the other hand, increased, as from the earliest days of the Aryan conquest large numbers of native women were captured, and it was

quite permitted by the Vedas, as in the early books of the Old Testament, to appropriate these. Here again we see an element of difference from the Chinese development, for the Chinese did not violently conquer the region they occupied. Such women generally became concubines, so that the zenana already became common; though doubtless very many went into the numerous brothels. Women were given as presents, like horses or jewelry. A prince had, as a rule, at least four principal wives and probably hundreds of concubines. Another root of polygamy was that the practice grew, as in ancient Judea, of compelling the widow to marry the brother of her late husband.

There were no child-marriages, as I said above, and young women generally chose their husbands. Women were not secluded but perfectly free, as in Egypt and Babylonia. Parents had little control of their daughters until, at a much later date, they began to marry them before puberty. As a result there was amongst the mass of the people much the same sexual freedom as there is today. As Mr. Sarkar naively puts it: "Free love-making between young men and women before marriage was fully recognized in ordinary society." I take it that this means between men and women of the same caste, for the law, Mr. Romesh Dutt, an able Hindu lawyer, tells us, became very severe on adultery with a woman of lower caste. (I have said sufficient about the growth of the idea of caste in the Key.) At the religious festivals in the country the dances to the beat of the drum commonly ended in orgies of promiscuous intercourse. Amongst the wealthier folk of the city woman had a corresponding liberty. A girl could receive the highest education that was available, and a number of women seem to have been honored for their learning. Women teachers of philosophy and religion, or of the dreamy speculativeness and verbiage which was replacing the simple nature-religion of the Aryans, are sometimes mentioned.

There is said to have been no infanticide in this early period, since, presumably, there was no overpopulation. There was, in fact, a general ingenuous view of sex-relations as the Brahmans, the caste of professional priests which had naturally developed, lost themselves in abstruse speculations (see the volume on philosophy of the Key) in which the mass of the people did not and could not take the least interest. Many Brahmans, in fact, compromised with the general lax ideas of morals. It became not uncommon to accommodate a guest with one's wife or to request a friend to see if he could give a child to a childless wife. The priests began to function in this capacity, and more than one decaying dynasty was in this way renewed by the accession of priestly blood. In short, we may say that the phallic element of native India prevailed over the pastoral idea of the family of the invaders, and from a very early date India became one of the frankest of civilizations in its sex-life. "Hot blood" has really nothing to do with these matters. In very many parts of northern India, to which the new civilization was still confined, the climate is no warmer than in Egypt, where, with a few compromises (as on the festival of Osiris), the ethical element of

religion had conquered the phallic; as, also, in Mesopotamia. The truth seems to be that in settling amongst a people of higher culture, with impressive cities and luxuries, the rude Aryans found their "austere morality," as it is often called, a rustic code of life that made them seem inferior in culture; and that, as the Brahmans, who retained the old ideal of chastity in theory, entered upon their remarkable philosophical development, they carried their religion into the clouds, far above the heads of the mass of the people. Some strange blend of Aryan and native deities then gave the people a picturesque religion which they could follow, and the general amorousness was consecrated by attributing it to Siva or Krishna.

In the later part of this period the Brahmans gave out a more practical literature, a series of Sutras or laws for the moral regulation of life, chiefly in regard to person and property, and specially with a view to preserving the caste-divisions they had done so much to create. To preserve the higher caste a Brahman boy went to live in the house of a teacher under very strict discipline. Dutt says that he stayed there twelve, twenty-four, thirty-six, or forty-eight years, according to the amount of the Vedas that he wanted to master. During that time he must avoid all luxuries, spiced foods, and amusements, and he must beg the simple food of himself and his teacher and keep the house clean. He might have to wash the teacher's feet and put him to bed. No books were used in the instruction, and we can thus easily understand the almost unique development of Brahmanic religion at that time into the most subtle metaphysics the world had yet known. There were hundreds of thousands of these brooding teachers in India, apart from the greater colleges. At the end of the period of instruction the youth returned home, married, and lived a normal life.

This was enough of itself to widen the gulf which separated the highest caste from the mass of the people and at the same time to separate the ethical and ascetic ideas from the general religious life. Dutt describes the common type of marriage in the country. If the youth's proposal to the parents of the girl he had chosen were acceptable, both parties would come together and touch a vessel containing flowers, fried grain, and gold, and the youth would then offer a sacrifice. On the wedding day the youth and maid bathed in perfumed water, and the women led the youth to the bride's house. It was a domestic ceremony, highly seasoned with jokes and chatter about the purpose of the marriage. The actual ceremony varied in all regions, but commonly the youth led the maid three times round a sacrificial fire on which she scattered grain. Then she was made to tread on a millstone while she listened to the very necessary exhortation: "Like a stone be firm." We are told that the young couple had then to sit apart until the Pole Star rose in the sky, and that in some places they must have no intercourse for the first three nights. In some places the priest was called in to hand over the bride. In other places the father simply handed her over to the suitor in exchange for a cow or a bull, or the lover took her without any ceremony. In a few places there was a mock-rape, the youth pretending to steal the girl. As to age, the Sutras say that a girl

must not marry until three years after she attains maturity, but child-marriages began fairly early as a reaction against the looseness of the age. A youth wanted to secure a virginal bride or a father wanted to secure the higher price of virginity. The erotic hilarity was then renewed on every possible occasion. There was a festival when the girl announced that she was pregnant, when she had her first child, when she began to feed the child, and so on. The life of a large village was enlivened by constant festivals of a nature that we may properly call phallic, and sex was on the lips or in the thoughts of men and women in every hour of relaxation.

§4. THE MISSION OF BUDDHA

Those who have read what I have written in the Key to Sex and Love about the Hindu sex-ethic will now begin to understand the reason for the very general freedom of ideas and practices. And it is in large part this freedom that explains the appearance of Buddha. In part, as in China, the rise of the great Hindu moralists is due to a social decay and political confusion that spread over the country in the seventh and sixth centuries. The records are still not historically reliable, but it is significant that they tell of four parricide kings in succession in the century of Buddha. Another report says that a half-barbaric usurper massacred the entire clan to which Buddha belonged. The desire of more and more sensual luxury seemed to Buddha, when he began his contemplative period, the root-evil of all this confusion, and it is the more frank and obvious sensuality or sexuality of most of the people which explains why he did not merely, like Kung-fu-tse, appeal to princes for temperance and more modesty in their ambitions. Presumably Buddha, as a member of a royal house, saw in his youth a far greater parade of sensuality than Kung was likely to see in China. Temperance, or the golden mean, which is in this respect the essence of the Confucian teaching, might well seem an impossible gospel to an Indian reformer. There was nothing for it but to cut at the roots of the evil and denounce sensuality as a poison. There is the further obvious difference between the two reformers that, while China had as yet no priesthood in the ordinary sense of the word, India had a powerfully organized priesthood, to which, on account of its ostensible neglect of its moral duty, Buddha was bound to adopt an attitude of implicit hostility.

The truth is that Buddha was no more an original moral genius than Kung-fu-tse. A more careful study of Indian history would deprive many modern writers on ethics or mysticism of their appeal to the intuitions of the Asiatic reformer. Some experts call Gautama a reformer of Buddhism rather than its founder. It is at least clear that there was an ascetic or anti-sensual movement in India long before the time of Buddha, and it is to this that he was converted. Indeed, the founder of Jainism, Mahavira, who was more stringently ascetic than Buddha, since his followers retired from the world, was a little earlier in time, and it is his teaching which has inspired the strict communities of India during the Christian Era, while the Chinese and other Asiatic monasticism inspired by the Buddhism of

a later date has generally been much less austere, though far cleaner in its record than Christian monasticism.

With this side of Buddha's teaching and its influence on a small minority of Asiatics in every age I am not concerned. It is in the general human elements of his teaching that he contributed to civilization, as I have already illustrated in the case of Burma and of China. What precise language Buddha used we do not know, and I have elsewhere given the summaries of his teaching offered us in later Buddhist literature. But it is clear that he laid just as much stress on the general human duty or desirability of love of all living things as he did on abstinence from sensual pleasure. The Buddhist books speak lyrically, as Christ did, of "love" of all men. Translated into practicable prose, this means just the same thing as Confucian "Reciprocity" or the Golden Rule of the Old and New Testaments. It means that kindliness and generosity of mind are general moral qualities which, if properly cultivated, will not allow a man to go far astray. In the "Iti-vuttaka" Buddha is made to say:

> "All the means that can be used as bases of doing right are not worth the sixteenth part of the emancipation of the heart through love. That takes all those up into itself, outshining them in radiance and glory. Just as whatever stars there be, their radiance avails not the sixteenth part of the radiance of the moon."

The fulsomeness of this kind of language defeats its own object. People in every civilization are prepared by their own experience of life to recognize that mutual good feeling, as far as we can sustain it in face of each other's defects, is one of the most desirable conditions of social life. But the dreamy language of Buddha—if we care to recognize any of the language in the sacred books as his—and specially his condemnation of pleasure foredoomed him to virtual sterility. His followers remained a small minority, acrimoniously wrangling with the Brahmanists, until some three hundred years later, and eventually his creed was expelled from the greater part of India.

The events which led to the next important social phase of Hindu life have been told in the Key. In the fifth century the Persians, in the fourth the Macedonians under Alexander, invaded India and conquered part of it. Of direct influence on its life they had little, but the stimulating discovery that there were other and totally different civilizations, and the comparison of customs and institutions, must have made for progress. Already one Indian kingdom, Magadha (in which Buddha and Mahavira had taught), was so rich and powerful that it could put in the field 200,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry, 4000 elephants, and 2000 chariots. About the year 320, as I have explained, a bastard son of the ruling house, the great Chandragupta, usurped the throne, united all north India under his rule, and carried civilization to a still higher level.

§5. IN THE DAYS OF CHANDRAGUPTA

We have here, about the year 300 B. C., two valuable documents for the study of the evolution of manners in India. One is a work

of a Greek writer, Megasthenes, an official in the Persian service in India. He lived mainly in Chandragupta's capital, Patuliputa, which he describes as a city comparable with those of the western world. Its walls had a circuit of about twenty-four miles and were pierced by sixty-four gates and surmounted with five hundred and seventy towers. The king's palace, he says, was grander than those of the kings of Persia. Golden pillars ornamented with vines and silver birds supported the roof. Some of the gold vessels in use were six feet in diameter, and there were jeweled copper vessels and richly carved furniture. The king went daily from the palace, which was surrounded by a wonderful park, to the court to administer justice. He was borne in a golden palanquin from the canopy of which hung tassels decorated with pearls, and the cloth was a fine muslin embroidered with purple and gold. At other times he went out to hunt on a horse or elephant with gold-decorated trappings. Two or three armed courtesans stood beside him when he hunted; but of this curious development the next writer will tell us more. The king loved to be massaged with ebony rollers, even while he was hearing cases in court, and one of the chief sports he provided was a race of ox-drawn cars. It seems that they then had a breed of oxen, now extinct, which could run like horses. The course was nearly four miles long. It is less pleasant to read that Chandragupta liked to see animals, and occasionally men, fight.

This is, with local color, a familiar picture of an oriental monarchy of the old days, but the Greek writer insists that the administration of the kingdom was as skillful and beneficent as the palace was luxurious. There was, as we now say, a government bureau for every public purpose. Some officials supervised the wages and hours of workers and the purity of material. Others saw to the markets, temples, harvests, etc., and others took care of agriculture, irrigation, and the forests. There was even a body of officials who had to find lodgings for foreigners, and they would send back to his relatives the property of any foreigner who died in India. The administration of justice was strict, the king himself, as I said, attending the chief court daily. But there was, Megasthenes says, remarkably little litigation:

> "They have no suits about pledges or deposits, nor do they require either seals or witnesses, but they make their deposits and confide in each other. Their houses and property they generally leave unguarded. . . . Truth and virtue they hold alike in esteem. Hence they accord no special privileges to the old unless they possess superior wisdom. . . . They did not even use aliens as slaves, much less a countryman of their own."

It sounds rather like a description of an imaginary utopia than an account, by a foreign but well-informed visitor, of a part of that pre-Christian world which is generally supposed to have lain in darkness and the shadow of death. Yet high authorities on Hindu history like Vincent Smith substantially endorse it. Smith accepts the assurance of Megasthenes that there was so little stealing—he

attributes it to the severity of the penalties—that he remained some time in the camp of Chandragupta's army of four hundred thousand men, and the thefts never amounted to more than forty dollars in one day. Perjurers had their hands or feet cut off, and many crimes were punished with death. Megasthenes says that there was no written law, in fact no use yet of writing, but Dutt questions this.

The Greek writer has a long passage on "the philosophers" (the Brahmans), and it helps us to understand still more the divergence of the ascetic priests from popular religion and the easy ways, as regards sex, of the mass of the people. Some of the Brahmans, he says, were householders, some solitary ascetics. Of the former he says:

> "The philosophers then abode in a grove in front of the city, within a moderate-sized enclosure. They live in a simple style and lie on beds of rushes or [deer] skins. They abstain from animal food and sensual pleasures, and spend their time listening to religious discourse and imparting their knowledge to such as will listen to them."

After thirty-seven years of this kind of life they retire to their own property and lead a more comfortable life. They "eat flesh, wear fine muslins and gold trinkets, and marry as many women as they like." One would have thought that the capacity for enjoyment was extinct by that time. The ascetics, on the other hand, lived in the woods in bark huts, feeding only on the roots and fruits that nature provided. Some of them learned to heal the sick and counsel the distressed. The more famous of them were even consulted by kings.

There is no known reason why Megasthenes, who was certainly well acquainted with Hindu life, should give us a false account of it, and therefore, even when we make allowance for indulgence on his part, we realize that at this period India enjoyed "a high degree of civilization," as Vincent Smith concludes, and the Brahmans were not nearly so superfluous from a moral point of view as some historians suggest. Very large numbers of them moved amongst the people, presided at their ceremonies and sacrifices, and gave them advice and assistance. If, on the other hand, any person wishes to measure the quality of a people by the number of self-mortifying monks and "saints" it produced, India would have to be placed very high in his estimation. Indeed, we seem forced to conclude that in the few centuries before Christ there was a far more formidable body of genuine ascetics in India than there were at any time in Europe. Megasthenes never mentions the followers of Buddha, and they must therefore have been relatively few and obscure at this period. But neither he nor any other writer who has survived suggests that the Hindu ascetics sank into the comprehensive hypocrisy which distinguished monasticism in Europe. One good reason seems to be that the Brahman lived almost alone and begged or gathered his food: not in immense monasteries on which princes were invited to shower wealth that the monks might make vicarious atonement for their sins. It seems, in spite of the scantiness of the evidence,

impossible to doubt that the ascetic world of India, and later of China, remained far cleaner and more sincere than Christian monasticism.

Yet some writers on India profess to derive from a Hindu treatise that goes back to the same period a much less flattering account of the civilization. This treatise, the "Arthasatra" (or Science of Politics), nominally (though this is far from sure) written by Chanikya about the year 300 B. C., is regarded as an anticipation of Machiavelli's "Prince." It reflects a world of princes who see plotters all round them and protect themselves by armies of spies and the torture of suspects. "On account of the kingdom the father hates his sons and the sons hate the father." There are five institutes of espionage, prostitutes and even mendicants being employed in the service. The spies make notes in cipher and send them in by pigeons. The denounced persons are liable to experience eighteen different varieties of torture, including seven sorts of flogging. Honors are sold, and most unscrupulous ways of extorting money are described in the prince.

These are, in fact, the shades of Hindu life before Asoka, but the historian who merely extracts these unpleasant details from the Arthasatra defrauds his readers of considerable interest and misrepresents India. The work, of which an English translation is available though rare, is an invaluable account of ancient life and a strictly moral treatise. It condemns the royal misconduct which it describes, and, on the contrary, opens with very elevated counsels to princes. They must control their sensual desires, protect the weak amongst their subjects, choose just and wise ministers. The ideal life of a king is sketched, and it might fit St. Louis of France except for his superstitions. Hence whatever selfish monarchs there may have been at the time, we are confirmed in our conclusion that the standard of life remained high, and the details given by Megasthenes are supported. Chanikya gives a mass of detail about contemporary life, even of the art of cooking, the diet of horses, cows, and elephants, the processes of agricultural and industrial life, and so on. The picture is quite consistent with that of Megasthenes. A man is fined if he does not help to put out a fire in his neighbor's house, and there are thousands of pails of water in the main streets and at the crossroads for the purpose. There is a fine for throwing dirt or dead animals on the streets.

But the unique section of this picture of ancient Hindu life is the chapter on "The Superintendence of Prostitutes," and here we realize in full the ingenuousness, even at that early period, of the Hindu attitude toward sex. There is, to begin with, so large a royal harem that eighty "fathers" and fifty "mothers" have to be appointed to take care of the ladies. A large number of these ladies attached to the palace are simply prostitutes who, quite clearly, are kept as a means of adding to the royal revenue, for we read that if one of them refused to yield her person to a man at the king's command, she was flogged. Apparently they—they were kept apart from outside prostitutes—were more or less in the position of slaves, since the daughter followed the profession of the mother, and at the

age of eight began to play music before the king. They were divided into three classes according to their beauty and their jewels, and the fairest of them closely attended upon the king, holding the royal umbrella, the golden pitcher, and the fan, when he sat on his throne or went abroad. They stood beside him even in the hunt. These wealthier royal prostitutes could purchase their freedom. The poorer were, when they could no longer "render any service in the form of enjoyment" (which is not quite the word used), worked in the royal kitchens or storerooms.

There was the same complete lack of anything in the nature of moral reserve or disapproval in the control of outside prostitutes. A large number of inspectors settled their fees and saw to their good behavior in the exercise of their profession. One who refused to take the prescribed fee was fined twice the amount, and to take the fee and refuse was very wicked:

> "When in her own house a prostitute deprives her paramour of his enjoyment, she shall be fined eight times the amount of the fees, unless the paramour happens to be unassociable on account of disease or defects."

All kinds of fines and penalties are laid down for the protection of the client. For her own protection a woman had to pay to the government once every month an amount equal to one day's average earnings. In addition she might earn money as a spy, and it is indicated that many of the women were well educated. As a class they were in a totally different position from that they held in every other civilization; except at times in Europe during the Middle Ages. In the enumeration of classes of citizens they were associated with actors, musicians, dancers, thought-readers, hair-dressers, and perfume-makers, and the teachers of any of these honorable purveyors of pleasure, including the prostitutes, were maintained out of public funds.

This unique situation is at once a logical development of the Hindu life I have already described and an explanation of the permanent erotism of India. The ascetics were a class apart: a body of men who chose to sacrifice sex and sense in order, they thought, to attain a clearer intellectual vision. Since the mass of the people had no such ambition, and could not, if they wished, enter the caste of the Brahmans, the sex-tabu of the holy or wise men was a matter of complete indifference to them. On the one hand the "intellectuals" naturally, in their thirty or forty years brooding over the words of the Vedas, passed into a state of dreamy and verbose speculativeness—the sort of stuff which some retail as "profound" in modern American cities—to which the people were supremely indifferent. On the other hand, there was no theological scheme of sin and damnation, and the moral code, being grounded solely on experience of life, did not frown on sex as such. Thus India even at the height of its civilization came to retain the naive attitude toward sexual pleasure of its primitive phallic religion.

CHAPTER V

IN THE GOLDEN AGE

IT IS important to notice that this advanced condition of Hindu civilization about and just before the year 300 B. C. preceded the period when Buddhism had any influence on the country or its rulers and owed nothing to stimulation from foreign nations. The "lessons of history," particularly on the ethical side, are so regularly drawn from a version of history which so ignores these very interesting developments in Asia that they are rarely quite sound. Most readers of history, apart from special students, are left with a vague impression that these Asiatics made very creditable advances in the direction of civilization but that they have no peculiar interest until the religious genius of Kung-fu-tse in China and of Buddha in India lit the darkness of the struggling secular life, and that even the civilizations inspired by their moral intuitions remained of an inferior and unprogressive character until the superior wisdom of the west came to their assistance. All such impressions are grossly unhistorical, and they conceal from us some of the most genuine and valuable lessons of human development.

I will at the close of this volume point out the general lessons of Asiatic experience. For the moment it is enough to note that a very high civilization was developed, from purely native resources, both in China and India, without any religious inspiration. Not only did the high social quality of the reign of Chandragupta in India appear at a time when Buddhist ideas were still confined to severely isolated and obscure ascetics, just as the admirable life of China under the Chou Dynasty preceded Confucianism and was disconnected from the slender official religion, but neither sage was in any sense religious. I have shown elsewhere that no one disputes the complete religious skepticism of Kung-fu-tse, who advised his followers to ignore all questions about the spiritual, and that the real experts on Buddha, who have separated later fiction from the genuine teaching, unanimously represent him as a pure humanist. Reincarnation became in time a central dogma of the Buddhist religion, but Buddha had, just like Kung-fu-tse, urged his followers to waste no time on questions about the soul or gods. Life taught its own lessons, and it was the one aim of these sages, not to pretend that they had special revelations or intuitions, but to disentangle the rules of harmony from the disorderly experiences of life. The representation of them as "seers" with profound moral intuitions or insight is entirely false to history.

My aim in this book is to carry the history of morals in Asia as far as the central part of the Middle Ages, to which we traced the development of morals in the western world. It remains therefore to see how Hindu civilization fares when at last it obtains a Buddhist monarch and the spirit of Buddha's teaching is expressly infused into it. We saw why in the earlier period it can scarcely be regarded as a product of the Brahmanic religion. The immense body of the Brahmans had become a world of imaginative brooders, as remote

from life as the navel-contemplating monks of Christian Greece. If there was one virtue on which they were agreed it was asceticism, and particularly abstinence from wine (or soma) and women; and if there was one virtue which the Hindus particularly declined to cultivate it was abstinence from sensual and sexual pleasure. While, therefore, we may assume that the Brahmans in touch with the people taught justice, and we now know that a far larger number of them devoted themselves to common human service than westerners generally suppose, the defects of the Hindu civilization and especially the free life of the majority of the people, show how little religion counted for in conduct. It was a matter of sacrifices and of sense-stimulating processions and ceremonies.

If, as in the case of China, we try to tabulate the defects of the Hindu civilization, let us be careful to compare them not with the ideals of our modern age, but with those of the other nations of the ancient world. Some historical writers on morals lead their readers to use a double standard of comparison. They would have us judge the Greeks and Romans or ancient Chinese in the light of our modern ideas, which the race has taken six thousand years to develop, but judge the Christian nations of the Middle Ages by the extent to which they rise above the life of the ninth and tenth centuries, the lowest depth to which historic civilization ever sank. In the case of Asia, on the contrary, we ought, as I have explained, to be particularly lenient. Its great nations had as yet not received the least assistance from the experience of other nations, while Europe had inherited the wisdom of ten great civilizations. In these circumstances we must award a very high mark to the Hindu culture. Justice and benevolence, honesty and mutual aid, were as finely developed as in any other land. That the moral or social sense which dictated these virtues remained blind to any obligation of purity as such—since conjugal fidelity, which was recognized as a duty, is a matter of justice—merely adds interest to our modern controversy as to its place in the ethical code. The real defects of the Hindu civilization were the unscrupulous efforts of princes, as described by Chanikya, and the toleration of cruelty and torture in dealing with suspects and criminals. These, let me repeat, were general defects of ancient, medieval, and even modern civilizations until quite recent times, as I showed in the last volume and will show again in the next. But we shall now see how Buddhist influence at least for a time remedied these defects.

§1. A BUDDHIST KING

The grandson of Chandragupta, the monarch who is being slowly appreciated in the western world, Asoka, is one of the few kings who deserve the extensive notice in history which kings usually get; and the fact that not one in one thousand ever heard of him illustrates once more the false standard of history-writing. He is sometimes called the Charlemagne of Buddhism, but the comparison is almost pointless. Charlemagne did not establish Christianity in Europe, as Asoka established Buddhism in India; and Asoka, a vegetarian and pacifist, who thought it a sin to slay a dog, was very far

removed in personal ideals from the blonde giant who loved fighting as much as he loved women. The comparison is in some respects unjust to Charlemagne, whose ideals were colored by his age and tasks much more than by his religion. Asoka inherited a well-knit and prosperous kingdom, and had no need of conquest. Historians reject the old legend that he had one hundred brothers and slew ninety-four of them to prevent rivalry. It is true that in his earlier years (273 to about 260 B. C.) he followed the Brahmanic religion and betrays its lack of deep moral influence. He conducted one aggressive war, but there is hardly a parallel in history to the poignant remorse he felt during the remaining twenty-seven years of his reign for the human suffering which his war had caused. In this mood he listened to the teaching of Buddha, and he devoted the rest of his life to the realization of the Buddhist ideal in his own kingdom and the propagation of it beyond his frontiers.

Far beyond the confines of India, even on the fringe of the Mediterranean world, archaeologists find the decrees of King Asoka engraven on rocks to tell the whole world that Mercy was the supreme law. He became a Buddhist monk, made the pilgrimage with great piety, and convened a General Council of the Buddhists which (in 244 B. C.) marks the beginning of what we may call the Buddhist era in Asia. Buddhist temples, especially in caves or hollowed out of the sides of mountains, were created in great numbers, and it is said that Asoka spread over the land no less than eighty-four thousand smaller shrines in three years. A Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Fa-hsien, whose book has been translated into English by Dr. Giles ("The Travels of Fa-hsien," 1923) gives us some idea of the rapidity with which the Buddhist monastic ideal spread. The spread of the monastic ideal in Europe, which is often represented as miraculous, was slight and slow in comparison; and, as I said, we have no reason to believe that the Asiatic monks ever fell so low as those of Europe. In the first Indian kingdoms—even Asoka's kingdom, Magadha, was still only one of many—into which the pilgrim entered he found fourteen large monasteries with tens of thousands of Buddhist priests. One had three thousand inmates. Another, where an "authentic" foot print of Buddha was preserved in a temple, decorated with gold and silver and four hundred feet high with a green jade statue twenty feet high, had five thousand monks. Superstition had already, as in Europe, degraded the pure teaching of Buddha, and spurious relics drew crowds to the monasteries. One even professed to treasure the spitting-bowl of the sage. In another kingdom between fifty and sixty thousand priests used to come together in one city, where a tooth of Buddha was venerated. There were also large convents of women, and great treasure began to accumulate in the sacred buildings. Gorgeous processions, with embroidered banners and swinging censers passed through the streets, and the country roads were lined with trees, to give shade, and provided with numerous rest-houses, to encourage pilgrims to travel from shrine to shrine. People built small shrines to Buddha in front of their houses, and a room was set apart in every house for the wandering monk or priest whose healing service or religious counsel was deeply appreciated.

We have, in short, in the pages of Fa-hsien a picture of a land as devoted to piety and virtue as any section of Europe was in its rare epidemics of religious fervor. We are asked to make an allowance for the leniency or short-sightedness of the religious enthusiast —his book suggests rather that he was shrewdly observant—yet when we have done so the picture is one that must astonish a Christian reader. Fa-hsien spent three years in one monastery, which (like several others) is said to have been so famous for its learning that it drew students from the whole of Asia, yet the idea of irregularities in the monastic life does not even seem to have occurred to him. It was an age of great intellectual activity. The orthodox monks counted ninety-six schools of heretics, and vast numbers of men begged their bread to devote themselves to learning.

This remarkable development is interesting not only because it rebukes the folly of those who insist that there was no deep religious fervor or high moral idealism before the beginning of the Christian Era, but particularly in showing how the purely humanist ideas of Buddha came to influence an entire population. The people still venerated the ascetics without feeling the least need of asceticism in their own lives. Asoka himself had at least two queens, and his palace at Patuliputa, the capital which I have already described, was so splendid that common folk believed it had been built by spirits. He was ascetic mainly in diet, for Buddhism had already contracted somewhere in Asia the idea of reincarnation and the transmigration of souls (often into animals), and Asoka ceased to eat meat and tried to convert his subjects to vegetarianism. In this, naturally, he failed, and men found it incongruous and unconvincing that a human being should be put to death for putting an animal to death. Irrational beliefs are apt to lead to such absurdities. But the general principle which Asoka deduced from his belief—the right to life of every living thing—so far agreed with the pure teaching of Buddha that it had a real and wide influence. Fa-hsien tells us, indeed, that there were no butchers' shops in the cities, and that only men of the lowest caste, who had to give warning of their approach by striking a piece of wood, continued to hunt and fish. V. Smith says in his standard history of India that these were "regarded as lepers," but the Chinese writer plainly says that, as we should suspect, they were lepers. Smith is also inaccurate in saying that there was a large free hospital for the poor in the capital, endowed by the city, for Fa-hsien says "hospitals," not hospital. It is the first mention in history, centuries before the time of Christ, of hospitals; and the king not only supplied free drugs for ailing humans but provided homes for sick animals.

It is, however, clear that meat-eating and intoxicating drinks were not, as the Chinese traveler says, wholly suppressed. The people sanely accepted the gospel of benevolence and rejected the ascetic code. Fa-hsien says of the great city of Magadha:

> "Its people are rich and thriving and emulate one another in practicing charity of heart and duty to one's neighbor."

Again we will take off a discount for enthusiasm, but, when we remember that the visitor came, not from a barbaric land, but from an ancient civilization which even in its decay was full of refinement and benevolence, we must suppose that the general level of character was high. Asoka appointed numbers of inspectors to see that his ethical ideas were carried out. By such measures he checked the admiration of his people, yet his forty years of rule in the interest of virtue—or twenty-seven years after his conversion—evidently made a deep mark on the country. His other leading ideas, after universal love or sympathy, were reverence for teachers and parents, truthfulness, and toleration. Every religion and sect except such as demanded animal sacrifices was fully tolerated. Flowers alone were offered in Buddhist temples. The truculence of the criminal law was amended, and apparently the death-sentence and torture were abolished, except that a convicted traitor had his right hand cut off. Taxation was light, for the royal revenue came mainly from the king's estates, and the salaries of officials were regularly paid so that they should have no excuse for graft. We have, in short, a comprehensive suggestion of a civilization—happy, prosperous, peaceful, cooperative, and very free and sensual—not unlike that which, as we saw in the previous volume, the Arabs and Persians would later develop; and, as Buddha was not yet considered a god, though his human features were becoming strangely distorted in the legendary literature, we may still ascribe its virtues to humanist considerations. But we have not yet reached the greatest height of Hindu civilization before the Mohammedan Conquest.

§2. INDIA RISES AS EUROPE SINKS

The death of Asoka was followed by a series of feeble reigns in which the continuity of this fine Hindu culture was broken. The first fervor of Buddhism was enfeebled by the rich endowment of the temples and monasteries, and ritual religion, which Asoka had not favored, replaced with its superficial piety the humanitarian impulses of the Asoka period.

In a famous and beautiful poem Sir E. Arnold has appreciated Buddha as "The Light of Asia." It is to this kind of literature rather than to the historical record that mystics look for the ground of their eulogies. In China, we saw, the introduction of Buddhism was immediately followed by several centuries of decay and reaction, and the restoration of culture led at once to a comprehensive complaint that the religion was an enemy of the national interest. In Thibet and most parts of Asia where it has been preserved Buddhism has not proved an inspirer of civilization. In India, we have now to record, the establishment of Buddhism was followed by five centuries of such demoralization that I propose to pass completely over them. The period during which Buddhism was supreme in India is dated from about 250 B. C. to 200 A. D., since after the latter date the Brahmanic religion began to recover ground. That period is one of the darkest in the annals of India. At the recovery, in the fourth century A. D., the impulse came from foreign contacts, not from the now elaborately ritual religion of Buddha, and it was found that grave inhumanities had crept into the life of India during the long

disorder. The reader will carefully note that this is the period when the humanist teaching of Buddha is submerged in a ceremonious and supernatural religion. In the end the religion was expelled from the greater part of India. It is precisely those ascetic and mystic elements of Buddha's teaching, which our modern mystics profess to admire so much, that led to the degeneration of it into a religion; and the pure teaching is as rare in Asia as the original teaching of Christ is in Europe and America. No sophistry or rhetoric can obscure the lesson of the contrast of Kung-fu-tse and Buddha. Kung, the plain humanist, some prefer to say materialist, controlled millions of fine lives, just as he originally meant to do, for two thousand years. Buddha was emasculated into a God.

Yet we find the life of a large part of the Hindu people still inspired with Buddhist benevolence during the long period of confusion. It is as if through the teaching of the reformer the people had discovered the human value of the virtue he recommended, and in this sense we may appreciate some permanent element of Buddha's influence in India. The naive way in which they accepted this human part of his teaching and profoundly venerated him for ages, yet entirely ignored his anti-sensualism is almost unique. They did not, as Christians did in Europe, indulge their desires and then groan in spasms of repentance before the image of the master. They would adorn Buddha's statue with flowers while they had joyous thoughts of love in their hearts. But the fact that one of the most pronounced notes of Buddha's teaching was in fact a protest against sensual and sexual enjoyment was a permanent weakness, and the Brahmans, who had been reduced to a sect during the five or six centuries after Asoka, began to recover ground. In particular the new cult of Krishna, in whose legend many of the stories that are told of Christ —it is now impossible to say confidently which borrowed of the other and I prefer to believe that they arose independently or from common ancient myths—were blended with amorous stories which gave a divine sanction to sexual life, began to conquer the heart of India. The use of phallic emblems in temple sculpture, domestic shrines, and personal decorations, is doubtless much older than this period, but the religion of Krishna and other erotic sects which now appeared must greatly have encouraged the practice

We may pass over the period from the death of Asoka (232 B. C.) to the fourth century of the Christian Era or be content with these general observations. The Asoka Dynasty ended feebly in the year 185 B. C., and a period of disintegration and decay followed. The people suffered periodically from invasions and civil wars: art and literature and trade languished, except at short intervals, in the economic confusion. What was finest in Buddhism was, as I said, the sheer sentiment of benevolence, and it was easily displaced by the fiercer passions of adventurers, fighters, and greedy princes. Kung's assignment of the same sentiment to a definite intellectual and social basis proved a more effective restraining and civilizing force. We must, as in the case of the Chinese reaction, not suppose that the Hindu people at this time sank to the semi-barbarism of the European Middle Ages. The life of the mass of the people was dark-

ened and for long periods robbed of the peace and prosperity which make benevolence easy. But there were also periods of recovery and normal trade, and in the early part of the fourth century a new dynasty of strong men applied the (in the old world) necessary surgical operation of a reconquest and brought nearly the whole of India for the first time under one scepter.

This Gupta Dynasty raised Hindu civilization to its Golden Age (330-455 A. D.): in fact, since the country recovered again after the disorders of the fifth and sixth centuries, we may say that India rose steadily in civilization while Europe sank lower and lower. We know little about the monarchs of the early part of the period except that they vigorously reduced the various principalities and by a firm organization of their empire made possible a great revival, indeed a more splendid efflorescence than ever before, of art and letters. I have described this in the relevant volumes of the Key to Culture. Historians compare the period to the Elizabethan Period in England; though we must not forget that, unlike England, India had been highly civilized and refined for ages before that date. A great national literature, a secular literature (history, poetry, etc.) of immensely greater interest than the gaseous inflated literature of religious speculation, was created. The genuine parallel with the Renaissance in Europe is that, while religion continued to employ, we will not say inspire, the sculptor and architect, and the finest Brahmanic and Buddhist temples arose, in the field of literature the artist moved further and further away from religion, and his work suggests to us that there now arose a vast middle and wealthy class of cultural interests and free ideals. But it is not until a later date that we again get the more intimate knowledge of the ways and morals of the people in which we are in this work particularly interested.

§3. CONTACT WITH OTHER CIVILIZATIONS

In this earlier section of the Gupta Period we have in the main a revival of the older Hindu ideals because powerful monarchs have provided the conditions, peace and prosperity, of such a revival. It is wearisome to repeat so often the reflection that religion merely rose and sank with these revivals and reactions instead of causing them, but the contrary fallacy is so widely expressed in our literature that repetition may be useful. It is a quite general and outstanding fact of history that religions did not inspire revivals of civilization but took advantage of such revivals to deck themselves in more artistic vesture and attract more attention to themselves: it is a very general fact that those outflames of intellect and sentiment which we call Golden Ages began with skepticism about the prevailing religion, and the skepticism spread and deepened with the advance of culture. In this Golden Age of Hindu culture the two great national religions, Brahmanism and Buddhism, were so nicely balanced in power and so hostile to each other that neither could plausibly claim the credit for the revival. But both profited by it, and with their new wealth they raised superb monuments, most of which, unfortunately, perished at the Mohammedan invasion.

The first period of the restoration ended about the middle of the sixth century with a destructive invasion by the barbarians of cen-

tral Asia, and the victorious resistance to them impoverished and enfeebled the country. But again we must not imagine India barbarized as Europe was at this time. Vincent Smith in his standard work ("The Early History of India") chooses the period 400 to 650 A. D. as one of the most brilliant and progressive. When, twenty years ago, I pointed out that the chief principle of human progress is, not religion or morals or conquest, but the conflict of differing cultures, it was thought heretical. It is now increasingly recognized, and Smith himself, commenting on this development in India, says:

> 'Experience proves that the contact or collision of diverse modes of civilization is the most potent stimulation to intellectual and artistic progress."

We have already seen that the Hindus had, chiefly through the extension of Buddhism, entered into a fairly close correspondence with China. Chinese Buddhist scholars came to seek the true interpretation of the sacred writings in the Buddhist monasteries of India (which completely falsified the work of Buddha), and the blazing of the trail by pilgrims led to constant visits of merchants and travelers. But at this period contact was also established with the west. The western Roman Empire was sinking into barbarism, but the Eastern or Byzantine Empire was, we saw, unbroken by the Teutons, and there was a revival of civilization in Persia. The Persians considered themselves the heirs of the conquests which Alexander the Great had made—in fact, Persia had before his time extended its sway as far as India—and were constantly looking with covetous eyes in the direction of India. There was still, though the increasing drought was ruining the region, an inhabited corridor across the now barren area between Persia and India, and from the fifth to the eighth century there was much communication across it. One result of these foreign influences in India was the cultivation of science. Probably the impetus came especially from Alexandria, through the Persians. Mathematics and astronomy in particular found many Hindu enthusiasts. Some day, perhaps, the part which the Alexandria of the Ptolemies has played in the preservation and restoration of civilization will be fully appreciated.

The disorder of the sixth century was brought to a close in India by a vigorous soldier and prince, Harsha, who brought all India "under one umbrella," secured peace, and, for all the early truculence of his character, made a serious effort to raise the moral and social condition of the people. In his later years he embraced Buddhism and set before himself the example of Asoka. He traveled incessantly that he might see for himself and improve the condition of the provinces. In this he did not, like some luxurious Persian prince, have trains of camels (or elephants) bearing silken tents, but was content with temporary huts, made from the boughs of trees, wherever he halted. But criminals fled or trembled when the impressive cortege of the great king approached, hundreds of drummers marking every step of the royal progress with a beat on golden drums. Merit was sought out and rewarded: crime and violence were suppressed. Harsha ruled forty years, like Asoka, and—it is a pleasant note in Hindu history—with the assistance of his highly

cultivated sister, he completely restored the civilization of the ancient land.

Here again we have the assistance of a Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Hiuen Tsang, who spent fourteen years (630-644) in India during the second half of the reign of Harsha. His book has been translated into French, or used as material in a French work, the "Histoire de la vie de Hiouen Tsang," by Stanislas Julien, and it affords an interesting picture of the time. The visitor, a very zealous Buddhist, is mainly concerned with religious and monastic life, but he gives much the same account of the general condition of the country as the Chinese traveler I quoted in the last chapter. It was happy and prosperous, and, except that brigands (usually non-Hindus from the mountains and beyond) were numerous, there was little crime and violence. The taxes were light, as the royal estates yielded a sufficient revenue to the king; and the administration was just, as officials were adequately paid and controlled. We, however, recognize the effects of the earlier period of violence, and perhaps we can measure the degeneration of Buddhism, in the restoration of the savage legal punishments which Asoka had abolished. There were ordeals of fire, water, and poison for the accused, and convicted criminals often lost their hands, feet, noses, or ears. We must remember that these things were done in both the contemporary civilizations with which the Hindus were in contact, the Chinese and the Greek. At the same time, Hiuen Tsang tells us there was much zeal for education and culture. The king himself cultivated letters and patronized learning, and some notable historical works were produced. Like Asoka the king became a vegetarian and tried to prevent his people from killing animals; and, as in the time of Asoka, the people retorted that a little more tenderness for human life would be more impressive than this tenderness for animal life on the strength of the superstition of the transmigration of souls. The Brahmanists got up a conspiracy against Harsha and were persecuted.

Otherwise the king granted complete religious toleration, on the Buddhist principle which contrasts so finely with the growing intolerance of European Christendom. In his earlier years he had been eclectic. His father had been a sun-worshiper, his sister and brother were Buddhists, and he was a Brahman. With complete impartiality he raised temples to the sun, to Siva, and to Buddha. At length he became a fanatical Buddhist, and, while we must recognize that it moved him to create benevolent institutions and improve his people all over India, his later experiences, as told by the Chinese pilgrim, show the degenerate condition of both religions.

Buddhism was still powerful and very wealthy, though it was now split into two great sects whose furious quarrels anticipate the Catholic-Protestant division of Christendom. Hiuen Tsang was the champion of one sect, and the king loved to bring the rival champions to the court and listen to their debates, his sister sitting by his side. Harsha proved the genuineness of his new Buddhist piety by threatening to cut out the tongue of any rival who spoke against Hiuen Tsang, and he endowed Buddhism with prodigious wealth—

and, naturally, assisted it in its fatty degeneration. Some of the outstanding princes were already disgusted with it and were beginning to suppress it in their states. In the main Hindu kingdom it enjoyed its last years of triumph under Harsha. On the banks of the Ganges there was a great temple with a tower a hundred feet high that enclosed a life-sized golden statue of Buddha. Smaller statues of solid gold were borne in processions, and Harsha himself bore the canopy and scattered pearls and flowers. He donated thousands of embroidered robes, decorated with jewels, to the statues, and his lavish generosity to the faithful is without parallel. He held monster assemblies—one in the year 643 is said to have run to half a million people—and paid vast sums in entertaining and rewarding them. It took him many days to give, personally, a hundred gold coins, a pearl, a cotton robe, and food, flowers, and perfumes to each of the ten thousand Buddhists at the assembly. But he was loyal to the Buddhist principle of tolerance, and probably mindful of the interest of the state, for he went on to reward men of all religions. Twenty days were taken up in the distribution of gifts to the Brahmans, then ten days in distributing gifts to the ascetic Jains and other sectaries, ten days in bestowing gifts on beggars from all parts of the kingdom, and a month in relieving orphans and other destitute persons. In this one great assembly of the year 643 Harsha emptied his treasury, yet smaller assemblies were held every year. Of monasteries and sacred buildings he built or endowed a vast number; and it is a relief to read that he did not neglect to raise schools, in which medicine and mathematics were taught as well as theology.

It is significant again that Hiuen Tsang, who must have lived for more than ten years in the monasteries, never mentions rumors of laxity or moral degeneration. Those who find the life of such institutions fragrant will read in his pages of austerities, practiced by communities of thousands of monks, that rival those of the Egyptian desert or of the few genuine abbeys of the Middle Ages. Never was there a more childish illusion than that of the Roman Catholic who thinks that these self-tormenting practices were a unique adornment of his own Church. The man or woman who feels uplifted by reading about such matters ought to read the long story of Jain and Buddhist monasteries in India. Hiuen Tsang tells us of some monasteries in which all the monks used to rub their bodies with ashes until the skin was quite white. In others the monks wore no clothing, and they used to pull every single hair out of their bodies: which must be rather more painful than wearing a hair-shirt. Others lived in caves and wore round their necks rosaries made of skulls; while even more repulsive "saints" wore their clothes soiled with ordure and ate only putrid meat. It is refreshing to learn that amongst the crowd of sects and heretics to Buddhism and Brahmanism was one which taught that the supreme law was to do no harm to any man. The general picture is one of great zeal for what they esteemed to be learning and virtue, and, though Hiuen Tsang visited thousands of monasteries, some of which were rich and had elegant buildings, he seems never to have heard of any in which the ascetic ideal was not faithfully followed.

Although, however, there seems to have been little or no sexual irregularity, wealth, sectarian rivalry, brooding over matters remote from life, and ritualism seem in time to have robbed Hindu Buddhism of its social value. After Harsha there was another period of confusion, and the country was rent into small unprogressive principalities. By this time, the end of the seventh century, the tide of Mohammedanism was rolling eastward from Persia, and in the eighth century Moslem princes or chiefs led their armies through the mountain passes, in the old Aryan route, and fell upon India. How they were converted to Hindu culture and how they modified the ideals of the people we may see in a later volume.

CHAPTER VI

THE WAYS OF THE TURKS AND TATARS

THE little sketches of Chinese and Hindu life which I have been able to include here and there in the preceding chapters must make many regret that our historical literature does not more frequently include accounts of Asiatic life instead of largely imaginary accounts of the life of Europe in the Middle Ages. There can be no doubt that the superior refinement and learning of China and the juster social order and purer monasticism of India are generally ignored because they would by contrast make the life of medieval Europe look more squalid than ever. My own readers will now fully realize how misleading the ordinary "history of the world" or of civilization is. Mr. H. G. Wells made a fine beginning of reform by giving a large space to China and India in his "Outline of History," but on the scale of his work it was not possible to give an adequate account of their life. If the social pictures I give in this and the last volume be read in conjunction with the schedule of history which I gave in the Key, the reader will appreciate the truth of the remark with which I opened this volume: that a serious history of civilization must desert Europe after the fall of Rome, pass to China and India and then to the brilliant crescent of civilizations that stretched from Spain to China while Europe was sluggishly cleansing itself. It is not even a sound excuse for the historian to say that, after all, the foundations of our modern civilization are to be sought in the Middle Ages. It is the foundations of our reactionary and vanishing institutions—our royalties, aristocracies, and churches—that you will find there. The germs of the ideals of our modern age were implanted by the Arabs and by the revival of classical literature.

But the story of morals in Asia has a wider interest. It furnishes the most valuable material to assist us in settling some of our actual controversies. That the story of China and India definitively answers the question whether there can be high civilization apart from the Christian religion goes without saying, but it answers also the claim of our Modernists that at least some form of religious belief and inspiration is needed. Chinese culture stultifies the claim: Hindu culture owes whatever it seems to have derived from a religion to the purely humanitarian sentiment of an agnostic moralist:

and in both cases the general adoption of the Buddhism of a later date, which is a religion, was followed by long periods of demoralization. I do not need to attribute the reaction to the religion: the fact suffices that a profound reaction, not progress, followed the adoption of the religion. Further, the experience of Asia clearly shows that even the idea of spirituality is not in the least a condition of progress. Neither Kung nor Buddha was a materialist in the modern sense, as the Stoics and Epicureans were. China and India had not at that time developed a natural philosophy which raised such questions. But both emphatically disclaimed any interest in "spirit," and their moral culture must therefore be pronounced, like that of the Arabs and Persians, purely materialistic. It is equally mythical and unhistorical to say that civilization needs a base in Christianity, religion, or spirituality.

Other deductions bearing upon our actual controversies that I have made in earlier books of this series have here been fully confirmed. One, that is enforced in every chapter of this work, is that moral idealism arises in every age from the experience of life and has nothing to do either with revelations or intuitions. Another is that there is not the least inconsistency between a refined sensuality, as in China, or a widespread erotism, as in India, and progressive civilization. In both cases we find the most pronounced epicureanism, as it is popularly called, just in the periods of most intense artistic and intellectual activity. The lesson of India is particularly instructive. We now know—as I explained in an earlier chapter—that civilization was well developed in it before 3000 B. C. India is therefore actually the longest-lived civilization in history. Those other civilizations which were contemporary with it in the dawn of history perished millennia ago, in spite of their ethical religions. It has seen the cities of Egypt merge into the sands and those of Babylonia and Assyria crumble into mounds of clay. It has seen the passing of the splendor of Persia, the glamor of Greece, the greatness of Rome, the brilliance of Islam; and I quite understand the pride of those young Hindus who smile at the ignorant air of superiority with which they are sometimes patronized. Yet this five-thousand-year old civilization, far older than that of China, still throbbing with vitality and probably about to enter upon a new and wonderful destiny, has ever been the freest of all great civilizations in the enjoyment of the pleasures of sense and love.

A final lesson must be noted briefly, for my review of Asiatic development is not yet quite complete. The theory has often been advanced, and has recently been put into circulation with a false air of novelty by Spengler, that nations, like individuals, grow old and die a natural death, so that we may justly wonder whether the European-American civilization has not entered upon its stage of senile decay. This sophistry is open to several deadly replies, but I need note here only that China and India quite belie the theory. The Chinese civilization, sustained by the same people with comparatively little infusion of foreign blood, is about four thousand years old. The Hindu civilization, reinforced only once by a notable accession of people of an alien race, is five thousand five hundred

years old. And both nations are as robust as ever and are probably about to enter upon a greater phase than ever.

§1. THE CIVILIZING OF THE TURKS

One popular or interested fallacy which I have often exposed in my presentation of the facts of history has not yet been brought into consideration in this book. It is the false or fallacious claim, in the interest of the medieval Church, that it takes many centuries to civilize barbarians. But we have approached the period of history when the Tatars conquer and dominate China and the Turks conquer and dominate the Persian-Arab world, and, as both peoples are Asiatic, we may fitly close this book with a short account of their introduction to civilization. Like the Arabs, both are outcomes of the overpopulation of a relatively barren and barbaric region; and, like the Arabs, both accepted very promptly the higher culture of the fertile countries they overran. It is by such historical parallels that we can demonstrate the untruth of the paltry theory that no agency could have civilized the Teutonic invaders of Europe in less than six or seven centuries.

The defects of the Turks, or of their Sultans and their corrupt ministers, in recent times have led many writers to suggest that we understand it all when we say that they are Asiatics. It was a common cry during the late European War that the Allies were going to "sweep the Turk back into Asia to which he belongs." I have pleasure in recollecting that even in those prejudiced days I, in "The Soul of Europe," gave a just appreciation of the fine qualities of the Turkish people as distinct from their rulers. So frivolous or uninformed are many of the people who use this language that they do not seem to know that the Hungarians and Finns, two of the most admirable small peoples of Europe, are just as Asiatic as the Turks. These, however, broke into Christian Europe, while the Turks invaded the Persian-Arab lands. We saw in the last book how from the tenth century onward Turkish soldiers were attracted more and more to the service of the Caliphs, and how, having at last nearly the whole military power in their hands, they overshadowed and eventually displaced the Caliphs.

The reputation of Saladin for fineness and generosity of character is enough to remind us how these Turkish semi-barbarians of the Asiatic steppes became highly civilized in two or three generations. The story of their settlement is long and complicated, and I need say only that in the course of the eleventh century the Turks, with whom Kurds were mixed, took over the rule of Persia, Syria, and Asia Minor. The Arab-Persian rulers had, we saw, lost their vigor, and it is not unusual for historians to say that the Turks saved Islam. They embraced the Mohammedan religion with zeal and made a notable effort to realize its precepts of justice and benevolence. Some of the Sultans were monarchs of high character, purifying the corrupt administration and restoring the prosperity of the lands they governed. In this they wisely employed Persian and Arab statesmen and scholars, and the recovery of art, letters, trade, and character in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is

very creditable to all three races. It is to this period of Persian-Turkish culture that Omar Khayyam, the poet-astronomer who strikes so modern a note, belongs, and I have shown in the Key (Vol. 28) that he is only one, and by no means the greatest, of a line of poets and thinkers of exquisite art and skeptical sentiments who during two centuries reflected the splendor of medieval Islam. Philosophy and every branch of science, art and letters were carried to the highest pitch they had reached since the decay of Athens. From Bagdad and Mosul, through Aleppo, Damascus, and Cairo, to the great cities of Moorish Spain, there was a zeal for learning which, one would almost say, surpassed that of the Greeks since it extended over every class of the community. It was the greatest age of science yet recorded in history: an age that shamed the semi-barbarians of Europe into inaugurating the Scholastic Movement which is so often misrepresented as due to the impulse of the Church.

Historians too rarely notice that this splendid revival was in very large part due to the fostering care and protection of Turks whose ancestors had been, less than two centuries earlier, quite as barbaric as the Goths and Vandals. The sheer fact is that, while Popes still professed to find it difficult to civilize the barbarians of Europe after six centuries of spiritual domination of them, the humanist culture of the south tamed and refined one race after another in a few generations, and it was these who eventually, through the Moors, the Saracens, the Normans, and the Crusades at length imposed on Europe the sense of beauty that appears in late medieval art and the zeal for knowledge which culminates in Thomas Aquinas and Roger Bacon. Almost the one inkling of the historical truth at this period that is usually given is some reference to the remarkable personality of Saladin, which could not without utter absurdity be ignored. He and Frederic II tower high above the crowd of brutal Christian monarchs, and both are essentially products and expressions of the new Turk-Arab-Persian civilization.

Saladin was by race a Kurd, son of a governor in the service of the Sultans, educated in Damascus in the Arab-Syrian culture. In the second half of the twelfth century the Turks drove the Fatimite Dynasty from Egypt, and Saladin became governor, fixing his seat at Cairo. The scanty references to him in our historical manuals probably give most readers a quite false impression of his personality. He was a very devout Moslem of the more austere school. He refused to live in the superb palace of the Caliphs, sold for the public benefit all the gold and jewels—including an emerald four fingers long and a ruby that weighed more than two thousand carats—he found in it, and allowed the gorgeous structure to fall into decay. His zeal for war was no chivalrous refinement of the fighting impulse, as in Europe, but a pious determination to drive the Christian infidel out of the east. The Sultan, who was jealous, forced a civil war upon him, and he displaced that monarch, became himself Sultan, and transferred his seat to Damascus. Here he devoted himself to a thorough reorganization of the Mohammedan empire. Every province soon became familiar with the superb progress of the new Sultan. Over his head was borne the state canopy or parasol of

yellow silk, decorated with gold embroidery and surmounted by a golden eagle. A noble bore by his side the royal saddle, its cloth of gold brocade glittering with jewels. Two pages in yellow silk led the two white royal chargers, and a guard in yellow silk and red satin, a troop of musicians and poets, the bearer of the gold mace, and all the richly-robed grandees of the court (mostly learned men and humanitarians) accompanied him. At night great silken tents were reared, and candles in golden sticks lit the opulent interior. But the great Saladin was dressed soberly in black silk, a steel cap glistening under his turban. He sustained the pomp of his office, but he led a life of great sobriety and was ever attentive to the welfare and education of his people.

This is the man who recaptured Jerusalem and drove the Christian knights back to Europe. Stanley Lane-Poole, one of the few modern historians who have thoroughly understood and appreciated the greatness of the Saracen civilization, points the painful contrast of the behavior of the Christian knights when they had conquered Jerusalem—he might have added their conquest of Constantinople—and indulged in savage murder and mutilation of unarmed Mohammedans until the streets ran with blood, and the noble chivalry of Saladin. He was generous to the Christian poor and ladies who were left in Jerusalem. He released the husbands of the ladies and gave them funds to return to Europe. Even medieval Europe recognized and profited by the grandeur of his character, yet in our age, when we talk so much about the lessons of history, none seem disposed to point out to their readers that these Kurds and Saracens had more recently emerged from barbarism than the Christian knights whose brutality they shamed by their courtesy, generosity, and refinement. From that contact, as I said, came the age of chivalry and of courts of love in Europe. Saladin was a fearless and incomparable fighter, a man of fiery temper on occasion, but he hated the need of bloodshed and merely waged what he regarded as a Holy War. He would never allow children to see deeds of blood or permit the beating of servants. He was normally the gentlest and kindest of men, the father of the orphans and destitute in his great realm.

§2. THE TAMING OF THE TATARS

I have in the Key said almost all that is required for my present purpose about the initiation to civilization of a still more backward Asiatic people, the Tatars, but their experience so strongly reinforces one neglected lesson of history—that almost any barbarians can be brought to admire and strive for culture in one or two generations—that I must devote a page or two to them. The original Tatars were wild Mongolians of the Manchurian region, though the name was in time extended to all the Asiatic peoples brought under the rule of the Khans. We saw how under Jenghis Khan they swept over China in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, levelling its cities and slaying its people with all the ferocity of barbarians. From China the Khan turned his vast army of seven hundred thousand men westward and overran the region between India and Persia, which in those days was rarely without a civilization inspired from Persia.

At this period an Asiatic people called the Khwarezm held such cities as Samarkand, and, settling in them, even Jenghis adopted many high ideals of civilization. For all his ferocity he was a devout monotheist, though tolerant of all religions: and for all his amorousness he was very severe against adulterers and criminals. He exempted priests and physicians from taxation and enforced on all towns the duty of providing hospitals. One smiles at the narrow-minded and ignorant Christian literature about hospitals and charity when one finds, as we have found, these non-Christian peoples age after age, from Spain to China, raising countless hospitals at a time when Europe was just beginning to build a few miserable edifices of that character.

Jenghis had the ability of a great statesman and organizer, and he very quickly learned the ideals of enlightened statecraft (apart from war), but one does not expect a complete transformation of character in a single generation, especially in a very militant monarch. It is in his grandson, Kublai Khan, that we see the full conquest of Chinese and Persian culture. I have given only ten lines to this remarkable monarch in the Key and must here add such details as the remaining space permits.

Asiatic history is so grossly neglected that many must learn with surprise that Kublai, hardly two generations removed from barbarism, ruled a vaster empire than Charlemagne (or any other monarch) and organized it on more modern and enlightened lines than Charlemagne or any ancient ruler. He built a new capital, Tatu (near the actual city of Pekin), twenty-four miles square, with straight streets and rectangular blocks of houses. From this an elaborate postal service kept him in touch with his innumerable provinces. It is sometimes said that many of his officials were corrupt but I find only two notable instances. Kublai learned that his minister of finance, a man whose ways he had not closely scrutinized since the financial life seemed to flow smoothly, had been assassinated. He sought the reason, and, when he learned that the official had been corrupt, he had his body dug up and decapitated, executed two of his sons and degraded seven hundred other officials who were involved, and distributed as presents the forty beautiful widows and four hundred concubines of the dead man. This official was a western Mohammedan, and the discovery led to some persecution of the Moslems; though Kublai was one of the most tolerant of princes, receiving Christian missionaries at his court with great honor. What he really believed it is difficult to say, but his gentle and virtuous chief wife is said to have converted him to Buddhism, which he tried to make the state-religion. Men might, he said, worship whatever god they pleased if they observed the laws. Moses, Buddha, Christ, and Mohammed—he had followers of each brought before him and listened to them with profound interest—were equal prophets of the one God.

His zeal for education and learning was just as enlightened. Learning that thousands of Chinese scholars had been carried off by the army of Jenghis, he had them all liberated, and he surrounded himself with some of the most illustrious. He built numerous colleges in the capital and schools in all provinces of the empire. The

superior astronomy of the Arabs and Persians had now reached China, and Kublai, a strict believer in astrology—he had five thousand astrologers, including Jews and Christians—zealously promoted the science, importing instruments and raising twenty-seven new observatories. Great public works and philanthropies also were carried out by him, and he had the strictest regard for the welfare of his people. Someone told him that the successor of his minister of finance was following him in corrupt ways. He had the accuser beaten for libel and then made an inquiry; and, when the charge proved to be true, he had the minister executed and all his corrupt accomplices degraded.

In other respects we at times notice that the impulses of his ancestors had not, as we should expect, been quite eradicated. Many a superstition of the steppes lingered in his gorgeous court at Tatu or in the vast hunting tent, capable of holding a thousand men, which housed him during his travels. A great gold vessel as large as a barrel held the spiced wine, and all drank it from gold cups, but the servants who ministered had gold and silver cloth over their noses and mouths to keep their breath away, and two officers at the door watched vigilantly that no man trod on the threshold. Courtiers and officers who transgressed his rules were stripped and beaten. He loved an almost barbaric splendor, some of his suits gleaming with gold and jewels; and the wealth that concentrated in his capital was such that men could give him a birthday-present of a hundred thousand white horses.

Yet Kublai responded to the appeal of civilization in a way that makes the efforts of Charlemagne and the most praised monarchs of Europe seem small. He sent in every direction in search of distress that he might alleviate, and his educational work was immeasurably greater than that of Charlemagne. If while hunting, of which he was passionately fond—his party had a camp of ten thousand tents—he injured a district, it paid no taxes for the next three years; a piece of thoughtfulness for the poor which is hardly paralleled even in the lives of the few "saintly" monarchs of Europe. At the public almshouses he opened any poor person who applied received a loaf, and in time of drought he flung open the royal granaries and sold food at the normal price. Pensioners received regular distribution of wheat, and clothes also were distributed to the poor. He was amorous and sensual in his personal tastes. He had five chief wives, and the first of them, a Buddhist, had much to do with his better qualities and beneficence. Besides these he had a spacious harem to which thousands of the most beautiful girls of China were brought. Each, when she arrived, slept for a time with a matron, to see that her breath was good and her body sound and that she did not snore at night. After a spell in the royal harem the girls were generally married to officers. In short, Kublai Khan more richly deserves the title of Great which historians so lavishly bestow than half the monarchs who have received it, and the rise in so short a time of the Tatar prince and his chief followers to a level of civilization that surpasses that of contemporary Europe, in the thirteenth century, is one more episode of the history of morals that is too rarely appreciated.

A HISTORY OF HUMAN MORALS

Volume VI

Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

Morals in the Arab-Persian Civilization

Survey of the Mohammedan World from Spain to Bagdad

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

Girard, Kansas

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

Page

Chapter I. The Raw Material of Mohammedanism..... 5
(1) The Arabs Before Mohammed. (2) The Ethic of the Koran. (3) The Age of Fanaticism.

Chapter II. The Real Civilizing Agencies.....14
(1) The Persians of the Seventh Century. (2) The Contribution of Syria. (3) The Growth of Skepticism and Humanism.

Chapter III. The Gay City of Damascus.....22
(1) The Evolution of Morals in Syria. (2) The Court of the Caliph. (3) The Fall of the Ommeyads.

Chapter IV. The City of Harun al Raschid.....32
(1) The Growth of Skepticism. (2) Harun the Just and His Age. (3) The Climax.

Chapter V. The Morals of the Arabs of Spain.....41
(1) The Founding of the Civilization. (2) A Land of Light and Learning. (3) The Lessons of the Moorish Civilization.

Chapter VI. The Mohammedans in Egypt.....52
(1) Egypt After the Conquest. (2) Egypt Under the Ommeyads. (3) The Foundation of Cairo.

Chapter VII. The Saracen Neighbors of Rome.....59
(1) Moslem Life in Sicily. (2) The Harems of the Norman Knights.

MORALS IN THE ARAB-PERSIAN CIVILIZATION

CHAPTER 1

THE RAW MATERIAL OF MOHAMMEDANISM

IF I were asked to assign a date for the collapse of civilization in Europe and the beginning of that central section of the Middle Ages which we justly call the Dark Ages, I should suggest about the year 750 A. D. Fifty years later, it is true, we have the temporary check of this demoralization by the reign of Charlemagne, but, since the process of degradation had been entirely resumed by the year 850, and for two centuries the greater part of Christendom then continued to sink, we may regard the enlightened work of the great German monarch as an ineffectual attempt to save part of Europe from the advancing barbarism. By the middle of the eighth century the most respectable, or least barbarous, province of Christendom, Spain, had been detached from it by the Mohammedans. The next best province, northern Italy, had seen its Lombard civilization sterilized by the brutal Frank warriors whom the Popes had summoned to Italy; and the annexation of this promising region to the Papacy by the Franks had led to a debasement of the Roman Church which betrays itself in the most ghastly clerical feuds and outrages. At the same time St. Boniface and other good men give us an assurance that England, France, and Germany were in a state of grossness and confusion, while the Greek Empire stank with the brutalities of the Iconoclast controversy, the citizens even of its magnificent capital howling with joy as monks were made to walk round the Hippodrome arm in arm with prostitutes or to embrace nuns, or their castrated archbishop was driven before them on an ass under a shower of spittle. It is a picture of barbarism from Britain to the eastern confines of Christendom; and it continued, with local and temporary alleviations, until the eleventh century.

In my outline of history I have pointed out that this darkest age of European life dramatically coincides with the rise of a great Mohammedan civilization. In fact, since China was now in its Golden Age, under the Tang emperors, and was in full and cordial communication with the Mohammedan civilization, we should find the historian transferring his interest from the semi-barbaric and depopulated area of the Christian nations to the chain of peoples with magnificent material culture and intense intellectual life that stretched from Portugal to the China Sea. No historian does this, for it would be a recognition of the complete futility of the Roman and Greek Churches as civilizing agencies. Some writers, in fact, prefer instead to belittle the Mohammedan civilization with a few superficial jibes

and try to redeem the medieval squalor of Christendom. In the last book we have seen how really humorous are all attempts to brighten European history, and in previous works I have explained the superb art, the superb eminence in every branch of culture, the surprising prosperity and comfort, and the high social and humanitarian ideals of the five distinct Mohammedan civilizations (Spain, Sicily, Egypt, Syria, and Persia). Here we turn to the profoundly interesting subject of moral ideas and ways of living in these southern lands.

We shall not only find it pleasant to study the life of one of the most picturesque, vividly colored, and in many ways most brilliant, societies the earth has yet borne, but we shall discover points of the greatest importance to a serious study of morals. That is one reason why the southern civilization is so scantily noticed by conventional writers on history. We get, first, a very valuable light on the question how long it ought to take a real civilizing agency to lift a people out of barbarism. The Goths, Vandals, Anglo-Saxons, and Franks settled on the site of the old Roman Empire before the end of the fifth century, and I have shown that they were not yet civilized five centuries later. The Arabs set out from the same level of barbarism nearly two centuries later than the Teutons, and they were generally civilized a century later and very highly civilized by 800 A. D. This point must now be fully established.

The next point of considerable theoretical interest will be to find whether, or to what extent, religion counted in the education of the Arabs. Our curiosity is at once provoked when we reflect that Mohammedanism, though it is counted an ethical religion, differs from the Christian religion in refusing to condemn sensuality. Mahommed, we shall see, condemned adultery and fornication; but, seeing that he allowed a plurality of wives and an indefinite number of mistresses (concubines), this did not seem to lay a very severe strain on human nature. Sensual and sexual pleasure as such, apart from wine, he so far glorified that he gave his followers the impression that heaven meant an eternity of sensual pleasure. Thus while he, like Christ, and for the same reason (Persian influence), predicted a speedy end of the world, it had not the same effect of confining his followers to small pale groups of men and women who blushed when they saw a nude baby. While, therefore, the new religion was not calculated to inspire thought and the institutions of civilization, it at least did not paralyze its moral action by an unnatural asceticism to which no large body of people ever submits. Further, the new religion had no priests, no ritual, and few dogmas. A time would come when its religious leaders would usurp the position of priests, and its fanatics would murder each other over dogmas, but no hierarchy or doctrinal controversy arose in its first two or three centuries, as happened in the case of Christianity.

The chief and most fateful difference between the two religions, however, was that from the first the religion of Mohammed was not genuinely embraced by large numbers of those who professed it. The immediate followers of the prophet emerged victorious, in a small world, from a ferocious conflict, with the result that their vanquished and converted fellows nursed in their hearts a hatred and

contempt of the Prophet they now affected to venerate. It required only two generations to put some of these families in positions of great power, and they began at once to express the disdain of Mohammed that had passed from father to son. Skepticism, in other words, arose and spread widely in the Mohammedan world a thousand years before it spread in the Christian world: there was a vast literature and a general condition of literacy to facilitate its extension to all classes: and there was no formidable hierarchy to threaten the very numerous skeptical princes with excommunication or interdict. Apart, therefore, from periods of fanaticism, we have in the Arab-Persian world a reversion to the humanitarian ethic of the Greco-Roman world.

This in turn gives the new civilization great importance from another social or ethical viewpoint. Do we find the standard of conduct, which, in so far as it rests on any authority, is based upon Aristotle quite as much as upon a belief in God, entitled to our admiration? Do we find self-regarding virtues such as chastity stressed as much as social virtues like justice? The point is not of interest in connection with Christian controversy, as the Christian writer will at once shudderingly reply that, with all their eminence in the social virtues, the Arabs and Persians failed to appreciate asceticism. But it is of material interest in connection with the question of moral intuitions or of the existence of a moral law which is not social law. Here we shall find, as we have found repeatedly, that these keenly intellectual peoples recognized and acted upon the principles of justice, benevolence, and truthfulness as admirably as any in history, and immeasurably better than the Christian peoples of the Middle Ages, yet for the most part refused to acknowledge an equal validity in the law of chastity and glorified love as few other civilizations have ever done. And this will enable us to throw light, finally, on another of our ethical controversies. It is a worn tag of moralists and, unfortunately, of many historians, that any nation that fails to sustain chastity in its social idealism rapidly loses its wisdom and strength and incurs social dissolution. What was the experience of the Arabs and Persians? The entire moral history of this great Mohammedan civilization is instructive in connection with our actual ethical and social controversies, yet the most dogmatic of our moral oracles are just the men who pay no attention to it.

§1. THE ARABS BEFORE MOHAMMED

In the Key to Culture (No. 29) I gave one illustration of the barbaric mind of the Arabs in the days of Mohammed. Mecca was already one of the chief towns of Arabia, yet we read of a woman of one of its leading families, when the war with the Prophet began, wearing a necklace and bracelets of the dried ears and torn-out nails of slain followers of Mohammed and even cutting out and partially eating the liver of one of her opponents whom she bitterly hated. This was an exceptional piece of barbarity, but the whole fight was conducted with the license of barbarism. We are, therefore, not deeply impressed when recent writers on Arabia warn us not to confuse the qualities of the nomad Arabs of the desert with the

character of the townsfolk, and learnedly prove that the Persians and the Egyptians, the Jews and Christians, had reached even these remote towns of the country. We shall, of course, expect to find a slightly different mentality in the townsfolk, but what we have already seen in the case of Europe warns us not to exaggerate. The inconceivable brutalities which I described in the last book were not perpetrated by the country serfs but in the largest towns of Europe, and in the bishoprics and royal and noble palaces of those towns.

We find in Arabia in and before the time of Mohammed the extremely primitive code of conduct which, in spite of priestly revisions, we recognize in the early life of the Hebrews. On the lines on which I have traced the evolution of moral idealism this is entirely natural. The great majority of the Arabs had not risen above the wandering pastoral stage. Only a relatively small part of Arabia affords pasture all the year round, and in these areas tribes were permanently settled. Apart from the vast areas of stony and sandy sterility, a great deal of the country has a desert vegetation which will support camels, sheep, and goats only in certain seasons of the year. The majority of the people were, therefore, nomads, driving their flocks until they reached a suitable pasturage, and then raising a small temporary village of camel-hair tents. If in the dry season they encamped near the water and on the pastures of a settled tribe, it was only because they would otherwise fight for the right and because, if peacefully admitted, their knives and spears protected the villagers against other nomads.

Their code of conduct was, as we have found elsewhere, shaped by their environment; not by their nature-religion, which we need not notice here, or by any intuitions. Of their religion I need say only that it was no more than a utilitarian habit of sacrificing animals, and in some places human beings, to the spirits of stones and trees, streams and heavenly bodies, and that, as the Arabs were not agriculturists, the goddess of fertility had not a high position. Their gods or spirits, differing in every region, were, says an expert, "a mere rubbish-heap of divine names." They were not interested in conduct, and the Arabs were not interested in religious beliefs. Jews and Christians from the land of the persecuting Greeks found tolerance amongst them. The Arab had no law or code. He behaved as it was the tradition of his clan and family to behave; and if he gravely rebelled against the tradition, and the curses and threats of his kinsmen could not restrain him, he was expelled from the camp and thus virtually, in that desert world, condemned to death.

It is generally said that the nomad Arab recognized no law, but we have learned from our previous studies to say rather that his law (unwritten) had a very narrow range because his social group, the camp, or in a looser sense the tribe, was very small. In his own group his behavior was rather better than that of civilized folk, unless it be in a holiday camp. Parents were devoted to children, and mutual aid was habitual. The father, as in Rome before the development of civic law, was a despot in his home. If a woman were sterile he could divorce her: if she had unwanted female babies, he could bury them alive. As the groom paid a price or present for his bride,

he would guard her jealously, and a man would guard his daughter's virginity as part of her value. But the sexual code was in many respects liberal. If a man had to wander much, presumably with caravans, a woman could remain with her parents, who adopted her children, and she might refuse to rejoin the man. Temporary marriages were permitted. Wives were occasionally exchanged, and a man of special strength or stature might be asked by a friend to procreate sons for him. There was such an habitual veneration of standing stones, which were anointed on festivals, that there was clearly a good deal of phallic worship. Even at Mecca, until Mohammed became powerful enough to suppress the old custom, on certain festivals the men marched naked round the enclosure which contained the sacred black stone. Long afterwards, the historians tell us, a Bedouin once came in from the desert to do homage, and he thought it an act of special piety to march round with his buttocks bared.

These are the naive elements of barbaric life, and a conventional moralist ought to class the Arabs far lower than the chaste Teutons. In other respects they were on the same level. Within the tribe the Golden Rule prevailed: indeed, hospitality of the most generous description was extended even to the traveler, and many laws of courtesy were observed at the meal. But a man became a veritable savage the moment he looked beyond his tribe. Ferocity becomes at that stage, as I said in an earlier book, a social virtue. The enemy of the tribe and all his seed have to be exterminated. No barbarian of Europe was more truculent and unscrupulous in fighting. No line of the decalogue applied to one's enemy or his wife, goods, or children. Even within the tribe or clan when a murder occurred, as was bound to happen amongst such men, it was obligatory for relatives to seek to kill the murderer or his relatives. The soul of the dead cried for vengeance, and it was an act of piety to appease it. The race was too scattered, the political life too feebly developed, to provide social justice and punishment, but the confusion caused by these blood-feuds was so great that certain restrictions were already imposed. Bloodshed was forbidden in towns like Mecca which had special shrines and in certain months of the year.

The Arab was, in short, being driven by his experience of life to extend the range of social law, but tradition was very stubborn and resisted change. He would seem, therefore, to others a savage of uncontrollable impulses. The land is poor, and for a great part of the year food is scanty. When a feast came round, and everybody had to spare a sheep or a goat for the sacrifice, they all, after marching and howling round the altar, fell upon the meat like wolves. The social group being small, and all outside it being potential or actual enemies of it, what the Arab called bravery and we call ferocity was the first of virtues. There was no uniformity in the different parts of Arabia, as we should expect, but the typical nomad Arab or Bedouin was a very robust savage, enjoying poetry and good-fellowship, domestic affection and friendship in his own limited group, but as destructive, cruel, and thievish as any barbarian of Europe toward the race at large.

§2. THE ETHIC OF THE KORAN

We are reminded that it was not these Bedouins, or nomads of the desert, who founded the new Arab religion or civilization, but we must not forget that the far greater part of the Arab armies which soon poured over the world did consist of them. They were the raw material of the new civilization. Towns, comparatively to the size of Arabia, were extremely few and isolated. In spite of the difficulties of the country traders had long since landed on its coasts and traversed the interior. Even the Bedouins traded their products for dates and other necessaries. Stopping places for caravans, associated with favorite sacred stones or shrines, grew into towns. Trade taught men a slightly larger ethic, and strangers came to settle and talked of wonderful things in remote cities: luxuries, higher religions, civilized ideals. The ethic of a temporary camp in the desert would not work as the rule of life of tens of thousands of people rubbing shoulders on the streets of a town every day. In these urban centers a minority of thoughtful men realized that Arabia was primitive and must move on.

It was in these conditions, as I explained in the Key, that Mohammed, probably a caravan-conductor married to a comparatively rich widow, began to dream of a new religion for the Arabs. Biographies of him are late and not very reliable, and experts still differ as to whether he was a quite sincere enthusiast or an adventurer, whether he could read or merely pick up gossip in his travels, and so on. It is clear at all events that he knew a great deal about Judaism and very little about Christianity. The existence of one God, to whom he transferred the name of the local (and probably phallic) deity of Mecca, was his fundamental idea. These Christians, he said, had three gods: Allah, the Virgin Miriam, and the prophet Isa. The second fundamental idea was a very definite belief in a future life the character of which was determined by one's conduct on earth; and, as is natural in a man who wants to convert a nation to a new faith, correct belief was a very important point. Brooding over these and other religious ideas which he had heard, he developed a capacity like that of the modern Spiritualist inspirational medium to speak volubly for hours; and in physique he was neurotic, though strong. His wife, having money, secured a circle of followers for him, and they wrote down his platitudes; and they were long afterwards put together in the Koran.

But, whether or no he sincerely believed that he was inspired, it is a mistake to imagine that he meant to found an organized religion to compete for world-acceptance with Judaism and Christianity. His horizon was at first bounded by the length of his camel-rides. Moreover he had, as is generally forgotten, picked up the Persian idea that Allah would presently destroy the world and judge all men. We are not concerned about his religious ideas, but here they begin to have a moral interest. This Persian idea, based upon the sharp antagonism of devil-created flesh and God-created spirit, was, as we saw, one of the chief roots of asceticism. The interest of Mohammed is that he contrived to adopt the idea without its ascetic consequences. Later mystic sects of the Mohammedan world would

spiritualize his teaching, and even S. P. Scott, one of the best recent writers on the Moors and Saracens, maintains that the bright-eyed houris, the gorgeous banquets, the streams of wine, the pebbles of precious stones, the perfumed atmosphere and beautiful fountains which make Mohammed's paradise so much more alluring than that of Thomas Aquinas and Dante must be taken symbolically. I doubt it. Mohammed naturally condemns "whores and whoremongers," and as long as his first wife lived he was strictly faithful to her, but there is a mighty difference from St. Paul when he genially allows his followers four wives—it is disputed if he meant to restrict the number to four—and as many concubines as they could afford. This not only made virtue easy, but it encouraged sexual pleasure. Certainly most of his ruder followers would take quite literally the "damsels with swelling bosoms," the "lovely large-eyed girls like pearls hidden in their shells," the "virgins, fascinating, all of an equal age" that he promised in Paradise; just as literally as the exquisite pleasure he promised of being able to look over the battlements of heaven and see unbelievers in the ghastly eternal tortures of hell. After the death of his first wife he married twelve women, mostly rich widows, and had a number of concubines. He rather fancied himself with the ladies and used cosmetics.

Yet we must remember the rigorous fast, the abstinence from wine, and the prayer five times a day that he imposed on the faithful. He insisted just as firmly on charity, on the care of the widow and orphan, and imposed a tax for that object. He denounced cruelty to animals, forbade infanticide, and checked the blood-feud; though the latter abuses would tend of themselves to disappear when the whole race marched to war and every child was welcome. On the other hand, he sanctioned slavery, as all the world still did, and in a different way he was as injurious to woman as Paul. Scott says that he "repressed the unblushing licentiousness" of the earlier period—most writers make the Arabs strict about adultery—and "elevated the position of woman." He certainly did not help woman. He was a most jealous man, and it was in his household that strict seclusion began, and women had to wear the veil when they went out. Woman counts in his philosophy only as a child-breeder and source of pleasure. One may recognize in his words a masculine democratic note but certainly not an equality of the sexes. On the whole he adopted some of the best principles of Judaism, but to acclaim him, as is the custom of modern mystics, a seer or person of profound moral instincts is absurd.

§3. THE AGE OF FANATICISM

This is most clearly seen in the later years of his life. I refer to the Key for the historical details, but it will be remembered that the Meccans, who felt that the prosperity of the town was threatened, drove him and his few followers to Medina (622 A. D.). He had already betrayed a casuistry that does not remind us of Buddha. When the Meccans had angrily resented his attack on all idols and false gods, he got a revelation from heaven that their local deity was quite sound; when the danger was past, he explained that he had been misled by the devil. At Medina, where he lived ten years, this

casuistry became worse. His blunders as an amateur statesman brought great poverty on Medina—he was not at all a genius—and he directed his followers to plunder the caravans that made for Mecca. It was a common enough practice in Arabia, but scarcely a moral inspiration. Again, whereas the Meccans had spared his life out of respect for the law that blood must not be shed in Mecca, Mohammed sanctioned the shedding of their blood, treacherously, in the sacred month. The imprecations he pours on them in the Koran are sometimes excused on the ground that they are "oriental," but such excuses are ridiculous. They mean that he, and all who use such curses, had in many respects a low moral standard. The Persians under Cyrus were just as oriental but did not froth like dervishes or early Jewish prophets over those who did not agree with them.

The truth is that the eagerness for converts and for more wealth and power, which perverted Christianity, far more quickly and more poisonously perverted Mohammedanism. I am trying merely to show that the faith of Islam, as Mohammed developed it in his later years, was unfit to civilize nations, and we must look elsewhere for the cultural agencies. We are often invited to dwell on the sublimity of the idea of God which Mohammed gave the world, a God without the priests and ritual even of Judaism, a God to be addressed directly by every man five times a day. But these writers forget that in borrowing this idea from the Jews Mohammed borrowed also the Jewish ethic in its earliest and crudest, instead of its latest, form. The struggle with Mecca led not only to a ferocious war, but Mohammed sanctioned the assassination of his enemies. When he crushed Mecca and enlisted a few tribes under his banner, he abandoned his early idea of persuading men of the truth and sent armies out to conquer and forcibly convert other tribes. He bespattered the whole of Arabia with blood, in the name of his "sublime" God, and allowed his followers full license with the wives of the slain. Of the booty he demanded so large a share that the soldiers grumbled. He was a brigand-chief on a large scale, and the Persian and Greek monarchs turned up their noses when he had the audacity to write and tell them that their religions were false and they must embrace Islam.

Ferocity was the most conspicuous vice of the Arabs. Yet what Mohammed did in his later years was, not to check, but to inflame this ferocity by consecrating it in the service of Islam. As the army grew larger, the raids more extensive, and the plunder richer, the ambition and covetousness of the Prophet and his followers increased. They began to dream of an empire, to be won by the sword. At this juncture Mohammed died, but his strongest general and counselor, Omar, dare not yet aspire to be the Caliph (Successor) and he put in that position an ex-merchant who continued to direct the ferocity and looting impulse of the Arabs to the extension of Islam. They had already reached the neighborhood of Palestine and Syria, and the rich old cities lured them onward. Large numbers of the troops were not even nominally Mohammedans, and no man knew how many were convinced Moslems. It is quite a mistake to imagine them all thirsting to spread a gospel. Some historians be-

lieve that this expansion of the Arab race would have occurred if Mohammed had never been born.

The first Caliph died in two years, and the famous Omar, a man of great strength and considerable ability, succeeded. I have not to tell here how he conquered Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and how he gave the vast new empire a code of law and some sort of organization. It is enough to note that he was hardly more fitted than Mohammed to inspire a civilization. The Mohammedan chronicles tell that until 617 he was one of the worst opponents of the prophet and very far from religious. R. F. Dibble in his recent "Mohammed" (1927—a good picturesque account) says that up to this time Omar's "most cherished avocations had been wine, wife-beating, coarse interference in delicate feminine matters, and bitter hatred of Islam." He was a Hercules for strength. "If Satan were to meet Omar," Mohammed said, "he would get out of Omar's way." The legend is that, when he heard that his sister and her husband had adopted Islam, he thrashed them both, and then picked up a page of the Prophet's utterances. He was impressed and is said to have become a devout believer. He was, at all events, invaluable as a soldier and adviser. The chronicles tell us that once in his earlier life he had avoided trouble with the customs by making his camel swallow a lot of gold and cutting it open afterwards.

We need not ask whether Omar said the prayers and kept the fast and avoided wine. His piety chiefly took the form of a truculent determination to bring as much of the world as possible into Islam and relieve the dogs of idolaters of their treasures. It was a blend of greed, ambition, and zeal for the glory of God. How little civilizing such a religion was we perceive from the incessant quarrels and insurrections among the Moslems themselves. Some frankly wanted the fasts and prayers abolished, and the campaign recognized as an imperialist adventure. Omar was murdered, as were his two successors. It tells us something that three out of the four "orthodox" Caliphs were assassinated. The third, Othman, was accused of favoring the lax or skeptical, and the fanatics founded the Shi'ite sect which has ever since filled Islam with rancor. The new religion, in a word, had so many vicious qualities that it was far less qualified than primitive Christianity to promote individual character, and it was not at all calculated to inspire civilized institutions. We have to look elsewhere for the agencies which in less than a century created a high Arab-Persian civilization while the raw material of Christendom remained so many centuries in a state of at least semi-barbarism.

CHAPTER II

THE REAL CIVILIZING AGENCIES

 HE excuse is sometimes made for the turbulence and truculence of the Arabs during several decades after their acceptance of what is called a lofty conception of the deity that from long tradition their character made them impatient of all control or government. The early Christians, it is pointed out, were men and women of the Greek cities. To them submission to law was as familiar an attitude as lawlessness was to the Bedouin. Modern history admits too many of these superficial excuses for facts which conflict with the received opinion of the value of religious ideas. Mohammed and his four successors, and the great majority of those who directed the sanguinary frenzy of the campaign, were not Bedouins; and of the mass of their soldiers we must say that their lawlessness, their impulse to kill and loot, was intensified and employed, not rebuked, by their religious leaders. In "The Caliphate," a standard work, Sir W. Muir tells in detail how Arabia at once became aflame with revolt after the death of Mohammed. In one region the rebel army consisted of forty thousand men who wanted to disown Islam, and for a time it looked as if the new religion would be buried with its phophet. The Caliph, Abu Behr, and Omar, who succeeded him, directed the loyal tribes to crush the revolt mercilessly. It is sometimes pointed out that the Caliph imposed a strict discipline on the troops, but it is scarcely a unique piece of virtue to forbid troops to kill prisoners and children and direct them to annex the women to their harems instead of cutting their throats. The Caliph sanctioned the brutal execution of apostates, and he approved the outrage when a poetess who had satirized Mohammed had her hands cut off and her teeth knocked out.

This rebellion throughout Arabia may seem at first sight to justify the theory I have just mentioned, that the Arabs were too proud and independent to submit to the yoke, but aside from the fact that they rebelled because they considered the new revelation an imposture, it had made no attempt to correct their worst faults. In fact, they abandoned the sullen temper in which their defeat left them and eagerly flocked to the banner of the prophet precisely because it now made an appeal to their worst instincts: theft and bloodshed. There are two very important points about the early history of Mohammedanism which are left entirely out of sight in the small popular sketches of Mohammed and Islam that people read today. The liberalism on which we pride ourselves is doing a great deal of mischief in historical literature by politely suppressing unpleasant truths. Most people are, now that we have passed out of the old anti-Mohammedan phase, under the impression that all scholars regard the Prophet as a genuine and profound moral re-

former; and that, when his gospel had speedily won the enthusiastic support of the Arabs, they set out in a sacred religious fury to convert the world. On the contrary, as Muir well shows, more than half the Arabs rejected Islam as an imposture, and, after the truculent defeat, "it was the scent of war that now turned the sullen temper of the Arab tribes into eager loyalty."

We may admit that the early Caliphs honestly accepted the revelation but none knew better than they that the armies which now crossed the deserts under the flag of Islam were drawn by the prospect of looting the cities of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia. The loot had to be pooled, but this suited the soldier, as each got a fixed income from the result; and the prospect of annexing two or three Syrian girls each was dangled before the eyes of all. Instead, therefore, of the new religion imposing a yoke which the bold Bedouin resented, it consecrated his three fiercest impulses: bloodshed, loot, and sexuality. The other important point about this early period, the rapidity with which the richer Arabs, even of Mecca, developed a passion for luxury of a kind that the Koran sternly forbade, we shall see in the third section of this chapter. For the moment it is enough to realize that the fierce troops of bronzed men in striped mantles who now, from all parts, made for the north of Arabia were, in the great majority of cases, not driven by religious zeal, but fired by the reports of stupendous loot and unlimited women in the cities of the older civilizations. We shall find that it was the culture of these older lands which civilized them, and it will be useful to describe shortly in what condition the Arab-brigands discovered them.

§1. THE PERSIANS OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY

The area of the ancient civilizations north of the Arabian Peninsula, was now divided between the Persian kingdom, in the east, and the Byzantine or Greek Christian Empire. It was, as a matter of fact, the deadly exhausting struggle of these powers which enabled the primitive armies of the Arabs and their auxiliaries to overrun nearly half the civilized world in a few years. At the very time when Mohammed was vainly attempting to convert Mecca the armies of the Persian monarch cut their way westward until they were within sight of Constantinople. The Greeks recovered their energy under the threat, and they in turn cut their way eastward until they were almost in sight of the Persian capital. The exhausted monarchies then concluded peace and retired within their respective frontiers. The desolation they had made prepared the way for the success of the Arabs, but, obviously, civilization had not perished in the few years between the close of the Greek-Persian War and the advance of the Mohammedans.

We have seen in an earlier book that Persia had been a mighty civilization, with some high ideals, a thousand years earlier, until the semi-barbaric Alexander the Great ruined it. An old story, which may or may not be true, tells us that as Alexander, drunk as usual at the close of a banquet, lay on the couch with the beautiful courtesan Thais beside him, he, at her instigation, fired the palace and nearly destroyed the great city of Persepolis. To cut the history

short, I may say that there was a Persian revival in the third century (A. D.), and the austere Zoroastrian religion was once more enforced. Forty thousand magi (priests), it is said, met to organize the religion. They selected one in ten on the ground of learning and character, then again one in ten, and so on until only seven of the highest merit, with one supreme priest, were left to direct the country. It was then that the Persian sacred book, the Avesta, was compiled. Later there came periods when the arts were felt to be as important as, and much more pleasant than, the austere virtues of Zarathustra, but two facts will suffice to introduce us to the Persia which culturally conquered its Arab conquerors.

The great king Chosroes I, of the sixth century, who held the Persian throne for forty-eight years, raised the country to the highest level yet known of prosperity, culture, and general excellence. He suppressed the corruption which always tended to invade the administration under a despotic monarch, and he made every effort to restore learning and art. For this purpose he drew upon the best elements of the Byzantine civilization as well as the great traditions of Persia. He had ancient Greek literature translated into Persian and founded a university. I need not go into detail, but we shall understand the advance of the Arabs better if we realize how, while Europe and the Greek empire were sinking lower, Persia was restoring the intellectual and artistic foundations of civilization. Chosroes was tolerant of all religions, and it was only the profound ingratitude of his Christian son and his spiritual advisers that moved him at length to persecute. Chosroes had a Christian wife, and allowed her to practice her religion and have her son baptized. During the king's absence this youth heard that he had been killed, and he called upon the Christians to assist him to seize the country and suppress the Persian religion.

Chosroes II, grandson of the preceding, nobly continued the cultural work during a reign of thirty-eight years. He, in fact, did more for the promotion of art and science. The graceful architecture which the Arabs would presently improve and carry as far as Spain replaced the old Persian style, and an attempt was made to restore the cultivation of science and philosophy. This monarch also showed his liberality by marrying a Christian wife, and, if the story told by the annalists is correct, he had the distinction amongst monarchs of that age of being faithful to her until she died; though, since he had in his later years a harem of three thousand concubines, waited upon by twelve thousand female servants, we can scarcely suspect him of asceticism. Probably, however, this was merely part of the decoration of his court by which he advertised the prosperity of Persia. Constantinople had just, in the early years of the reign of Chosroes, witnessed those appalling brutalities of the usurper Phocas which Pope Gregory had so lamentably applauded, and Chosroes swept over the Greek world with his armies and brought back an incalculable treasure from the churches and palaces.

With this wealth Chosroes made his royal residence at Dastagerd the most wonderful in the world. He had nine hundred and sixty elephants and six thousand horses and mules in his stables.

Twenty thousand camels were in readiness to convey the royal tents and furniture on a campaign. Six thousand guards protected the palace, and twelve thousand slaves ministered in its spacious rooms. One wonderful chamber is said—we are getting to the heroic age of Persian and Arab literature and must not be too credulous—to have had its roof supported by forty thousand columns of marble and silver (or wood coated with silver), while a thousand golden balls suspended from the roof taught all the rudiments of astronomy by imitating the motions of the planets and the constellations of the zodiac. In the neighboring park were pheasants, peacocks, and ostriches, and even lions, tigers, and wild boars were kept for the hunt; for Chosroes was no soft voluptuary. This was at the country residence, Dastagerd, for Chosroes kept away from the Persian capital Ctesiphon. When, twenty years later, the victorious Arabs reached Ctesiphon, their writers bewilder us with the inventory of the spoil that was brought out from the vaults. One fancifully says that the gold coins alone numbered three thousands of thousands of thousands; but, as many of the Arab soldiers could not imagine a figure higher than one thousand, we may take this simply as "millions," which is safe enough. From one room of the palace they took a silk carpet, sixty cubits square, with an exquisite reproduction of a garden for its pattern; and the Caliph was so "democratic" that he insisted on cutting it up to divide amongst the soldiers. Caliph Omar put on himself the gold tiara, cuirass, belt, and bracelets of the king. He and his men wandered like sheep amongst the spoils of the world. From the islands of the Indian Ocean had been brought a store of a rare odoriferous gum, for use in the lamps of the palace, and the soldiers mistook it for salt and used it in making their bread.

However much we may reduce these fantastic accounts of the later Arab and Persian writers, it is clear that at the time when Mohammed was developing his boorish dream of conquest in Arabia there was in Persia as splendid a civilization as the world had known for many a century; and it was, as I said, preparing the way for the unsuspected barbarians by now entering upon a suicidal struggle with the Greek Empire. This Persian civilization had one serious defect: a defect which we shall long continue to find in the new Arab-Persian civilization. Its chronicle is time after time stained by acts of revolting cruelty. This, unfortunately, was a weakness that was not likely to be cured by the truculent Arabs and their religious violence. But the Persian kingdom was, in its zeal for art and science, preparing a remedy, and we shall see presently how this best element of the Persian civilization is at length cultivated once more and proved the chief source of the splendor of the new Mohammedan world.

§2. THE CONTRIBUTION OF SYRIA

Since the first capital of the Mohammedan empire, outside of Arabia, was the Syrian city of Damascus, we must consider what sort of civilization the Arabs would encounter on this side. Our literary traditions are such that, while the very word Persia suggests gravity and virtue, the word Syria gives us at once an impression of voluptuous effeminacy. I have myself repeatedly illustrated periods

of luxury by referring to the "nude Syrian dancing girls" who were employed as aphrodisiacs at the banquets of the wealthy Romans and later Greeks. We instinctively regard the Syrian capital as a constant source of some taint of lazy sensuality, and writers talk to us about the seething passions aroused in its torrid climate. They would find, on inquiry, that men who came from Medina and Mecca often shuddered at the severe climate of Damascus: that it was more easily supplied with snow to cool its wine than any other great city of the ancient world, and that, on account of the bitter cold it might experience in winter, it was less adorned with palms. One may be invited, on the other hand, to reflect that its name lingers on the lips of ladies in America today—"damask," as it was at one time the most famous center in the world for these textiles—that "damascened" arms and armor had the highest repute in the world for centuries, and that Damascus is the only city of a hundred in that part of the world that survives today.

A peculiarity of Damascus, which the Arabs would presently make one of the greatest cities of the world, is that it was never, until then, the capital of an empire. There had at one time been a kingdom of Syria, but when the Greek king of Syria founded Antioch the old city sank into decay. It had become part of the Byzantine Empire, which extended over Syria and Palestine. In other words, it had, as we are apt to forget, been an entirely Christian city—though once raided and partly destroyed by the Persians—for nearly three centuries when the Arabs took possession of it. I need, therefore, say little more than that it shared whatever virtues and vices we found in Constantinople and Antioch; and we found much more vice than virtue. The Greek historian Procopius complains that the Persians had little difficulty in taking Antioch because its citizens "cared for nothing but festivals and luxury and were constantly quarreling with one another at the spectacles." Its life was stained by the same disgraceful and often murderous fights of the two factions, the Blues and the Greens, of the Circus as at Constantinople. It cared nothing whatever for culture and had no distinction in art. Under the Greeks Damascus was still lower than Antioch, and the only elements of decent culture in it were introduced by Chosroes, the Persian king, during his short occupation of the city.

But, while we have few references to Damascus in the three centuries of its Christian period, we may be sure that its bazars afforded every luxury and its people copied every vice of the Greek world. The Syrian desert approaches it on the east, while the other Syrian cities are cut off by a range of mountains, and from time immemorial it had been the market-center for the folk of the desert. On the other hand, it stands, so to say, at the crossroads of the great highways from Mesopotamia and Egypt to Asia Minor and Europe. Its population had fallen low, but there must have been some rich merchants and officials to copy the ways of the degenerate Greeks. One ancient writer tells us that it would take a day to walk around its walls, and since the great earthquake of the year 526 A. D. had shaken the greater part of Antioch into ruin and destroyed—it is said—from quarter to half a million of its people, Damascus would

seem to the Arabian nomads the greatest prize of the region. How rapidly they assimilated its culture as well as its vices, we shall see in the next chapter. I want first to make quite clear the second very important yet little known point in the evolution of Mohammedan morals.

§3. THE GROWTH OF SKEPTICISM AND HUMANISM

This point is that within less than twenty years of the death of the prophet there arose in the sacred cities of Mecca and Medina marble palaces in which almost every line of Mohammed's ascetic code was ignored, while his sanctification of love was very zealously appreciated. Half of Arabia had, as I said, disowned the faith that had been imposed upon it, and had had to be forced once more, at the point of the lance, into a sullen acquiescence. In a few years this discontent of the desert Arabs was turned into wild rejoicing by the proclamation of the Holy War, and in virtue of the organization of the Caliph Omar all shared in the profit of the war and wealth began to flow into Mecca and Medina. When the cities of Mesopotamia and Syria were reached, the deserts and roads of Arabia witnessed strange scenes. Long trains of camels laden with gold and silver, with silks and tapestries and carpets more exquisite than we can make today, with ivory and ebony furniture and chests of coin, brought to the southern cities such wealth as men had never dreamed of; and tens of thousands of beautiful girls, Greek, Syrian, and Persian, were brought with the treasure, since Mohammed and his pious successors placed no restriction on the number of a man's slaves or concubines. The less handsome or older women of the northern cities had been put to ransom, and some strange stories are told of the primitive Arabs before Omar organized the loot. One man had captured the not very attractive daughter of a Greek noble and he had restored her to her family for a thousand pieces of silver, or probably about $250. When more intelligent companions told him that he ought to have demanded far more, he said that he was unaware that there was a larger figure than ten times one hundred. Most of these uncouth soldiers had little more use for coin than for silks and gold vessels. They wanted camels and girls. However, the disposal of the loot was at last organized and a prodigious wealth began to flow south.

The third Caliph, Othman, acceded to power only a dozen years after the death of Mohammed, yet the flag of Islam already floated in the breeze from Persia to Egypt. This man, who had married a daughter of the Prophet, belonged to one of those leading families of Mecca which had bitterly fought the new creed and accepted it only under compulsion. Whether he was himself convinced that it was an imposture we shall never know, for he dare not outrage the feelings of the believers, but he permitted a relaxation of discipline and, especially, he greatly enriched his relatives and their friends at Mecca. Now at last the richer men of Mecca began to take a keen interest in the progress of Islam. Even under the stern Omar the Arab discipline had repeatedly broken down. Omar once had to deal with a provincial governor who, though he had eighty wives and concubines, entered into adulterous relations with a Bedouin married

woman. Other high officials had to be flogged for drunkenness, and Omar's own son dissipated with a group of gay companions. The truculent campaign was over for the time by the year 638, and the relaxed soldiers turned on all sides to the wine-cup and the harem.

Under the easy-going Othman there was open defiance of the law, both in Mecca and Medina, which were still the capital and holy cities of Islam and the center of its new wealth. Indeed, even in the cities of southern Arabia officers and merchants began to live like nobles. We read of one who owned a thousand slaves, a thousand concubines, a thousand horses, a thousand camels, and sufficient land to yield him a thousand gold pieces a day. Othman himself built a marble palace at Medina, and there were soon scores of such palaces in the two cities, elegantly furnished from the spoils of war and equipped with spacious women's quarters, where Greek, Persian, and Syrian ladies would speedily teach their new lords the arts of civilization. Probably the Christian ladies were allowed the use of wine, as they were generally allowed to retain their creed. Long before the middle of the seventh century luxurious banquets with abundant wine were common in Mecca, where only a generation earlier ladies had decorated themselves with human ears and nails. Their sons now sat on couches that were strewn with myrtle and flowers, dressed in red, yellow, and green silks, drank wine from silver cups or exquisite Egyptian or Phoenician glasses, in chambers that were scented by perfumes burning in gold and silver vases.

Their Persian ladies, in particular, soon taught them the delight of song and dance to music. There is a legend that some Persian slaves were repairing the Ka'aba at Mecca, and a citizen heard one of them singing over his work and learned the art. The Arabs had been accustomed to recite their amorous and romantic poetry. Now there was quite a fever to learn the arts of singing, of playing the flute or the lute, of dancing to the tambourine or the drum. Music teachers made fortunes, and beautiful dancing girls became more expensive than cooks. Everything that Mohammed had scorned was now openly enjoyed by the wealthier citizens, and even his generous concession of concubines did not suffice to meet the new appetite. The rivalry in poetry and song led to a movement such as we shall find in Europe in the days of the troubadours. Woman was idolized; female beauty, now revealed in half a dozen national types, became the chief inspiration: love leaped over every barrier. We are told that the sons of these new rich of Mecca—and they had become incredibly rich in five years—made assignations with their lovers in the sacred enclosure itself. Othman made feeble protests, when the zealots stormed his palace with their angry cries, but the license increased. He had to depose a governor of Mecca for postponing the hour of public prayer for the convenience of his mistress.

The best poets were the heroes of the two cities, and they unblushingly included the names of their lovers, married or unmarried, in their poems. Men told each other for years how, when the news came that a Syrian caravan was bringing lady-pilgrims to Mecca, two of these amorous young poets rode out on dromedaries that were covered with gold-embroidered brocade, to sing and make love to the

ladies. One of these poets, Arji, was a grandson of the Caliph, and, to gain access to a reluctant woman he pursued, he exchanged clothes with the milkman and penetrated the house in the filthy robe and with the skin milk-bags of the man. The governor, whose wife he scurrilously attacked in his songs, had to wait until he committed a murder before he could imprison the popular poet. A female teacher of singing and the lute held public receptions on certain days, when even her female slaves wore gorgeous dresses and sparkling jewelry. The men had a club for chess (which also the Prophet hated) and drinking. And the jaded appetite soon sought other pleasures. Young men appeared who dressed in the bright flowing robes of ladies, darkened their eyes and stained their hands with henna, plaited their hair, and danced to the drum as the loosest women of Syria were wont to do. They made large incomes by catering to both sexes in Mecca and Medina. Even the normal voluptuaries protested against these, but they are said to have had a gild that was strong enough to protect them. Professor A. von Kremer, from whose "Orient under the Caliphate" (of which an English translation was published in India in 1920) I borrow most of these details, remarks that these hermaphrodites may still be seen at weddings in Cairo and "probably at Mecca, where, as is well known, all forms of immorality are greater than in any other place of the Moslem world." Poor Mohammed! Even his large concessions to the flesh did not reconcile people to his prohibitions.

I have run a little in advance of my program in describing this remarkable transformation of Mecca and Medina, but it must be understood that these two sacred cities gave the example and preceded Damascus in this kind of gaiety. We shall see in the next chapter how a member of one of the rich and dissipated Meccan families at last became Caliph and made Damascus his capital. Othman was, of course, murdered, but the strict Moslems did not regain control, even in Mecca and Medina, and in a few years the skeptics attained power and gave a unique character to the developing Mohammedan civilization.

CHAPTER III

THE GAY CITY OF DAMASCUS

THIS Moslem civilization of the Middle Ages extended from Spain to Persia and lasted four or five centuries. From the eleventh century onward the Turks encroached on it in the east and the Spaniards and Normans in the west, and although the diminished Moorish empire still flourished for three centuries in Spain, and the Turks became Mohammedans and for several centuries maintained the high standard, it will be better to confine ourselves here to the period from the seventh to the eleventh century. The area is so large and the period so long that we are at once on our guard against general statements about either the virtues or the vices of the medieval Moslem. There were a few regions where the fanatics dominated during nearly the whole period, and there was always some alternation in power of fanatics and skeptics even in the larger countries. Hence the writers who describe Christendom by quoting its scanty virtues and suppressing its extensive vices now describe the Mohammedan world by quoting its periods of decay and ignoring its generally fine qualities.

In the Key to Culture and in my Little Blue Books I have said much about the material and intellectual splendor of this Mohammedan civilization and shown that what we would almost call the conspiracy of silence of our historical writers in regard to it has two aims: to prevent people from realizing that, while the Christian religion failed entirely in seven centuries to inspire a civilization, these non-Christian peoples rose in about two centuries almost to the level of ancient Greece, and to conceal the fact that, when Europe did at last re-awaken, the chief impulse came from the Mohammedans. The moral development which accompanied this brilliant material prosperity and intellectual activity is one of the most interesting parts of my present subject. No responsible historian now questions that from the eighth to the thirteenth century the Mohammedan world was, in culture and splendor, as superior to the Christian world as the United States is to Mexico. Those who feel that this fact is entirely opposed to the theory of the evolution of civilization which is still taught in nearly every school fall back upon the sensuality and vices of the Moors of Spain, the Saracens of Italy, or the Arabs and Persians of Asia. What we saw about European morals in the last chapter disposes us to smile at their complaint, for it would be difficult to imagine a Mohammedan people more vicious than those we described. If, indeed, there is any point at all in these petulant remarks about Arab-Persian vice—there is no point unless the writer means that the Moslems were conspicuously more vicious and sensual than the medieval Italians or French—we find ourselves confronting the dilemma that, while our moralists denounce these things as de-

structive of civilization, we actually find them accompanying the highest level of culture and refinement and efficiency that the race reached between the first century of the Christian Era and our own time.

These interesting questions we shall keep in mind in studying life in the various parts of the world of Islam, but we must see all the historical facts before we attempt to answer them. Let us give one final warning. I have several times pointed out that we may discover a great deal more vice in one period than another, not because the period is more vicious, but because it has a much more abundant and more candid literature. For Christian Europe during the early Middle Ages we have a very scanty literature. If we set aside theological writings which no one reads today we have the scantiest and poorest literature of any six centuries of the civilized era. But the Mohammedan world during the same period produced one of the most abundant and most brilliant literatures ever written. The vandalism of the Spaniards and Italians and the degeneration of the Turks have deprived us of all but a few fragments of this great literature, but we must remember that the little we have reflects contemporary life more candidly than does the Christian literature of the period. In fine, let us not forget that until recent times the historical tradition in Europe and America about the Mohammedans was based almost entirely on the writings of Christians who scarcely knew a word of Arabic, very rarely visited Mohammedan countries (though they were welcomed), and were steeped in religious rancor and contempt.

§1. THE EVOLUTION OF MORALS IN SYRIA

For many reasons the Arab civilization of Syria is the most interesting. It was the first of the Mohammedan civilizations: it was founded by the most skeptical of the nominal followers of the prophet: it was set up in a region which is generally understood to be the classic center of sensual excess and degenerate character. In the preceding chapter we left the city of Damascus, its capital, at the time when the advancing Arabs of the first generation of Islam took it over from the Greeks. It had been Christian for three centuries and was, as far as our knowledge goes, neither better nor worse than any other city of the Byzantine Empire. What gives it a peculiar character in the new Islamic world is that the emir or governor appointed by the Caliph Omar belonged to the chief family of Mecca which had so bitterly opposed the Prophet. It was, in fact, the mother of this man, Muavia, who had torn out and partly chewed the liver of Mohammed's uncle. Force had at first compelled this Ommeyad family to make a profession of Islam, and then, as I explained, the vast loot garnered by the Arabs and the special enrichment of his relatives by the Caliph Othman, who belonged to the family, had very easily disposed them to read the Koran with hypocritical marks of reverence. Under Othman they began to speak freely, and, when he was murdered, his kinsman Muavia hung up the Caliph's bloody robe in the mosque at Damascus and inflamed the anger against the fanatics. Muavia fought a civil war against

the Caliph Ali and, when this man also was murdered, soon secured the Caliphate himself.

Since the title implied that he was religious as well as political head of the Mohammedan world, Muavia, who had his eye always on the inflammatory masses of the true believers, continued his outward conformity. But, like Theodoric of Italy and so many barbarian conquerors, he was attracted at once to the ideals of civilization. As one of the chief merchants of Mecca he had, of course, been more nearly acquainted with those ideals than a leader of Teutonic tribes, but I showed that even the higher Meccans were at a very low level and most of their supporters were barbaric. Indeed, in avenging the murder of Othman Muavia's Syrian troops are said to have stabled their horses in the shrine at Mecca, and the chroniclers say that a thousand children were born of the rapes they committed. It is therefore notable that in one generation Muavia, with only the tainted culture of the Greek world for his inspiration, made Damascus a highly civilized and very prosperous city of more than a hundred thousand souls.

Life within its massive walls—they were fifteen feet thick—had languished and become tawdry during the rule of the Greeks. Now men were drawn from all parts to the opulent court, and the bazars were soon packed with the luxuries of the world. Along the Straight Street, the "Main Street" of the city, poured Syrians, in their wide trousers and red coats, their camels and donkeys laden with the produce of Syria, fierce-looking Arabs from the desert in striped mantles of camel's hair, sheiks on their fine Arab horses, negroes from Egypt, Jews and even Greek merchants from Antioch and beyond. Christians were so far tolerated that they retained half their churches, and for eighty years, until the great mosque was built on its site, the cathedral was divided into two halves, one for Moslem and one for Christian service. The idea, which is not uncommon, that the Arabs cut the throat of every man who would not be converted, is ludicrous. Only an exceptional fanatical chief persecuted. Muavia and his successors, and the great majority of Arab and Persian rulers, preferred to impose a light tax on non-believers and attract as many as possible of these tax-payers.

With the spoil of the eastern world the new Caliph at once made his palace a wonder of luxury and beauty, and, when he found the Moslem world generally submissive to his rule, he began to relax. There were fanatics who used sulphurous language about the wine that was drunk in the palace and the soft splendor of its appointments. The strict Mohammedan sect of the Shi'ites dates from this period. But Muavia was sufficiently established to indulge at least a mild indifference to the Koran, and he was still sufficiently Meccan to deal harshly with opponents. One fanatic began in Damascus itself to denounce the new luxury. Muavia sent him a thousand gold pieces, which he promptly distributed to the poor, and the unscrupulous Caliph protested that the money was merely lent to him and had the man—as crude and violent an apostle as any monk of Egypt—banished into the desert. When, on the other hand, the fanatics of Mecca complained to him of one of the erotic poets who were en-

livening that city, Muavia had him summoned to Damascus. He had some of the new songs sung before him, and he not only sent the man back to Mecca loaded with presents and with an order to the governor to leave him unmolested, but from that time Mecca began to supply Damascus with its best poets and musicians. Few people realize what an important part Mecca, the cradle of the religion, played in inoculating the Moslem world with the ideal of free love.

§2. THE COURT OF THE CALIPH

Muavia ruled for about twenty years, and before his death his court had fully developed those features which are commonly described as oriental; though we do well to remember that they were Persian and Arabian rather than Syrian. In halls which were adorned on floor and walls with the most beautiful Byzantine mosaics, with ceilings of odoriferous woods heavily decorated with gold, the new monarch and his guests sat at the finest banquets and choicest wines the Asiatic world produced. Slaves in black silk, relieved with stripes of vivid color, waited on the guests. Even the cook, if summoned to the hall to receive compliments, had to put on robes of damascened silk. Sitting on divans of gold brocade, with the most superb ornaments of the ancient world surrounding them on every side, the Caliph and his friends listened to such songs and music and stories as I have already described in the case of Mecca. In another part of the palace were the beautiful women—the Moslem had not yet a harem guarded by eunuchs—selected from the hundreds of thousands of captives.

S. P. Scott, the leading authority on the Moors of Spain, whom he places next to the Greeks (and in some ways superior to them) in the brilliance of their civilization, has a few pages on the Arabs of Damascus, whose history he has not studied with the same care. Most of what we know about them comes from the writings of their bitter enemies at Bagdad or at Constantinople or from strict Moslems, for Damascus was slower than other parts of the Mohammedan world in literary and scientific development. When, therefore, we read in Scott that most of the Caliphs of Damascus were "profligates and infidels," that "in no country was society more corrupt," that there was "unspeakable infamy" and "disgusting debauchery," and so on, we must make a large allowance for religious prejudice. Muavia himself seems, considering the environment of his youth, to have been a moderate and sensible ruler, quietly defying the Koran, which he regarded as a childish imposture, on the point of wine and luxury, yet not nearly so cruel as we shall find the orthodox Caliphs of Persia and attentive to the welfare of his people.

The kind of life that really contains a social danger began under his son. Yezid has probably had his vices embroidered a little in orthodox accounts, but he does seem to have been of the selfish type that dreams of pleasure only. He was an open skeptic, on one occasion besieging Mecca itself to dislodge an opponent. His pet monkey, which drank wine from his gold cup, was buried, when it died, with the ceremony due to a Moslem prince. On one occasion, when a great crowd waited at the gate of the palace to see the Caliph issue,

he angered them by sending out his monkey in the state-procession. It is said that he put musk as an aphrodisiac into his wine and was very drunken. We must not, it is true, imagine him as entirely softened by such pleasures. He found equal delight in polo and racing—the chroniclers tell of incredible races in which a thousand Arab horses took part—and he could take the field in person. But there is no doubt that during his short reign of three or four years the court and city were encouraged to set the Koran contemptuously aside and cultivate a life of unrestrained gaiety. There is a story of a daughter of Muavia who, during a pilgrimage to Mecca, incautiously had her curtains drawn aside while she was lightly clad. A young noble saw her, began in the fashion of the day to write passionate verse about her charms, and won her consent to an intimacy. The freedom of the time may be judged from the closing lines of one of the poems which this man addressed to the sister of the Caliph:

> "And her parting from me was as intimate and sincere
> As when a lover parts from her chosen bride."

Many an oriental, if not western, ruler would have had the man killed to put an end to the gossip of the people, but the Caliph of Damascus merely gave him a heavy bribe to marry some other lady and remove himself.

Such reigns are apt to occur in all dynasties, when a strong father has brought peace and great prosperity and the son finds he can leave the burden of rule in the charge of competent ministers. Yezid's son was even feebler, but he lasted only three months. An ambitious noble then seized power and married Yezid's widow, who promptly suffocated him with a pillow, and there were some years of confusion. But these short reigns of idle and voluptuous rulers were more than balanced by longer reigns of sober and beneficent Caliphs, so that to dismiss the dynasty of the Ommeyad Caliphs as merely covering a time of "sensuality and debauchery" is quite unwarranted. I do not want here to write history, but it is necessary to show, or at least useful to understand, how all the liberty of conduct which some of the Caliphs of Damascus encouraged was consistent with a remarkably rapid advance in civilization. During the hundred years that the dynasty lasted two strong, constructive Caliphs ruled for twenty years each and another for ten years. Welid I, who acceded in 705, is described by some authorities as the best of all the Caliphs. The Mosque of Omar (his cousin) still testifies at Jerusalem to the progress the Arabs had made, and it is only one of many beautiful buildings that were erected.

An Arab geographer of a later date describes the city of Damascus as the Ommeyad Caliphs made it, and the work was substantially completed under Welid I:

> "Nowhere else will be seen such magnificent hot baths, nor such beautiful fountains, nor people more worthy of consideration. . . . The mosque of Damascus is the fairest of all that the Muslim now hold."

He has a long description of the beauties of the city and its

mosque. The latter alone is said to have cost between twenty and thirty million dollars, "besides," the geographer quaintly says, "eighteen shiploads of gold and silver from Cyprus." A series of beautiful colonnades with white marble shafts ran round the court. The inner walls of the mosque were lined with variegated marbles below and exquisite colored and gold mosaics above. The capitals of the columns were coated with gold. The interior afforded praying-room for twenty thousand Moslems, and it was lit at night by six hundred lamps hanging by golden chains. The entrance to the mihrab, or holy of holies, at the end was adorned with gold mosaics and lapis lazuli and even jewels. As a final marvel the geographer says that the builders were so numerous that they ate $15,000 worth of cabbages a day.

The Arab writer who gives us this enthusiastic description of Damascus, at a time when power had passed to Persia and the old city was overcast, lived at Jerusalem, and the comparison he makes of the two cities is far from flattering to the latter. Damascus, at the foot of the hills, was plentifully watered, so that it was easier to adorn it with spacious parks and beautiful gardens, but it had also the finest industries and most wonderful bazars of the world. As I have said, "damask" became the name all over the world for the finest flowered silk (as it was originally) and "damascened" arms and armor and other metal work were famous everywhere. The geographer illustrates the skill of the metal-workers of Damascus by telling of a wonderful large time-piece at one place in which brass falcons told the hour by leaning forward and dropping balls from their mouths into brass cups. The city, he says, had a hundred hot baths (or bathing establishments) and forty houses of ablution. It had twenty colleges and a number of hospitals.

Mukkadasi finds his own city of Jerusalem "the most illustrious of cities." "In no place will you find people more chaste," he says, and there are "all manner of learned men and doctors." Presently he admits that, with all its superiority in sexual morals, Jerusalem is known throughout the east as "a golden basin filled with scorpions." In fact, he almost reverses his earlier description, saying:

> "You will not find anywhere baths more filthy than those of the Holy City, nor anywhere the fees for the same heavier. Learned men are few, and the Christians numerous, and the same are unmannerly in public places. . . . In this city the oppressed have no succor; the meek are molested and the rich envied. Jurisconsults remain unvisited, and erudite men have no renown; also the schools are unattended, for there are no lectures. Everywhere the Christians and the Jews have the upper hand."

I take this interesting contrast of Damascus and Jerusalem from a work published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, a Christian organization, entitled "Palestine under the Moslems," a collection of translations from the Arabic. It forcibly reminds us how unjust it is in any history of morals to dismiss the period of the Damascus Caliphs simply as one of "sensuality and debauchery," a time when,

Scott strangely says, "the barbaric orgies of the Bedouin tent were supplemented by the polished vices of Egypt and the nameless iniquities of Rome and Constantinople." People get vague moral thrills from reading this kind of thing, but historical statements in plain English would entirely destroy the illusion of awful mysteries. The stories of the "Arabian Nights" are more instructive than some of the historical manuals. They almost never refer to unnatural or abnormal sexual practices of any sort. On the available evidence I should say that there was less of these practices in Damascus than in Persia, Egypt, and Spain, and for less than in contemporary Europe and the Greek empire. On the other hand, there was much the same general attitude of freedom in love-affairs as in the analogous period of the Renaissance in Europe: without, be it noted, the hypocrisy of a large body of priests, monks, and nuns who lived by professing sanctity yet were generally loose.

The mischief of these rhetorical statements about Mohammedan morals is that they convey to the poorly instructed reader an impression that in this Mohammedan east of the Middle Ages men indulged in excesses of sensual life which prevented them from making intellectual progress, wrecked their civilization, and must be taken by ourselves as warning examples. This is piffle; and unfortunately there is a very great deal of it in the writing of history. The few really morbid sensualists, the princes who stupefied themselves by excesses, died out quickly, as usually happens, and made room for more sensible men. The really customary "sensuality" was consistent with the highest degree of efficiency. The rich men of Damascus who had palaces lined with marble and porphyry, mosaics and lapis lazuli, exquisite gardens for which perfumed flowers and shrubs were sought in the whole world, companies of beautiful women guarded by richly clad negro slaves or Byzantine eunuchs, soft divans covered with gold brocade or the finest and brightest silks, perfumed lamps and exquisite banquets and choice wines, were often the ablest merchants of the time. The nobles and princes who stripped the empire of the works of art, luxuries, and jewels for the adornment of their palaces were for the greater part, even during the Ommeyad dynasty, more capable and beneficent rulers than any in Europe. The brilliant prosperity and efficiency of their civilization should be proof enough of this, but there is another side to their work. While they disdainfully set aside the asceticism of the Koran as the personal opinion of "the camel-driver of Mecca," and thus saved themselves from the hypocrisy of Christian Europe, they quite agreed with Mohammed about the service of the unfortunate and they improved upon all their contemporaries in the promotion of culture.

The Damascus Caliphs are contrasted unfavorably with those of Bagdad and Spain in regard to intellectual activity but the comparison is unjust. They were the pioneers of the Mohammedan civilization, and during that first century the Arabs had not yet realized the treasures of ancient wisdom and science that were buried under mounds of dust in the somnolent Byzantine world. But such Caliphs as Welid I did establish schools and encourage culture.

There were twenty colleges in Damascus when there was not one in Rome, which had been civilized for more than a thousand years. This, however, is, as I said, only the first phase of Arab history. The great intellectual development will come presently. What it is most material to notice is that these "profligate and infidel" Caliphs were not only the most efficient promoters of agriculture, industry, and commerce but the most philanthropic rulers of their time. Welid I, who built the great mosque, and used to visit the bazars and workshops personally to see how further progress could be secured, made extensive provision for the aged, the blind, and cripples. He initiated the Mohammedan scheme of social service, which was the finest in history until our own time. These sensual Caliphs of the first dynasty, in short, made Damascus many times richer and more prosperous than any city of Europe, provided every house with a supply (in leaden pipes) of running water, gave it innumerable baths, fountains, and gardens at a time when such things were unknown in Europe, built schools, hospitals, and houses of charity, improved the roads and multiplied wells in their empire, and raised the general comfort and prosperity to a height unknown since Roman days.

§3. THE FALL OF THE OMMEYADS

This first dynasty of Caliphs began in the year 661, or less than thirty years from the time when the barbaric Arabs had poured over the eastern world. Within half a century, with only the effete cultures of the old Greek and Roman cities to guide them, they had created a notable civilization. If our histories candidly recorded these facts we should less frequently hear people claiming that it takes a thousand years for a moral agency to civilize barbarians, that religion is the only effective agency for the purpose, and that a people that rejoices in sensual luxury is an unprogressive and doomed people. On the other hand, since many of the Caliphs were certainly morbid sensualists and the dynasty came to an end in less than a century, we must inquire finally whether there was any connection between these two facts.

There were several later Caliphs of the selfish and foolish type of Yezid I, whom I described, but strong and sober and enlightened men held the Caliphate for more than forty years out of the first sixty. Yezid II (720-724) "excelled all his predecessors in folly and wickedness," but, as is usual with this type of prince, soon vanished. This is the prince who, making the pilgrimage to Mecca with his troop of drunken nobles, wanted to show his contempt of the Koran by having a tent set up on top of the Kaaba, the central shrine of the Meccan temple, in which he and his companions could get drunk. He would give a man fifteen thousand gold pieces for a good song, and it is said that he once exchanged garments with a filthy oil-seller in order to get into a house which was closed against him. The stories of the time are innumerable and interesting but quite unreliable. One good story is that the wife of the sober Welid I had a lover whom she used to hide, when her slaves gave warning, in a very handsome wardrobe in her chamber. Welid came in one day when he knew that the man was there, began to admire the furniture, and

courteously asked his wife to allow him to select one piece for himself. He, of course, chose the wardrobe and promptly bade his men bring it away and bury it, with the adulterer inside, in a deep pit.

I will say later that the one real defect of the princes of Islam was a streak of cruelty that lingered for centuries, but under most of the Damascus Caliphs there is little authentic evidence of cruelty. They were humanists and generally wanted all their subjects to enjoy life. It is the second dynasty of Caliphs, the Persian Abbassids, who are generally described as superior to the Damascus Ommeyads, that most frequently indulged the impulse of cruelty. A Caliph of the strong and temperate life, though often cruel in his repressions, held power for twenty years after the death of Yezid II, and the city and the empire were more prosperous than ever. Although there was then a period of confusion, of conflicting ambitions and worthless princes, we can see clearly enough that this "profligacy" of Damascus merely furnished an excuse to rivals to gather the strict Moslems into a plot to overthrow the Ommeyads. In Persia there was still a strong party of the native nobility, as I will tell in the next chapter, who resented the ascendancy of the Arabs and were more than willing to help to throw off the yoke of Damascus. There was in Persia a certain Abul-Abbas, a descendant of Mohammed's uncle, and it was plausibly argued that in view of the infidelity of the Ommeyads the Caliphate should pass to this branch of the family. There was, of course, no hereditary principle recognized in Moslem law in regard to the Caliphate. Abul-Abbas simply proclaimed a holy war on the apostates and libertines of Damascus. Strict Moslems flocked to his standard, and the Persians were pleased at the prospect of transferring the center of government to their own country. On the other hand, the armies of Damascus had become inefficient under selfish rulers and in the absence of war, and the civil war ended in the triumph of Abul-Abbas or the commencement of the Abbassid Dynasty.

How much holiness there was in the war, and what the world gained by the overthrow of the "profligates," may be told at once. The new Caliph set out to destroy every single member of the Ommeyad family. They were hunted all over the empire with shocking barbarity. An uncle of the new Caliph was made governor of Damascus, and after a time he proclaimed that he disapproved of the persecution and would give shelter to any fugitives of the family. About ninety members and supporters of the late court trusted his word and returned to Damascus. He invited them all to a superb banquet with his own leading supporters, and at a given signal his men butchered the whole of the ninety guests. Rugs were thrown over the bodies, which were left in the dining hall, and the banquet proceeded with increased boisterousness. The comment of the Christian historian, Sir W. Muir ("The Caliphate"), on this is unconsciously scathing. Even in the barbaric days, he rightly says, the life of an enemy had been sacred in an Arab's tent if for some reason he was received as a guest, but "the fatal influence of Roman and Byzantine manners had vitiated the nature of a people whose sense of manly dignity and personal honor had for ages been con-

spicuous amidst the widespread depravation of Asia." I might point out, however, that the word "Roman" is quite wantonly introduced. In fact, there was much cruelty in the Arab nature, but what we saw about Byzantine barbarities in the last book justifies Muir's statement. The Ommeyad stock in all its branches was rooted out with appalling ferocity. The city of Mosul rebelled gainst the brutal new ruler. The people were disarmed by a promise of pardon, and four thousand negro soldiers were then let loose on them, raping the women, looting the houses, and massacreing the men; and, to clear the Caliph, the negroes were then put to death. Women in every city were killed if they would not betray their kinsmen or treasures. Nobles had their hands cut off and were then taken from city to city on asses until they died. Even the tombs of dead Ommeyads were opened and their bones scattered. Only one young prince escaped, and we shall see later how he found his way to Spain and there, in virtue of his education at Damascus, founded the noblest of the Mohammedan civilizations.

CHAPTER IV

THE CITY OF HARUN AL RASCHID

THIS orgy of savagery may seem an unfortunate introduction of a new line of Caliphs, and it must certainly seem strange to those who read, as one does occasionally, that the Caliphs of Bagdad were superior to their profligate predecessors of Damascus. I have corrected the latter part of this statement by showing that during about sixty of the ninety years of the Ommeyad dynasty the power was held by men of good, and often excellent character, and that these Caliphs built up a civilization with a rapidity and solidity which have few parallels in history. I wish to stress this point as it refutes the common moralism that sensuality and free love mean lack of progress, if not social decay. It was a hurricane of brutality, partly fanatical and party calculated, that swept away the prosperous Ommeyad empire.

That such brutality should come from the Arabs of Persia is a further disproof of common statements. The Ommeyads had fixed their seat in what is usually regarded as the tainted region of Syria. The Abbassids, on the contrary, resided in the cities of Persia, which had long been ruled by the most austere and spiritual religion of the old world, and they were descendants of the orthodox supporters of the Prophet. It shows how little religion had to do with the inspiration of the Mohammedan civilization. Two generations after Mohammed his descendants and more zealous followers were still capable of barbaric outrages. In fact, they infected Persia with this particular barbarism, that the sacred cause of their religion sanctioned unrestrained ferocity, and we shall find occasional outbreaks of repulsive cruelty a much worse feature of the new Persian civilization than its sensuality; in which it was just as conspicuous as Damascus. What the Persian Caliphate might have become if this ferocious bigotry had not been tempered by Persian culture we can easily imagine. But it was thus moderated, and the first point of interest is to see how the disdain of Persian nobles, familiar with the far superior teaching of Zarathustra, for the nonsense poured out by Mohammed led here also to a growth of skepticism and humanism which was the real inspiration of the new civilization. The Mohammedan religion is unique in this way: it was spread by armies which were inspired by the very un-religious impulses of loot, fighting, and a craving for beautiful concubines, and it was from the start recognized as an imposture by large numbers of the educated people and nobles who found it politic to profess it.

§1. THE GROWTH OF SKEPTICISM AT BAGDAD

In the last book we saw how a succession of fine monarchs had restored all the splendor and culture of ancient Persia but their civilization had been so weakened by a struggle with the Greeks that the Arabs conquered it. For the next hundred years it was dominated

by Arab families which ruled and exploited it in the name of Damascus. But there remained a large body of Persian nobles, the great landowners, who sullenly resented the boorish Arabs and their inferior creed, and were always ready to assist an insurrection. It was chiefly these who put the orthodox and unscrupulous Abul-Abbas the Bloody, as even Arab chronicles call him, on the throne. He maintained his cruel and treacherous ways for five years, and his successor, who was just as treacherous and cruel, built the new city of Bagdad on the Tigris—at first only as a strong military center in case of insurrection—and made it the capital of Islam. He was a strict Mohammedan, and during his twenty years reign wine and sexual looseness and blasphemy against the Prophet were truculently suppressed. Whether the moralist finds this sobriety and devotion worth all the ferocity and treachery that accompanied it we are not told, but even under this Caliph the development of a new order of things began.

The Persian nobles were now indispensable servants of the Caliph in ruling the country and directing his policy, and they and the magi were in increasing numbers "converted" to Islam: that is to say, since these early orthodox Caliphs were disinclined to employ infidels, the Persians genially identified Allah with Ahura Mazda and swallowed the Prophet and his Koran with as good grace as they could. The wealth and power which they thus obtained led to a revival of culture, and the philosophies of Greece, which were as yet imperfectly known, of Persia, and even of India, with which the Persians had long been in contact, were discussed in the cool marble-paved courts of the new palaces. Since the Caliphs were, like many of the medieval Popes, sincere believers in astrology, ancient works on the heavenly bodies were translated, and the foundations were laid of the new Arab science of astronomy. History also received special attention.

The Arabs were beginning to look like mere barbaric conquerors in this artistic and intellectual world, and under the third and fourth Caliphs of the dynasty the Moslem rigor was relaxed. Wine began to appear on the table in the Bagdad palace, there was an enlargement of the women's quarters, and considerable sums from the treasury were expended on the promotion of art and culture. The educated Persians now began to speak openly and, contrary to what Scott says, there was as much skepticism as at Damascus. In his learned and interesting work on the Arab-Persian civilization ("Islam under the Khalifs of Bagdad," 1878), which I do not find displaced by any later work, Mr. R. D. Osborn has a long and interesting chapter on this phase. He shows that there was a large party of cultivated skeptics amongst the Persians, some of whom openly denied the existence of God. It is said that in order to break the faith of the common folk in the Koran one of their number was deputed to write a rival book. The orthodox legend, which every devout Moslem believes, is that after waiting six months for the great work the writer's friends went to his room and found it littered with discarded manuscript, for he found it impossible to challenge comparison even with the first line of the matchless revelation of

the Prophet. As the first line is merely, "Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds, the compassionate, the merciful," which a lady corporal of the Salvation Army could equal at any time, we will suppose that it was rather fear of the court that checked the inspiration. The cruelty practiced occasionally by the orthodox Arabs was still revolting. A writer who offended the Caliph was slowly cut up limb by limb, the members being thrown into a furnace as long as his sight lasted for him to see it.

To these liberal Persians the accession of a pleasure-loving Caliph was, says Osborn, like the dawn of summer upon a frozen world. Bagdad increased rapidly; scholars and artists and musicians basked in the favor of the court. This was less than twenty years after the founding of Bagdad, yet it was found that skepticism was very widespread. "The highest officials of the court now openly scoffed at the religion of the Prophet," says Osborn. Persian nobles who had been imprisoned under the truculent second Caliph were now released and entrusted with the highest offices. The Grand Vizier, a minister who magnificently promoted the material welfare of the kingdom and provided hospitals and charitable institutions, was a Persian noble of this description. Sir W. Muir calls these nobles and officials "Manichaeans," and no doubt many of them held to the ancient Persian religion which had inspired the Manichees, but the clash of religions and cultivation of science and philosophy led to a spread of skepticism. It is clear in every detailed history of the period that it was these skeptics and humanists who created the great civilization of which Bagdad was the center.

Unfortunately, the new liberty was abused by tactless or overconfident individuals. They used to taunt the "strings of camels," as they would call a row of Arabs bowed to the ground in worship; and one day a Persian asked such a group if they thought it really polite thus to present their buttocks to Allah. They insulted the shrine at Mecca when they had to accompany court-pilgrimages. Under the wine-bibbing Calip Mahdi the stricter Moslems could do nothing but growl and threaten. "If you seek the Vicar of God," said one, "you will find him with a wine-flask in one hand and a lute in the other." It was all very wicked and sensual and improper; and the new Persian civilization was making rapid advance in prosperity, refinement, and humanity. But Caliph Mahdi fell ill and became superstitious, and the fanatics got his ear. He turned in repentance to Allah; and he at once recovered the barbarity of the Arab. To find an excuse to depose his Grand Vizier, the chief maker of the new civilization, he ordered him to put an innocent man to death. Yakub was too humane—being an unbeliever—to do this, and he quietly gave the man money and sent him abroad. For his disobedience he was lowered into a dungeon in the earth, a hole with no windows and sealed by a lid, and in this horrible place, into which a loaf of bread and a pitcher of water were lowered by a cord once a day, the finest statesman in the world at the time languished for fifteen years. There was a general persecution of skeptics. The kingdom was purified, and its civilization was put back several degrees.

§2. HARUN THE JUST AND HIS AGE

The older son maintained the persecuting policy of the father for a few years, but he fortunately died and his younger brother, Harun, to whom history has added the epithet "al Rashid" (the Just), succeeded, at the age of twenty-five, to the Caliphate. There is a pretty story which tells how, soon after his accession, he was one day carrying one of his children on his shoulders when he recollected that twenty years earlier the unhappy Yakub had similarly carried him. It is more probable that he realized the loss to the country of the services of the Persians. He threw open the dungeons, and the Bermecides, or descendants of the liberal Bermek, now known to all the world as "the Barmedices" of the Arabian Nights, resumed their splendid labors in the service of Islam.

Modern experts on this period are not disposed to accept Harun at anything like the traditional valuation. Weil, one of the highest authorities, bluntly describes him as a tyrant. Muir remarks that, though he was a generally wise and energetic ruler, his career is stained throughout by acts of treachery and cruelty, so that this greatest of the Abbassid Caliphs is inferior to the best of the Ommeyad Caliphs, who are so often held up to vituperation. The more strictly Moslem civilization of Persia surpassed that of Syria only in literary and scientific culture, and this is not only to be expected at so much later a date but was due almost entirely to the generally skeptical Persians. Harun was a strict Moslem, but at least in the early part of his reign he admired and appreciated learning, made Yakub the Grand Vizier once more, and encouraged the Persians in every branch of culture. He even admitted the Vizier to his musical entertainments in his harem, and, in order that Yakub's son, Jafar, of whom he was extremely fond, could be admitted, he joined him in virginal marriage to one of his daughters: with tragic consequences, as we shall see.

Every serious historian observes that the popular Arab stories of Harun strolling round the city in disguise at night are found only in fiction like the Arabian Nights. Osborn ventures to say that Harun was hard and selfish, and cared little for the welfare of his subjects. He had the Byzantine empire repeatedly raided to find beautiful maids for his harem, and he left government almost entirely to the Bermicides. They served him and the country superbly, for during the first seventeen years of his reign "the earth was irrigated with water of musk and rose," says an Arab writer. Harun's wife was as strictly proper and strictly selfish as he. She was the first wife of a Caliph to have gold and bejeweled vessels at table and palanquins of ebony and sandal wood decorated with silver. The stuff of her robes had to be woven with threads of silk. She had in her magnificent chambers perfumed candles and troops of beautiful maids dressed as pages. And, like Harun, she prayed five times a day, and made the pilgrimage, and had the roads and bridges repaired and new wells dug for the pious pilgrims.

In short, we have reached the age of romantic splendor and dazzling palace life, due entirely to the wise work of the Persian nobles, when gold and precious stones seemed to be strewn over the

palaces and mosques. And as long as the rule of the Bermicides lasted, and apart from the treacherous acts of the Caliph, there was a high standard of character. One of the most sensual and opulent of the Persian nobles, whose wonderful palace on the Tigris was daily besieged by suppliants, was asked to assist a poor musician who had a very beautiful mistress or slave. He told the musician that the governor of Egypt had asked him to select a gift and he would ask for this beautiful girl, but the musician must not part with her for less than ten times what he had paid for her; and when the man had got his money, the noble laughingly gave him back the girl. But the nobles went far beyond this personal benevolence. Schools were opened for the people, and there were colleges of translators to make the best works of ancient Greece available to Arabic readers. Libraries were founded, and an intense literary activity set in. An excellent police-system was created at Bagdad, and hospitals and medical schools were founded. A Jewish traveler of a later date tells us that at Bagdad he found "many large houses, streets, and hostelries for the sick poor" and "sixty medical warehouses" which were supported by the Caliph. Every poor man who fell ill was maintained out of royal funds until he recovered. There was also a large asylum for the insane, in which the patients were examined once a month. Inspectors of the markets were appointed, and the merchants and traders formed a gild for the suppression of fraud. And in the course of time these schools, libraries, hospitals, and other institutions were extended to the other cities of the kingdom.

Strict Moslems, far from considering that their religion had inspired this civilization, looked sourly on it and pressed the Caliph to dismiss the unbelievers. At last the Arabs triumphed, and it is another ghastly memorial of religious fanaticism. I told how the Caliph had married his Vizier's son, and a great favorite of himself, to his daughter, Abbassa, so that he might be admitted to the royal harem without scandal. But he had compelled the youth to swear that there would be no marital intercourse, and Jafra had for years been faithful to his oath. At the time I have reached the princess herself began to resent the harsh ruling of her father and press Jafra to have secret relations with her. It tells us a little about these "dissolute" and "profligate" princes that Jafra firmly refused, and a trick of the kind that appeals to the oriental imagination was played on him. His mother, who had been heavily bribed by the princess, told him one day that she had a beautiful new maid for him, and, somewhat stupefied with wine after supper, he lay with the maid and did not perceive that it was his wife. She had a son, who was sent away to Mecca, but in the course of a harem quarrel Harun's pious wife told him of his daughter's misconduct. It is here, not in their sensuality, that we see the one conspicuous defect of the Arabs; though we will not forget that ghastly cruelty and treachery then disgraced Christendom also. Harun "the Just" invited the Bermicides to a sumptuous entertainment and then murdered all the men of the family but two. All their property was confiscated, and the family which had created the civilization of Bagdad was utterly ruined.

§3. THE CLIMAX

We must remember when we read how this strain of barbaric cruelty breaks out repeatedly in the Arab princes, generally in orthodox princes, that we are still right at the beginning of their civilized period. Many writers who comment darkly on the fall of the Bermicides would do well to look up the contemporary history of the city of Rome, which had now been the metropolis of Christendom for five centuries. They would, as we have seen, discover it stained with the most ghastly feuds and mutilations for half a century; they would read how, only four years before Harun's cruel act, two prelates attempted in a Roman Church to cut out the Pope's eyes and tongue, and the citizens so generally believed that the Pope was guilty of simony and adultery that he had to be put on trial; and they would find this brutality lingering and repeatedly breaking out for several further centuries. The unfairness of historians to the Mohammedans compels me to insist on this comparison. Neither religion was a civilizing agency. If these Arabs and Persians were in every other respect highly civilized within a century of their barbaric days, it is clear that they owed it to the refining influence of art and culture. In their annals, even at this date, we find as many stories of benevolence as we do of cruelty, and their social benevolence was, as I said, immeasurably beyond anything that was known in Europe. Up to this time, however, the Arabs had generally left the cultivation of art, science, and philosophy to the Persians, and we find a general improvement when they at last turn to this softening and humanizing influence.

This began under Mamun, the son of Harun al Rashid by a Persian mother. The stupid massacre of the Persians had, naturally, brought confusion and civil war upon the country, and Mamun was for some years ferocious in repressing the disorders. Despotic power, we may reflect, easily disposes a prince to such truculence, and it was then customary throughout the entire civilized world. But once the kingdom was pacified Mamun raised it to the highest point of its artistic and intellectual splendor. What it was like in the former respect we can gather from the account of the young Caliph's wedding. He married the daughter of his Persian Vizier, and this man bore the cost of an entertainment that lasted nineteen days. He gave a banquet to the whole staff of the palace, down to the camel-drivers and camels, and upon the higher officers and officials there was poured a shower of musk balls each of which contained a coupon for an estate, a beautiful girl, or a horse. A shower of gold and silver coins fell upon the lower officials and servants. At the marriage ceremony a mat interwoven with threads of pure gold was provided for the Caliph to stand on, and his feet disappeared in a heap of pearls. The nuptial chamber was lit by a perfumed candle, in a golden candlestick, that weighed eighty pounds, and, as the Caliph and his bride sat together a thousand pearls were showered over them from a golden tray.

The skeptics now raised their heads once more and scoffed at the Koran. One of them sent the Caliph a book on the religion of

reason, and the head of Islam became an enthusiastic rationalist. The Koran, he said, was "a wagging of tongues" in comparison with this pure theism. Atheists, Jews, and Christians were admitted to high office, and representatives of each school were invited to attend the debating society which the Caliph started in his palace. The one condition was that every debater must prove his belief from reason only. It is said that Mamun at one time proposed to abolish Mohammedanism and substitute this creed, as it would later be, of Voltaire and Paine. He gave every encouragement to critics of the established religion. It is amusing to read that there was complete liberty for all except the more rigorous Moslems, who held that the Koran was eternal and uncreated. There were twenty-eight Jewish synagogues in Bagdad, and Christian scholars from Constantinople were invited to join in the remarkable discussions. An astronomical observatory was built, and the sciences of astronomy, medicine, and geography were sedulously cultivated. The great commercial fleet of the Caliph reached as far as Madagascar, and there was brisk trade with India and China. Men began at last to have rational ideas about the earth and its inhabitants; and, that the various races might sympathetically understand each other, a very respectable science of history was founded, and the Arab language was improved and began to be used all over that region.

To speak of Mamun's career, as one American writer does, as a career of murder and duplicity, and not appreciate the wonderful intellectual life he promoted, at a time when Charlemagne failed even to give Europe a few elementary schools—to write large histories of education which devote chapters to the abortive work of Charlemagne and say nothing of this brilliantly successful inauguration of an intellectual period that in some countries lasted five centuries—to represent that Christianity had by this time made even more out of its barbaric raw material than any other agency could make—is sheer educational perversity, yet it is quite common. Sir P. Sykes in his History of Persia rightly calls the reign of Mamun the Golden Age of Persian history. The empire of Charlemagne, the one comparatively bright feature of Christendom in six centuries, was squalid and barbaric in comparison. It is quite true that free love was as common as free discussion. One Arab writer says—this is not at all reliable—that Mamun declared temporary marriages legally valid. Another, a fanatical Moslem, says that the mosques had become "rat-traps set by Satan," as they were used for assignations, even by paederasts. The moralist has to ponder the fact that these things accompanied the most intense intellectual activity that the world had known since ancient Greece, and that Persia was never so prosperous, brilliant, and happy.

It is in this period that one must, as far as they relate to events in Bagdad, locate the stories of the Arabian Nights, which charmingly tell us the intimate details of Arab-Persian life, as it was imitated in Egypt. Most people who read that monumental work in English translations have an exaggerated idea of the sexual contents of the Arabic original, as they are told that a great deal has to be omitted from modern versions. I have a fairly candid French translation and

may say that it rarely, comparatively to its size, refers to sexual relations. The stories are not amorous, but are narratives of adventure and magic. As Lane-Poole says, it is "not a prurient work" but naive in its sex references. There were, of course, abnormal sexual practices in so effervescent and rebellious a world, but I find no evidence in any serious historian that these were more common than in contemporary Italy or Constantinople or even modern Berlin or London. What stands out from the text, however, when the story does turn on sexual relations, is the simplicity with which the story-teller frequently dispenses with marriage; though it is much the same in the European literature of the Renaissance and in modern French literature. The real interest of the age which this kind of literature reflects is, as we have repeatedly seen, that in proportion as the race grew in refinement and intelligence it became more zealous than ever for the social virtues and more indifferent to the tradition of chastity.

It is unnecessary here to describe the life in detail. It was much the same in every part of the Mohammedan civilization. I should have to repeat what I said about the life of Damascus, and we shall see more about the same life in Cordova or Cairo. Our painters have strangely neglected the inspiration of this wonderful age, but it is, as I said, excluded from general literature and education and little known. The life of the orient even today makes attractive pictures, and we can hardly imagine what it must have been like in those days of light and graceful architecture, lavish use of the gayest silks and brocades, marvelous abundance of pearls, rubies, and emeralds, and frequent adornment of arms, furniture, even harness, with gold and silver. We shall see later some extraordinary figures of the wealth of important though not royal individuals, and we can gather that in any large city of the Moslem world there must have been many thousand who could afford to live in what we should call palaces: not massive structures like the castles of Europe, but one-storied spacious buildings of a light and exquisitely graceful design in the interior, with marble fountains playing night and day, surrounded by oranges, myrtles, and roses, in the central court. While the lords of Europe still had their dining-halls strewn with straw, to mitigate the filth of their dogs and themselves (for these barons knew nothing of pocket-handkerchiefs), the Arabs and Persians had floors of beautiful and spotless mosaic, spread with such carpets as are no longer made. In the European homes of nobles the gaunt walls were merely decorated with weapons and animal-heads, and the plain furniture was generally of heavy oak: in the Mohammedan world the stuccoed walls were beautifully decorated from floor to ceiling, the plaster of which was often moulded with curious designs, and priceless tapestries hung here and there, while the furniture, apart from the luxurious and resplendent divans, was of ivory, ebony, or some rare wood inlaid with mother of pearl or decorated with gold. Few bathed in Europe and none yet wore washable underlinen, while the bath-room was one of the most treasured and luxurious parts of the rich Moslem's home. A few immense joints, with bread, and a horn of mead or beer (in southern Europe a sourish wine), made a banquet in

Europe; from Spain to Persia the dishes had a cosmopolitan variety, the vessels were exquisite, and the choicest wines of ten countries were drunk from gold or silver cups or beautiful glass. Slaves fell at times to two or three dollars per head, and the rich man had his thousands, trained as musicians or cooks or for every variety of service, and quite commonly clad in fine silks and brocades. And if you will imagine the sun of the south pouring its flood on all this, while the squalid heaviness of Christendom was shrouded half the year in mist or gloom, you have a general idea of the contrast between Christendon and Islam in the ninth and tenth and eleventh centuries. I should be quite disposed to find the southerners more sensual and more free in sexual matters, but what we have already seen about the ways of Europe must make us doubt if the Arabs and Persians could be more sensual and sexual; and in all other respects they were far superior to the Europeans. The chief difference was in knowledge and refinement, and it is hardly possible to exaggerate this.

But we have still three Mohammedan civilizations to study and we shall see abundant evidence of these things. Let us finish with Persia, or that part of its history, which precedes the Turkish conquest. After Mamun, to the great joy of the fanatics, a strict Caliph attained power, and it was the turn of the infidels to feel the lash. Skeptical Persians quitted Bagdad in large numbers: Jews and Christians were compelled to wear yellow robes in the street. It was, as usual, the inauguration of a period of distress, decay, and unhappiness. The Turks, who came in increasing numbers to fill the army and hold the highest commands, became arrogant and exacting as they noted the growing weakness. A common Turkish horseman would gallop at full speed through the crowded streets, trampling down the aged and the children, and the people retorted by murdering them whenever they got the opportunity. The Caliph quitted Bagdad in despair. But even the Turks—and in a later book we shall see how they also took to civilization—could not destroy the love of beauty and the wisdom of life that Persia had developed. Omar Khayyam, reflecting the sober epicureanism and skepticism of a large class of officials, comes more than two centuries after the days I have described, and still nearly two centuries later would appear the greatest and most human of the Persian poets, Sadi and Hafiz, and another brilliant period of gaiety and wine and love, of general benevolence and intense pursuit of learning. The torch of science, you will note, flamed up only in these periods of voluptuousness: the mind was clouded and the life disordered whenever this beautiful sensuality was checked.

CHAPTER V.

THE MORALS OF THE ARABS OF SPAIN

WE SAW that of the great Ommeyad dynasty of Damascus one young prince survived, and he found his way to Spain and introduced into it the culture of Syria. Hitherto there had lain between the Mohammedan world and Christian Europe the semi-barbaric mass of the Greek or Byzantine empire, which, in spite of the tolerance and eagerness to trade of the Arabs, was rendered impervious to the new art and wisdom by its arrogant religious prejudice. In that vast realm of Islam that stretched from Portugal to Kurdistan, and would soon extend to India, the members of twenty religions and a hundred sects lived in mutual toleration. The light tax that was imposed on non-Moslems was a financial resource rather than a sign of superiority, and the Caliphs, knowing how the Christians had now begun to deal with heretics in Europe, could justly flatter themselves that in this respect they were the most just and enlightened rulers on earth. Periods of persecution were very rare, local, and of short duration. It was probably one of the most stimulating forces of this progressive world that men of such very different ideas were free to discuss, and were compelled to discuss with courtesy.

In Spain this wonderful southern civilization was now brought into contact and contrast with what was considered to be the least backward province of Christendom. I have given in the Key to Culture such historical details as are necessary to understand this development. You will remember that the Arabs spread along north Africa to Morocco, and that a Spanish noble, whose daughter had been outraged by the king, invited them to Spain. They hardly needed an invitation. The Visigothic kingdom was rich and, as we saw, disorderly and inefficient. In thirteen months an Arab general with a small army conquered the whole peninsula; and he genially admitted the widow of the Catholic king amongst the large company of beautiful Spanish maids whom he selected for his harem, allowing her to continue to worship Jesus. There were, however, some decades of war and confusion and very imperfect administration until the surviving Ommeyad prince came over and claimed the Caliphate.

I can best complete what I have said in earlier books about the Spanish Moors if I here examine more in detail the character of the early Spanish Caliphs who built up the great civilization and then make some general remarks on the general character. Of the intellectual, material, and artistic splendor of that civilization I have, I hope, convinced every reader by what I have already written. My summary of its achievements in science and art and philosophy, in agriculture, industry, and navigation, in schemes of philanthropy and education, in sanitation and the arts of life—in short, in creating a

nation of thirty million people who probably enjoyed life more than any other that ever lived yet as a body were far more devoted to intellectual culture than the Greeks—is based upon the best authorities (Scott, Lane-Poole, Calvert, etc.) and lends a certain irony to the efforts of some recent writers to glorify the Christian Middle Ages and decry the Arabs. But we hear the usual cry that the Moors were debauched, sensual, and unscrupulous, and an inquiry into the facts will be interesting.

§1. THE FOUNDING OF THE CIVILIZATION

I do not notice that any of these critics of the Moors take the trouble to compare their morals with those of the contemporary or antecedent Spanish Christians. Even in the tiny kingdom of the Asturias, on the Bay of Biscay, in which the fugitives—the bulk of the Spaniards remained and mingled amicably with the Arabs—and their aristocracy and priests sheltered, people were just as sensual (in their rougher boorish way) and immoral and violent as in any part of the Mohammedan world. When they recovered half of Spain, there was no improvement. But we will return to these in a later book and confine ourselves here to what are called the Moors, or the mixed population of Arabs and Berbers who held the commanding position in the new Spain.

Adb-al-Rahman, the first Spanish Caliph, had been very imperfectly trained in Syria, for he was a mere boy when his family was butchered in the name of pure religion, and he had then spent a number of years in the unfavorable position of a fugitive in Africa. He took over a land which had been poor enough in culture and had been thoroughly demoralized by conquest and forty years of war and confusion. He had not only no help from the east but was bitterly denounced as a usurper in Egypt, Syria, and Persia. His own Arabs were divided, and he had to suppress insurrections repeatedly. His raw material consisted of a mass of common Christians, mostly serfs, whose cultural leaders had fled and a great number of half-barbaric Berbers from Africa. He and the Arabs were, no doubt, joined by many fugitives from Syria, but the number of Arabs was very limited. Yet in a wise and energetic reign of thirty-three years he founded so respectable and orderly a civilization that within fifty years it became the finest and most enlightened kingdom in Europe since ancient Rome. He was cruel at times in suppressing disorder, though less than most rulers of that age when they had to deal with treachery and rebellion, but an energetic and beneficent ruler.

The first Caliph was, in other words, a monarch who in favorable circumstances would have left a great and unstained repute. He was temperate in his life and devoted to the service of his land and people. He gave them a code of law and enforced it, repaired the roads and restored the postal service, gave immense sums in charity, attracted scholars and writers from the east, and particularly sought to enkindle intellectual interest. The fame of Cordova as a center of learning began within fifty years of the time when Abd-al-Rahman took over the profoundly ignorant and disordered country. He made Cordova his capital and directed its growth on the lines of the

Syrian city. The palm was introduced, and graceful palaces and mosques began to look down on the solid old Spanish buildings. He found time to write verse, and he fostered literary contests and discussions, at which he often assisted and gave generous prizes. By a judicious blend of affability and dignity and by the temperance of his life he drove out of the minds of most the memory of his early severity, and nobles and scholars cordially cooperated with him in the work of education, which is the stoutest foundation of public order. Abd-al-Rahman had created a respectable and very progressive civilization out of semi-barbarism in thirty years.

His successor, Hischem, was a strict Moslem, and Scott finds it "unfortunate for the future tranquility of the Peninsula that he was a fast friend of the theologians": a very drastic reply to any who suggest that religion was the source of the new civilization. Beyond a certain strengthening and enrichment of the fanatics, however, little harm was done, for the ascetic Caliph was nevertheless a tolerant ruler and a warm admirer of science, art, and literature. The saint was succeeded by a voluptuary, though a vigorous soldier and truculent punisher, who outraged the fanatics by the morals of his splendid court, where wine abounded and skeptics spoke as freely as at Bagdad; but he soon gave way to Abd-al-Rahman II, who may be said to have completed the fine work of the first Caliph.

The city of Cordova now became so beautiful and famous that foreigners, even the envoys of Christian kings—whose comparative boorishness surprises the Arab chroniclers—came to visit it. More mosques, palaces, gardens, and fountains were added, and the suburbs of the city, which astonished all visitors by their beauty, joyousness, and luxury, began to offer a spectacle unique in Europe. To every mosque, we are told, either a school or a hospital was attached, and the work of education kept pace with the characteristically Mohammedan scheme of philanthropy. No Caliph of Bagdad was more zealous in the patronage of learning and literature. Already the works of Aristotle and other Greek philosophers were read in the schools and palaces, and it was one of the most esteemed pleasures of the Caliph to listen to translations of them. The animals and plants and flowers of the east and of Africa were imported, and the numerous parks were themselves an education to the people. Fine roads connected the towns of the kingdom, and schools and charitable institutions and baths were multiplied everywhere. We can hardly believe that, as we are told, there was already a school for every child and an orphanage for every orphan in the towns, but it is at least certain that the contemporary work of Charlemagne, on which innumerable volumes have been written, was feeble and meager in comparison with the magnificent work of the Spanish Caliph; besides that the educational and philanthropic work of Charlemagne almost perished with him, whereas that of Abd-al-Rahman was permanent and would presently be consolidated by an even greater Caliph.

Let me give one illustration of the way in which, under the spell of our perverse historical traditions, vital facts relating to the evolution of civilization are still suppressed. I have looked in vain

through ten available encyclopaedias, the most modern and the best in several languages, and a large number of recent histories of the Middle Ages for some reference to Ziryab, the Caliph's chief minister and the genius who did most of this work. He is known only to experts on Moorish history, while Bede and Alcuin, and all the miserable kings and popes of Europe at the time, have their paragraphs, if not chapters. Ziryab seems to have been the greatest genius in several centuries. The Caliph summoned the great scholar and musician from Bagdad and awarded him a beautiful palace and a hundred thousand dollars a year. His learning was such—he knew ten thousand songs and all that was known in history, philosophy, geography, and medicine—that even learned orthodox Mohammedans believed that he was in communication with the djins. But it is as minister, as the final creator of Spanish civilization, that he deserves as large a place in our encyclopaedias as any man of ancient times. He it was who gave Andalusia that charming courtesy of manner which the Spaniards would later adopt. He regulated dress and manners as wisely as he enforced sanitation and provided drains and bountiful supplies of pure water. He added a fifth string to the lute, introduced new fruits and vegetables, drugs and dishes, perfumes and cosmetics, just as he improved the methods of diplomacy and brightened the homes of the poor. His labors were prodigious. He would often rise at night to dictate a new idea to his secretaries. Yet he was one of the most witty and entertaining of men, and so conscientious and unselfish that, though the Caliph hung on his words, he never asked a favor for himself or for those who appealed to him. And I wonder if there are twenty people in America or England who ever heard of Ziryab and his great work.

The character of the young Caliph—he was only thirty-two at his accession—was in some respects so weak that we may confidently ascribe this great work to the minister. The second favorite was a religious charlatan, learned in theology, but concealing great cunning and ambition under the cloak of asceticism. He founded a new sect and, when the Caliph joined it, imposed humiliating penances on him. Courtiers realized that the new way to favor was to join the sect, and the adventurer got such power that he could dictate the decisions of the judges throughout Andalusia. The holy man was shocked at the depravity of the court, yet—and this tells us much about that feverish world—the third favorite was a very beautiful and erotic and very greedy concubine. Tarub, this queen of the harem, refused one day to open her door to the Caliph until sufficient bags of gold were piled against it to hide the door: which must be the record price of a lady's favor. She wore a pearl necklace which the Caliph gave her, worth $250,000. But she further planned to get the succession to the Caliphate for her son, Abdallah, instead of the eldest of the Caliph's forty sons, and she instructed her chief eunuch to bribe a Syrian physician, with three thousand dollars, to prepare a deadly poison. The Syrian concluded that a much larger sum could be got from the Caliph by betraying the plot and, when the eunuch brought his "medicine" to the Caliph's bed—he was ill—he was promptly ordered to swallow it himself. The treachery, how-

ever, hurt the Caliph, and he died soon afterwards. He had always been "averse to cruelty," Scott says, and had persecuted the Christians only after they grossly abused the tolerance awarded them and roused Cordova by their open insults of Mohammed.

§2. A LAND OF LIGHT AND LEARNING

For a time it seemed as if religion were at length about to secure a real influence on the life of Moorish Spain, and it is hardly necessary to say that this at once menaced it with stagnation, if not reaction. The new Caliph, Mohammed, reveals by his name that he belonged to the religious half of the life of his singular parent. He was sour, avaricious, and pious. Abdallah, his step-brother, was as excessive in sensuality as the Caliph was in virtue. Scandalized Mohammedans complained that he was rarely seen in a mosque, yet that his palace was lit until dawn, night after night, with what a Roman would call an enthusiastic devotion to Venus and Bacchus. The scheming queen of the harem assisted the growing popularity of her own son. He had, if we may believe the chroniclers, lost the throne only by a romantic episode. Abd-al-Rahman had died at midnight, and Tarub had meant to seize power for Abdallah in the morning. But a eunuch, grateful for favors to come, had stolen across the city, past the lighted windows of Abdallah's palace, to warn Mohammed. That prince had already made himself so unpopular that he feared this was a trap to assassinate him. He was prevailed upon to believe the eunuch, and he was smuggled into the Caliph's palace dressed as a lady of the harem and riding on an ass. The porter at the gate was told that the lady was Mohammed's daughter. "She must," he said cynically, "have grown twice as large since she was here a few days ago." But Mohammed was admitted, and he secured the Caliphate and held it in spite of all Tarub's intrigues. He bitterly persecuted dissenters, neglected the kingdom, and incurred the hate of all except the fanatics. The earlier culture and prosperity were lost, and decades of war, brigandage, and inefficiency so weakened the country that the Spaniards began to recover territory.

From this threat the Moorish civilization was saved, and was carried to its highest brilliance, by another Abd-al-Rahman, the greatest of the Spanish Caliphs, another skeptical, sensual, and quite immoral Moslem ruler. He ruled Spain nearly fifty years (912-961), just at the time when Europe was in its Iron Age, and he made it indisputably the most prosperous, the happiest, and the most generally enlightened country that the world had yet seen. Christian kings, even the Greek emperor, exchanged compliments with him. It was the period in Germany of what some recent historians, who scarcely mention Spain, call "the Ottonian Renaissance," which is supposed to prevent any informed person from speaking any longer of the Dark Ages. I will appraise this in the next book but must mention here how the boorish German monarch sent a monk-envoy to Cordova with a letter that was crowded with deliberate and coarse abuse of Mohammed and his religion; and the monk was received at the court with perfect courtesy. These barbarians, the

Caliph would think, hardly know what they were doing. The Spaniards were driven back, all disorder in Spain was suppressed, and within a decade or two the administrative genius and wise measures of the Caliph—for it is clear that we must ascribe the chief merit to him in person—had endowed the country with a wealth the accounts of which strain our capacity for belief.

I have given in the Key a sufficient account of the material splendor of Cordova, and all Andalusia, at this point. It is the time when the city attained a population of between half a million and a million people; when it boasted its 80,000 shops, 4300 markets, 900 public baths, and such colleges and libraries as had never before been known; when the great bridge, 12,000 feet long, connected it with a score of garden-suburbs of surpassing beauty across the river; when twelve thousand marble palaces and mansions, with wonderful and spacious gardens, lined for nearly twenty miles what are today the squalid banks of the Guadalquivir. The Caliph could have bought Europe with a few years of his income. The guards at his palace wore shining armor over silk robes and had jeweled scimitars: the interior shone with beautiful silks and tapestries, gold brocade, gold and jewel-encrusted furniture. The Grand Vizier, or chief minister, could make his monarch a New Year present which historians estimate to have been worth five million dollars.

But the intellectual vitality and the philanthropy which Abd-al-Rahman III inspired were just as great. I refer to the earlier work (the Key) for an account of the famous crowded colleges, the universal school-system, and the zeal for learning and literature in every class. As to philanthropy, a pretty story, which is rarely told in full, illustrates the very generous provision all over the country. A favorite concubine of the Caliph lay dying, and, looking for some work of mercy that was not yet fully served to apply her great wealth to, she asked the Caliph to use it for the redemption of Moslem captives in Christian countries. After the most careful inquiries it was found that there was not a single unredeemed captive. (You may remember how Lecky found the redemption of captives one of the unique virtues of Christianity, and you will not forget that Abd-al-Rahman was not concerned about their spiritual future.) The second part of the story is often repeated: how, three miles from the city, the Caliph raised as a memorial to his beloved concubine Al Zahra ("The Blossom"), with her own fortune, the most beautiful and magnificent palace—if we believe only one half of what the chroniclers say about it—that the world had yet seen. I have in the Key described its unique gardens, its marble terraces, where gorgeously clad guards were posted, and its inner halls, where the marble capitals were encrusted with pearls and rubies, the roof was of gold and silver, the doors of jeweled ivory and ebony. But it is well to remember that this wealth was left for charity and only diverted to luxury because there were none on whom to exercise it. Class for class, all shared this marvelous prosperity, which was based, not on loot and conquest, but scientific agriculture, trade and administration. Seville *and Almeria, cities of half a million people, shone* as brilliantly. Not a willing man out of the thirty million people was unemployed, as

the Caliph had great public works that absorbed the margin. Vast aqueducts took a magnificent supply of water to every town. In short, in a half century of noble work Abd-al-Rahman, who took over an impoverished and half-ruined country from his religious predecessor, created, with the help of his learned ministers, a state in which poverty and destitution were unknown, crime was scarce, cleanliness and refinement were higher than in Europe today, slaves could rise to high positions in the army, the state, or the college, Christians and Jews held important offices, and mental culture was more widespread and intense than in any civilization of modern times.

The tags of the moralists and theologians have become so indispensable in the writing of history that even Scott, the most generous writer on the Moors—what I have said is only part of his glowing description—introduces his account of the reign of Abd-al-Rahman III with such phrases as, "the imams [priests] saw with dismay the portentous increase of skepticism," and "the destructive poison of infidelity permeated and was fast corrupting the entire mass of society." Scott then devotes seventy pages to a condensed account of the splendor—social and intellectual as well as material—of the reign! He notices that in the same period the stricter Moslems, the Shi'ites, raised up a dynasty in Africa, the Fatimite dynasty, and remarks that "the cruelties perpetrated by the Fatimites upon their enemies are incredible"; and I may add that this real religion-inspired "civilization" of Africa never became a civilization and has nothing that calls for notice in this book except its savagery. And Scott concludes with this verdict on one who must be regarded as one of the most successful civilizers in history:

> "The sensual passions of his nature bordered upon insanity, and his character was defiled by that nameless and unnatural vice."

Scott's work is by far the best on the Spanish Moors—he fails to appreciate the other branches of Islam—but this is one of the most appalling examples I know of the ethical (or Christian) perversion of an historian. A religious and ascetic monarch nearly ruined the country, and a skeptic and sensualist then brought it forty years of unprecedented wealth, happiness, refinement, benevolence, and zeal for culture; yet the historian who sees all this better than any other wants us to reflect how sensuality and naughtiness "corrupt society" and pure religion preserves it! It is even more remarkable to find that, as Scott shows, this most efficient and brilliant civilization was fully sustained under the next Caliph, Al Hakem II. Instead of his proving the degenerate son of a debauched monarch he proved to be the most learned ruler that ever lived, the greatest promoter of art, science, philosophy, and letters, an enthusiast for temperance, a model of charity and benevolence. It is he who, as I said in the Key, had a library of 400,000 (some say 600,000 or 700,000) volumes and had carefully read every one. (There would, of course, be scores of copies of one famous book.) His supreme passion was education, but his zeal for philanthropy was only second to this. He was toler-

ant, welcoming the boldest free thinkers to his court and only persecuting Christians when he had grave provocation, and it seems to have been rather under the inspiration of his high moral ideas that he sought to suppress wine and destroy all the vineyards of Spain; in which, naturally, he entirely failed. The imams themselves now often drank wine.

Thus in two centuries Spain rose to the highest position in the world. During that period only one of its Caliphs sought inspiration in religion, and his reign is, according to all historians, the one dark and disorderly section of the period. The two most splendidly creative reigns in Moslem history, covering eighty years, are the reigns of two sensualists and immoral men, and they left the country in a magnificent condition, the envy of the world. It is quite time that historians and moralists learned to distinguish between two kinds of sensuality: that of the man who exquisitely cultivates every pleasure of sense but cultivates also his physical and mental vigor—and to that category belong, not only these Caliphs and many others, but Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, Frederic II, and half the "great men" of history—and the man of feeble wit or perverse training who, while functions of national importance depend on him, enfeebles or stupefies himself by pleasure. What happened to Spain was that a young prince succeeded to the Caliphate, a strong and unscrupulous adventurer got power and debauched the prince's mind and character, and the great Ommeyad dynasty ended ingloriously. Decay followed, and it merely became worse when the orthodox rulers of Africa took over control. Yet there was such vitality in the civilization that, after the Spaniards and the Pope had summoned knights from all over Europe to help to win the country from the enfeebled Moors, a great kingdom was once more set up in Granada, where the Alhambra still testifies that it was, as Scott says, "the richest and most highly civilized region of equal area on the globe." It was small, but its wealth, based upon the wise control of production which had been inherited, was such that it "aroused the wonder and provoked the hatred of barbaric Europe"; and Mr. Scott is in this comparison referring to the Europe of the fifteenth century when the greatest of its many Renaissances is supposed at last to have civilized it.

§3. THE LESSONS OF THE MOORISH CIVILIZATION

I set out at the beginning of this work to write a history of morals without a moral, but the peculiar language of historians and the fluency with which moralists quote the supposed facts of history compel me in turn to moralize at times. I have quoted Scott's dark characterization of the Caliph, after ascribing to him such work for humanity as few rulers in history ever performed. He is equally paradoxical in characterizing the people. He says:

> "Under the later Caliphs Moorish society in the Peninsula became frightfully corrupt. . . . Infidelity was rife among all classes. The people, from the noble to the beggar, indulged in brutalizing sensuality."

Yet this "society" to which he refers, since we must assume that he is speaking chiefly of the wealthy merchants, consisted of the men whose efficiency was such that their success "provoked the envy of barbaric Europe," and all, class for class, were more refined than we. We have seen other periods of great wealth and luxury, but, whereas the Romans exploited the world for their wealth and the Ommeyad Caliphs of Damascus and even the Abbassid Caliphs of Bagdad grew rich to a very great extent by the spoils of war, the Moors of Spain never passed beyond their own frontiers after the eighth century and thus their extraordinary wealth was produced by themselves. Scott speaks of the "heartless, cynical, and debauched atmosphere" of the court of Hischem II, forgetting, apparently, that he has a few pages earlier said that "the epoch included in the reign of Hischem II is the most glorious in Moslem annals." Let us see if we cannot sort out these contradictions and get a consistent and reasonable view of the lights and shadows of the Moorish civilization.

The chief defect of the Mohammedan world of the Middle Ages was, we have already seen, a too frequent outbreak of cruelty, of readiness to torture, of callousness. We must clearly understand that in this the Arabs were not inferior to the rest of the world in their time. In Rome and Constantinople, the two leading Christian cities, there was a horrible readiness to mutilate and to kill; while the Christians of Spain, when they recovered part of the country, were in this respect far worse than the Moors. In fact, as we should expect from the general refinement and intellectual cultivation, the Spanish Moslems show far less cruelty than other Europeans after the full development of their civilization in the second half of the ninth century. After that time acts of ferocity are almost confined to orthodox Caliphs. There were, of course, intrigues for power of a kind we do not know today, but we must compare ancient peoples with one another, not with our age.

This cruelty or callousness which we attribute to the Arabs is, in point of historical fact, the conduct of a few individuals (Caliphs, princes, nobles, etc.), and we must not too readily ascribe the same qualities to the mass of the people, about whose character the chronicler usually says nothing. It is one of the defects of the despotic power which medieval life gave to rulers and nobles that they became callous in inflicting punishment or death. That in Spain at least the original ferocity of the Arab was fully mastered in the people is shown by the nature of their sports. These were, Scott says, "never polluted by the wanton shedding of blood." It was quite customary amongst the Arabs in time of war to have duels between champions selected from the contending armies, but they never made a sport of this in time of peace, as the Romans had done and every country in Europe would presently do. They detested fights with animals as a spectacle—they, of course, liked hunting—and they took no pleasure in feats of physical strength. Their chief delight was in horse-races and other equestrian spectacles, some of which were taken over by the Spaniards and other Europeans and brutalized.

The Moorish bull-fight, for instance, differed considerably from the kind developed by the Spanish Christians. Only Arabs of high

rank, amateurs, entered the arena, without troops of men to tantalize the bull, and the only weapon was a short spear, the point of which was blunted with leather. The bull was killed outright by a blow in a certain part of the spine. The chief object was the display of horsemanship. The tournament, or the sport from which Europe evolved its bloody tournaments, was even more innocent. This was the greatest of all Moorish spectacles. Special stands, beautifully decorated, were erected round the public square, and a brilliant crowd of silk-clad ladies, gleaming with jewels, and wealthy people generally looked on. Ladies did not wear a veil in public in Spain. There were twenty-four performers, the most skillful horsemen of the Moorish aristocracy. They wore flexible coats of mail underneath tunics of blue or crimson velvet decorated with gold stars, each showing the heraldic device (which Europe would copy) of his family. Half the young nobles were on white and half on black horses, their trappings heavily decorated with gold and jewels. The only weapon, again, was a blunt lance, on which the horsemen bore the colors of his lady: her scarf, perhaps, or a knot of ribbon. The object was not to kill or maim each other but to disable a man sufficiently to appropriate his ornament. Then they tilted at rings which hung from trees, rushing past at the full speed of their horses.

The chief domestic games also were innocent. Chess, with gold, silver, ivory, or ebony men, was the favorite game; and from the Moors Europe also learned draughts, backgammon, and cards. Acrobats and female dancers were very popular, and the girls, though very rarely nude, were often erotic in their movements. Men did not dance. All classes were passionately fond of music. The Moors had thirteen different instruments, or far more than any earlier people had ever had, and their zeal for music was a most important factor in the European evolution of that art; though histories of music rarely notice them. The composition of poetry was another pastime that was popular in every class of the community; and there were far more domestic gatherings than even in our time at which problems of science and philosophy were discussed with deep interest.

I do not take slavery as one of the vices of the Moors, for their slaves were happier than the immense majority of the people of Europe, and, if Christianity took eight or nine centuries to condemn slavery, and later blessed black slavery, we shall not expect the Moors to abolish it in one third of that time.

Eunuchs were a worse evil, for their intrigues in palaces and mansions were incessant; but the practice had been borrowed from the Greek Christians, and we read that even monasteries of the south of France made much money by castrating boys for the Moorish market. The Popes used castrated singers in Rome until quite recently. The harem-system itself, which required these eunuchs, was bad. Mohammed's idea in permitting an unlimited number of concubines would make it easier for men to avoid sexual irregularities, but this result was not attained, and the harem, with its rivalries and ambitions, led to some of the worst disorders of Arab history. It is quite clear that the mass of the Moorish people were solving the sex-problem on different lines: in effect by denying that there was any

sex-problem. We may, although history speaks only of monarchs and nobles, safely assume from the general passion for love-poetry, music, and gaiety that there was a very considerable freedom in regard to sex. That there was also much homosexual conduct is clear, for some of the princes and nobles openly had troops of gorgeously-clad young men, but I have elsewhere (Key to Love and Sex) given ample evidence that this practice persists in every age and is very widespread today. It was more open in Spain. Many of the writers who refer vaguely and shudderingly to the "unspeakable infamy" of the Moors of Cordova or Seville would find, on proper inquiry, that it is extremely common, in every class, both in city and country (especially in south Europe), today.

I am not concerned here with the ethic of sex but as an historian of morals I protest against the constant description of this sexual freedom of the Arabs as "poisonous" and "debauched" and "destructive of society." The historical facts wholly refute this. Every responsible work on the Mohammedan civilization, even the few chapters on it—a grotesque disproportion of space in so large a work—in the Cambridge Medieval History, testifies that they were, taking life all round, the most efficient people that had yet appeared in history. The fully illuminated, paved, drained, and hygienically controlled streets of their cities made them immensely superior to the Greeks and far superior even to the Romans. In the breadth of their education, again, they were enormously superior to the Greeks and at least equal to the Romans, while in the quality of their culture, especially science and philosophy, they immeasurably surpassed the Romans and all other people except, perhaps, the Alexandrians. The latter, incidentally, were just as sensual as the Moors. In cleanliness and refinement and courtesy also they, as a body, were far superior to any previous people. There is certainly no previous civilization that approaches them in combining, in every class of the population, a passionate love of flowers, music, fine clothes, clean linen, poetry, and beauty in every department of life with such zeal for intellectual vitality. In all these respects they remain superior to any civilization that succeeded them until the last half century, and many will doubtless agree with me that even we could profitably learn something of the art of living from them.

CHAPTER VI

THE MOHAMMEDANS IN EGYPT



N AN earlier page I referred to a dynasty of Caliphs, the Fatimite Dynasty, that was set up by or with the support of the stricter Mohammedans. North Africa is still, in spite of the civilizing efforts of French and Italians, so backward that few people realize that it was for a thousand years an integral part of the civilized world: the home of the merchant-princes of Carthage and the theater of a Roman civilization which was second only to Italy itself. Vandal destructiveness and Byzantine stupidity had almost ruined the fine civilization that covered what are now Tunisia and Algeria, but the land bore the stimulating ruins of beautiful Roman cities and its people remained capable of rising once more at any time to the full level of civilization. I heard the other day of an English literary man who surprised himself and his friends by discovering that St. Augustine, being an African, must have been a black. Most people probably know that the Berbers, Tuaregs, and other peoples of north Africa are no more black than the Portuguese and are, as the Romans proved, as capable as any of civilization.

Across this country the Arabs had swept on their way from Egypt to Spain, but they had, after enforcing Mohammedanism on the Africans, quitted that country for the fairer lands of Andalusia and Sicily. There remained in north Africa, especially Tunisia, a half-barbaric medley of peoples, only slightly influenced by the higher culture that developed in Egypt, Spain, and Sicily, and amongst these the fanatical sect of the Shi'ites spread. About the beginning of the tenth century there appeared amongst them a family which claimed descent from Mohammed's daughter Fatima. The claim was probably fictitious. In fact, one Fatimite Caliph cynically said, pointing to his saber: "Here's my genealogy." The rude Africans, impelled by the fanatics who poured curses on the wine and luxury of Spain, accepted them, but, as I said, they never made a sufficiently respectable civilization in Tunisia to merit our attention. But the futility of their religion as an inspirer of civilization is still more clearly shown by the next development. In the second half of the tenth century one of these Fatimite Caliphs seized Egypt and set up his dynasty there; and his successors speedily rejected all the asceticism of their sect and on that account raised Egypt almost to the same level of culture as Spain.

§1. EGYPT AFTER THE CONQUEST

We saw that Alexandria, the preponderantly Greek city at the mouth of the Nile, had become culturally the greatest city of the ancient world. Its great schools of science and philosophy had been almost abandoned when Christianity was imposed upon the city, and

under Byzantine rule there was no stimulation to restore the old culture. It was still a wonderful city, its famous lighthouse (Pharos), one of the seven wonders of the world, containing two hundred rooms and rising to a height of five hundred feet, reminding all of the remarkable progress in science that the Greeks had made under the Ptolemies. When Amru conquered it for the Caliph, his report ran, or runs in the Arab chronicles:

> "I have taken a city of which I can but say that it contains four hundred palaces, four thousand baths, four hundred theaters, twelve thousand sellers of green vegetables, and forty thousand tribute-paying Jews."

Modern historians suggest that some copyist of the original manuscript has genially added a cipher—one suspects that this was often done—to each of these figures except the last, but Alexandria was still a great city. It is no doubt an exaggeration when the Arabs say that it had a population of 600,000 in the seventh century, but its material splendor was still almost intact. There was such a glare of white marble that the citizens were glad to clothe themselves in black or red, to hang green silk curtains over their windows, and even, it is said, to have green veils over their eyes. The chief avenues were lined with beautiful marble colonnades, parks and gardens abounded, and there was still a cluster of noble buildings on the hill that had borne the great colleges and temples of the Ptolemies.

Some years later the Alexandrians rebelled, and the Arabs destroyed a large part of the beautiful city, but even Christian writers of the time admit that the first policy of the conquerors was to protect the city. The legend that the Arabs found in it so much of the famous library of earlier days that they fed the furnaces of the public baths for six months with the manuscripts is now very rightly rejected by historians. The story is not found in any writer until five or six centuries after the conquest of Egypt. A. J. Butler makes a careful study of the matter in his "Arab Conquest of Egypt" (1902) and concludes that it is "a mere fable, totally destitute of historical foundation." S. Lane-Poole says the same in the sixth volume of Flinders Petrie's "History of Egypt." There is no evidence that there was any public library in Alexandria at the time. The Christians seem to have burned the whole of the books or gradually destroyed what was left of them long before.

But the ancient culture still lingered in Egypt. The Egyptian Christians had as a body embraced one of those heresies of the fifth century which I described in an earlier book, and they had persisted in it in spite of more than a century of truculent persecution. They had become the Copts, bitterly hostile to Rome and Constantinople, and, not being orthodox, retaining at least some respect for the ancient culture. They actually assisted the Arabs to take their country from the Greeks, and at first there seemed a prospect of an infusion of Arab vigor into what remained of the old culture. There was still a medical school in Alexandria which was the best of that age, and there were students of astronomy and mathematics, while the

technical arts of later Egypt (glass, fine linen, etc.) were well preserved. The Arabs were, of course, as yet indifferent to or contemptuous of knowledge, but they appreciated the luxurious products of science and art, and, as the spoils of Visigothic Spain were at first sent largely to Egypt, the new wealth tended to promote art and industry. It is said that thirty thousand beautiful girls were shipped from Spain to Egypt, and that soldiers were seen selling priceless vases for a song to Jewish traders. All this, remember, was in the early days when the native barbarism of the Arab soldiers was enhanced rather than tempered by the religious fanaticism of the first Caliph.

§2. EGYPT UNDER THE OMMEYADS

Then, as we saw, the Caliphate was set up at Damascus and the Arabs of Syria, who controlled Egypt, became very skeptical and began to advance in culture. Just as the Nestorian Christians of Syria passed on to these Arabs the ancient Greek literature which they had partly preserved, though they had neither appreciated nor developed it, so the Copt heretics of Egypt ought to have contributed to the education of the Arabs in that country. It was by no means so desolate as one imagines when one reads about the fall of Egypt. It is said that, besides the great city of Alexandria, the Arabs found twenty thousand towns in the land. Historians seem to lose sight of scientific method and standards whenever they describe these falls of empires and kingdoms and the "sensuality" that had led to the catastrophe. The mass of the people were in each case as sensual as their rulers, yet as a rule they, though impoverished and afflicted, suffered no decay. The Egyptian people were as robust as ever. It is kings and dynasties that pay for their selfish indulgences and neglect of duty.

Unfortunately, the despotic character of the new civilization, which was directly and indirectly due to the Prophet himself, was very apt to lead to real corruption in the distant provinces as well as mischievous indulgences in the capital. Favorites or intriguers obtained the governorships and were responsible only to the Caliph, and, unless he was a strong and unselfish man, he required only that they send to him the full measure of tribute. As the eunuch-system grew, these men obtained the provincial positions by bribing the chief eunuchs or ministers, and they then proceeded to extort as much as possible from the people. Under such a system, which easily develops in a theocratic polity like Islam or the Papal States, corruption and extortion spreads through the whole hierarchy of officials. This happened in Egypt in the seventh and eighth centuries, and there were frequent insurrections and bloody reprisals. Alexandria was looted and half destroyed, and the Copts were alienated. The Arabs had, of course, normally left them free to exercise their religion, as they did in other countries.

The country, in other words, lagged far behind Spain and Persia in the development of culture, especially as its governors refused to settle in Alexandria and chose an old Roman town near the present site of Cairo. But there are some quaint pictures of life and char-

acter in this period of transition. From Persia the Arabs were now spreading eastward over Asia, coming into contact with the Kurds and Turks and cognate races. These were at first conquered and enslaved, and a Turkish slave brought a high price on the market. The Turks—I am not speaking of the very mixed people of Constantinople—are still large, robust, and handsome men, and in captivity they proved very loyal to their masters. They were soon drafted into the Persian and Egyptian armies and permitted to win high military and civic positions. We have a remarkable story of a Turkish ex-slave, Tuleen, of the ninth century. He acquired considerable learning and became governor of Egypt, which he ruled almost independently of Bagdad. At first he had a bodyguard of a hundred powerful young slaves, beautifully dressed and armed with silver-mounted whips. His vigorous and able rule made the country wealthy, and he built a large palace and almost a city round it. His vast and beautful gardens contained a race course and a menagerie, and the new buildings, apart from the mosque, cost him several million dollars. He handed a Copt architect quarter of a million dollars to build his mosque, and the style of mosque-architecture with which we are familiar began to develop by a blend of Coptic, Byzantine, and Persian ideas. Tuleen had a revenue of over ten million dollars, besides a vast loot from his wars. He had twenty-four thousand slaves, a hundred fine ships, and, of course, a large and beautiful harem. He was the first Mohammedan ruler to attempt to raise Egypt to the level of Spain and Persia.

We read of the customary dissipated and debauched son and successor, but this man, restored to some sobriety by the intrigues against him, turned out a vigorous ruler and commander, though all these Egyptian governors or kings (as they often were) until the eleventh century made the mistake of despising intellectual culture, and the progress of the country was on that account uneven and had no solid foundation. The Caliph of Bagdad thought it prudent to offer marriage to the daughter of this powerful governor of Egypt, and the journey and wedding cost five million dollars. The lady was carried in a litter from Egypt to Bagdad and a palace was built for her at every halt. Her bridal present included four thousand jeweled waistbands, ten coffers full of jewels, and a thousand gold mortars for pounding the perfumes for her luxurious toilet. The governor's father, Tuleen, had been a fairly orthodox Mohammedan, and had given $2500 a month, besides the appointed sums, to the poor. The son spent $50,000 a month on his kitchen and wine-cellar alone, and lavished money on new buildings, gardens, and aviaries of rare birds. He outraged the feelings of the strict Moslems by showing his skepticism in a way that few Caliphs ever imitated; he had pictures of himself, his wives, and her favorite musicians painted on the walls of his palace. As he slept badly he had his bed made to float on a pool of quicksilver—we shall certainly refuse to believe that this was a hundred feet square, as the Arabs say—moored by silken cords to silver pillars and gently rocked. A tame lion guarded him while he slept, but he was at length murdered, as the issue of an intrigue of the harem.

All this had, as I said, no security in the promotion of education and intellectual culture, and half a century of intrigue and confusion, of boy princes and scheming ministers, followed. One minister made a serious effort to redeem the country. He was an ex-slave, an Abyssinian black, who had been bought for fifty dollars and appointed tutor to the young princes. For nearly twenty years Egypt enjoyed peace and prosperity under his able direction, and he was the first to patronize art and letters seriously. He was a man of "jolly sensuality," in Butler's happy phrase. We are told that the daily consumption of his palace was seventeen hundred pounds of meat (a hundred sheep, a hundred lambs, a thousand pigeons, and seven hundred geese and fowl) and a hundred jars of sweets. Fifty skins of alcoholic liquor were given to the servants of the palace daily. We quite accept the jolly sensuality, yet this man was the most enlightened ruler, or virtual ruler, Egypt had yet had.

§3. THE FOUNDATION OF CAIRO

Into this Egypt, that changed its fortunes nearly every decade, came, in 969, the Fatimite Caliph from Tunisia, and an entirely new era opened. The details and color of life that we find in the "Arabian Nights" are taken from Cairo at a much later age, under the Turks, and we shall consider them in the next book, but we must see how Egypt in turn reached a high level of civilization while Europe still lingered in its barbaric slumbers. The first Fatimite Caliph, a strong and just man, devoted himself to suppressing disorder and organizing his kingdom. Almost at once it began to have an extraordinary wealth. His successor selected the site of Cairo, and a gorgeous palace with four thousand chambers was built. One of the daughters of the Caliph that built it left at her death five sacks of emeralds, three thousand silver vessels, thirty thousand pieces of choice Sicilian embroidery, ninety basins and ewers of crystal, and so on. Another daughter left property worth seven million dollars, besides her twelve thousand dresses. Their father had spent fifty thousand dollars on the making of a map of the world, a great sheet of silk embroidered with gold. Few of these Caliphs, however, took any interest in science or learning. Wealth, display, and pleasure were their ideals, even when they were, as they sometimes were, just rulers and enemies of official corruption. They all encouraged artistic industry, and Alexandria, Cairo, and other cities grew rich on their fine products of ivory, ebony, and precious metals, in exquisite glasswork and silk and other textiles. The chief ministers became as wealthy as in Spain. One, who had a harem of eight hundred women and a guard of four thousand young men, left ten million dollars worth of jewels and furniture. Caliph Aziz, a good man, attended his funeral in person and closed all government offices for eighteen days; and for a month poets were hired to recite the man's virtues at his tomb, while pretty slave-girls served wine and sweetmeats to the crowds. Aziz had a turban of gold-embroidered cloth which was sixty yards long, and the trappings of his horse were jeweled and scented.

In other words, these Fatimite Caliphs, though originally of a strict sect and still generally indifferent or opposed to education and learning, entirely outraged the austere precepts of the Koran and just in that proportion were restoring the civilization of Egypt. The details I give show that the apparently fabulous wealth reflected in the "Arabian Nights" is actually short of the splendor of Cairo in the tenth century, the Iron Age of Christian Europe. This was just the period when Popes were selling the Papacy for a few thousand dollars and wandering about Rome in search of women; while the revenue of the Caliph of Egypt, the least enlightened province of Islam, rose to $60,000,000 a year from taxes alone. But the story of Caliph Hakim (996-1021) will give us some insight into the character of that remarkable world; though I must add that he had a nerve-taint which was not far from insanity.

Hakim was the son of a Christian mother and was an extremely religious Moslem, so a cynic might suggest that we shall expect to find in him the combined influence of the two great religions. He was, in fact, a monster in his cruelty. He had a morbid love of the dark and used to hold his Council in the dark. He dressed simply and used to travel by night round Cairo on a gray ass; and men and women soon learned to tremble when he approached. All this blasphemous pleasure and luxury must cease, he said. Beer and wine were strictly forbidden, and the vineyards were destroyed. Even honey was seized and flung into the Nile. Women were forbidden to leave their houses or sit on the roof, working and chatting, as they were wont to do. All dogs were destroyed and all chessboards confiscated and burned. Christians and Jews must wear black tunics, and the Christians must wear crosses, the Jews bells, when they bathed, so that the faithful might not be contaminated. When people disobeyed his edicts, he had them flogged, and, if they persisted, fiendishly tortured and executed. When the Christians stirred, he burned all their churches and bitterly persecuted them. "Officials were tortured and killed like flies," says Butler, when there was opposition to his designs. Whole families were beggared or annihilated. Only hypocrites, who despised him, prospered. He had spies everywhere, even in the harems, and the land was ghastly with blood. He still went about on his gray ass, but there was such terror in his cold blue eyes—men spoke about them for decades—or his spies were so successful, that there was no attempt to assassinate him. One day he caught some boys in the streets of Fustat mocking him by showing a female guy. He sent his black regiment to burn down the town, and, as it resisted, they spent three days looting, raping, and cutting throats.

That this was entirely due to religion, or religious mania, is clear from his next development. He announced that he was himself the incarnation of God, and people must set aside the Koran and the Prophet and worship him. Sixteen thousand citizens of Cairo signed a declaration that they believed it. People at the half-ruined old capital, Fustat, laughed, and the black troops were let loose upon the town once more. At last the Turk and Berber troops annihilated his black guards—you see the origin of the name—and it appears that

the royal maniac was murdered. He had held despotic power over Egypt for quarter of a century, and he left the land a desolation. We saw what the three sensualist and immoral Caliphs had done for Spain. Here is the true story of what a strict religious monarch did with what was, in most respects, a high civilization. Yet writers bore us incessantly with their tags about the destructive social influence of sensuality and the fine constructive influence of pure religion.

Egypt passed through nearly twenty years of misery, and its savior is in his way as singular as its destroyer. From 1036 to 1094 there ruled a Caliph whose mother was a black slave of the harem, and for thirty years he labored finely and successfully to repair the injury wrought by the son of a Christian mother. Butler, in fact, insists that a great deal of the credit is due to the black mother herself: that for years she was the virtual ruler. Such peace and prosperity were now found in the streets which had shuddered at the blue eyes of Caliph Hakim that, we are told, even the jewelers did not bolt their stores at night. The staff of the palace rose to thirty thousand, and the bazars were crowded with the most beautiful products of the entire civilized world. But, though this was no debauched and careless Caliph, confusion and poverty fell once more upon the country in the second part of his reign. Like the Caliph of Bagdad he found that his Turkish servants had become his masters. There were terrible feuds between the different mercenary regiments and no Egyptian troops to control them. Brigandage and famine impoverished the land, until one saw nobles sweeping the streets or serving in the public baths. The military officers now cast their eyes on the treasures of the palace and compelled the helpless Caliph to sell them. In a single month of the year 1067 treasures worth $75,000,000 were "sold" at anything from a tenth to a thousandth part of their real value.

Some details of the "bill of sale" which has been preserved in later writers will give an idea of the incredible wealth and luxury which Egypt alone had accumulated at a time when you could probably have bought any city in Europe, except the Moorish, for a few tens of millions of dollars. Ten pounds of emeralds, valued at seven million dollars, and two hundred and fifty pounds of pearls, rubies, and jeweled rings were sold. There were a hundred and thirty thousand gold objects, eighteen thousand pure crystal vases, gold enameled plates and cups, inkstands of gold, silver, ebony, and ivory, porcelain jars of perfume, the jeweled turban (weighing seventeen pounds) and the silk map that I described above, life-sized gazelles, peacocks, and other animals and trees in gold and jewels, thirty-eight royal barges, tents of gold brocade and silk (one valued at $75,000, and another superb tent, of velvet and satin, which it had taken fifty artists nine years to make) and an unlimited quantity of precious stuffs (50,000 pieces of gold-embroidered damask) and vessels. There were no adequate purchasers. A Jew bought one and a half million dollars worth of stuff for fifty thousand. A Turkish general gave $1250 for stuff worth $750,000. A library of a hundred thousand precious manuscripts, including twenty-four thousand illuminated

copies of the Koran, was dispersed and wasted. Soldiers mended their boots with the rare leather covers. "Arrears of pay," the officers said; though the treasure included a hundred and fifty thousand gold coins.

Egypt never fully recovered this period of bullying and brigandage until the Turks themselves fully adopted civilized ways and succeeded the Arabs in power. It was the revitalized civilization of Turkish rulers with which the Crusaders came into contact and from which they learned the elements of decent behavior. Saladin, the famous leader of the Moslems, was a Kurd. But how he and his successors restored all the splendor of Egypt and gave it also a zeal for science we shall see in a later book. Here I confine myself to describing what the non-Christian world was like while the Christian nations lingered in semi-barbarism and squalid poverty.

CHAPTER VII

THE SARACEN NEIGHBORS OF ROME

I HAVE in earlier works been tempted to comment satirically on some recent American historians who affect to trace the evolution of European civilization under the beneficent influence of the Christian Church and omit to mention, or entirely fail to appreciate, this remarkable culture of the Mohammedans. This is one of the worst defects of the historical instruction that is given today in a very large number, probably the majority, of colleges; and the obvious aim is to falsify the history of ideals, flatter the Church-censors of education, and lend a wholly spurious "support of history" to the more conservative in our modern ethical and social controversies. But those writers are little less to blame who imagine this Mohammedan world separated from Christendom by a Chinese wall of religious prejudice and therefore exerting no influence on it until the Crusades. In so far as there was such a wall, it lay entirely on the Christian side of the frontier, for we saw that, apart from a few rare periods of fanaticism, the Arabs were remarkably tolerant and courteous to Christians.

But I have shown elsewhere that the cultural contact of the Crusades, when there were merely intervals of friendly intercourse between months of bitter fighting, was quite a secondary source of influence. The Moors of Spain had a very considerable direct influence upon Europe through the south of France (until the Popes devastated that fair region), through Jewish travelers, and in the end, when Europe began to be less stupid, through Christian scholars who found themselves welcomed in the Moorish schools. In many respects, however, the Mohammedans of Sicily had the greatest share in recivilizing Europe. When the Spaniards won back the various provinces of their country from the Moors there ought to have been a unique and helpful blend of what was best in both nations. We saw that, instead, the Spaniards wrought far more destruction than the barbaric Goths and Vandals had done when

they had entered the country, and it will hardly be questioned that the ruling motive was religious hatred. In Sicily and south Italy we find a different and very interesting development. The Christian Normans take over the Moslem civilization and they sustain its culture, even its erotic poetry and its harems, in an extraordinary way and extend it to the cities of north Italy. I have traced the historical evolution in the Key to Culture and will here add a few social and moral details to the general picture of the Sicilian civilization which I there gave.

§1. MOSLEM LIFE IN SICILY

In an earlier book I told how the Greeks realized the large resources of the beautiful island of Sicily and the adjacent parts of south Italy and founded there a civilization only second to that of Athens. Sicily alone is a sufficiently caustic reply to those who want us to appreciate the civilizing power of the Roman Church. Twice, and for several centuries each time, it has had a material splendor, a magnificent prosperity, and a high culture to compare with almost any in the world, yet until the secular government of Italy took it over in the last century it had been for five centuries a land of picturesque poverty and vice and profound ignorance, and it is still very far from the level it reached under the Greeks and the Saracens. The Romans, who took it over from the Greeks, allowed its culture to decay, for they regarded the island as little more than a slave-tilled estate to provide the Roman workers with free bread, but it decayed far more lamentably under the Christian Greeks of Constantinople. However, Palermo remained a notable city, and there was in the churches sufficient treasure to attract the Mohammedans from Africa. They raided the island and the Italian coast repeatedly, and in the ninth century they took over the government of Sicily and part of south Italy.

The reader will probably not need to consult a map to realize that the nearest Mohammedan province was what we now call Tunisia, and I have explained that in this most isolated region of Islam, seething with untamed Berbers and other desert tribes, culture remained low and fanaticism remained high. It was, as we have seen, the only section of Islam where the dour Shi'ites won power; and the geographical conditions sufficiently explain this. Hence we are not surprised that the Saracens (or Easterners, as sometimes they came from Egypt) who appear so much in the Papal and Italian chronicles of the eighth and ninth centuries are credited with ferocity. There was, as I have elsewhere shown, no difference in this respect between the Italians, Mohammedans, Greeks, and early Normans. It seems, moreover, that there is some exaggeration in the accounts of the savagery of these orthodox Moslems. They certainly wrecked the beautiful old Greek capital, Syracuse, which Archimedes and others had made famous in the annals of science, but when we are told that they sacked Palermo so thoroughly that it took six days to transfer the loot we must hesitate to believe. By the middle of the tenth century, a hundred years before the Normans entered it, Palermo was a greater city than it is today. An Arab writer tells us that it

had a population of between two and three hundred thousand, or more than three times the population of Rome and five times what the population of Palermo was in the later Middle Ages. To the Christian writers of the time it seemed to be the richest and most remarkable city in the world. It was so rich that large numbers of the citizens built graceful private mosques for their families, and along the river which flowed into it was a crowd of places of entertainment. In 1871, when the Italian government took over Sicily, the entire population of the island was found to be about two and a half millions. Nearly a thousand years earlier, under the Arabs, a single valley on the island had maintained as large a population as that in splendid prosperity.

We must therefore suppose that in spite of all their wars and religious feuds and mutual struggles the Mohammedan governors had introduced some of the best elements of the culture that had developed in Spain. There were, besides Palermo, eighteen cities and hundreds of towns and villages. The native Christians had settled down under the Saracen rulers—one writer tells us that some of their churches were decorated with texts from the Koran—and were more prosperous than they had been for many centuries. It is true, however, that a large number of the Arab governors were of a poor type, and the country made less progress than it would have done under a dynasty of strong monarchs like those of Spain. Life was much the same as we have described in other parts of the Moslem world. The silk-worm had been introduced with the palm and other oriental plants and animals. The early fanaticism had so far been lost that wine was generally drunk and vineyards covered a great deal of the island. The point of real interest is to see how the Normans adopted this life in spite of their profession of Christianity.

§2. THE HAREMS OF THE NORMAN KNIGHTS

First, since it throws some further light on the question how long it takes to civilize barbarians, let me say a word about the Normans themselves. These Teutons of Scandinavia were naturally the last barbarians to quit the cold north and invade the warmer and more luxurious south, and they found most of southern Europe already occupied. As is well known, they effected on the west coast of France the settlement which came to be known as Normandy, and writers often stress the fact that here they came into contact with French civilization and accepted the Christian religion. But we saw what kind of a civilization there was in France in the tenth century; indeed, other writers excuse its semi-barbarism precisely on the ground of the Norman invasions. "Robert the Devil" is a French legend which tells us what impression the French had of their Norman neighbors. It was just the story of the Goths and Vandals over again.

The province of Normandy was a small area for a rapidly increasing people, and, as they were enthusiastic and most truculent fighters, the sons of the various counts began to lead troops of men still further south in search of adventure. The Moors beat them off from Spain, which they raided, and they sailed round to Italy. Here

they found a glorious opportunity in the struggle of the Lombards, Romans, Greeks, and Saracens, and they hired out their spears and their long swords to each party impartially. We need not here go into the history. They at last founded a principality of their own in south Italy and conquered Sicily. By the end of the eleventh century, little more than a hundred years after their emergence from barbarism, the Normans ruled Sicily and set up an advanced and very picturesque civilization. Saracen culture in Sicily did immeasurably more in refining and civilizing the Normans in a single generation than the Church of France did for those who remained in Normandy in four centuries.

The work of the first king, Roger I, was one of consolidation, and for this it was essential that he should ignore the wishes of the Pope and grant perfect religious toleration. Some American writers foolishly represent the religious tolerance of early Maryland as a quite new phenomenon in history. It was, on the contrary, the normal condition of the ancient civilizations and of the Mohammedan world, but the Maryland legislation was not even the first departure from Papal policy in Christendom. As long as the Normans ruled Sicily they granted equal liberty to Mohammedans, Greek and Roman Christians, and Jews. It was the first lesson the Moslems taught them and it facilitated their work in annexing Sicily. The more interesting phase of their life, however, begins under Roger II.

The Norman historian, Ordericus Vitalis, tells a story about the accession of Roger which, if it is true, and it must be at least in part, shows how far these Norman and French Christian princes still were from real civilization. The first Roger died prematurely, while his son was still a boy. The widow, Adelasia, a woman of at least forty years, summoned Robert of Burgundy to protect them and gave him her daughter in marriage. Ten years later, when the boy had grown to manhood, she is said to have poisoned her son-in-law, to put an end to his power. Ordericus gives her a singular expertness in vice and crime. It is at all events true that another Christian prince, Baldwin of Jerusalem (which the Crusaders had now taken), sent envoys to claim the hand in marriage of the virile widow. He had heard the report of the murder, but he had heard also that she had collected an enormous treasure from conquered Sicily. The chronicler assures us that it took seven ships to carry the gold, silver, jewels, purple, and costly arms and robes that she took with her when she sailed east to meet Baldwin. She and her suite traveled on two triremes, each manned by five hundred rowers, and even the mast of her ship was decorated with gold and silver. Baldwin divorced his wife and married her; and, when her treasure was irrevocably made over to him, he discovered that he had sinned in divorcing his wife, and the Pope obligingly ordered him, at his request, to quit his adulterous relations with Adelasia and send her home—without the seven ships.

Roger II seems to have at an early age preferred the candid and pleasant naughtiness of the Saracens to these hypocritical and violent ways, and during the sixty years of his reign his kingdom offered a piquant and attractive spectacle. It would be interesting to

compare him personally with the contemporary Norman monarch, William the Conqueror, who had never been tainted by contact with the infidels. William is described by our best historian of that period, Freeman, as "utterly unscrupulous," a man who "never shrank from force or fraud," a monarch who had his friends murdered in cold blood and laid waste a whole county of England to make a hunting ground, the New Forest. Roger is, on the contrary, described by the best authority on the Sicilian Normans, Count von Shach ("Die Normannen in Sicilien") as "the greatest man of his age," a monarch who was cruel only when necessity compelled him and devoted himself with immense energy to the promotion of science and of the welfare of his people. He was personally a great geographer, and did much to correct the geographical works of his time; and he invited scholars and poets, of any race or creed, to come and assist in the development of culture. His court became "the cradle of Italian poetry": one might almost say the cradle of the troubadour movement which would presently refine the barbarism of the knights of Europe. His father had lived apart from Palermo, though it is clear that his mother leaned to the free and gay ways of the Saracens. Roger II settled in Palermo and made it a very beautiful city and the only center of learning (apart from Moorish Spain) in Europe. He chose the graceful eastern style for the many buildings he erected, and palms were brought to adorn the parks he opened. Aside from the fact that he still displayed a Norman temper when his great plans were thwarted, he was assuredly a great man, one of the chief restorers of civilization in Europe. Both from Spain and Egypt he invited the cooperation of the Arabs in infusing a love of beauty and knowledge into his people.

But a million people have heard of Charlemagne or Alfred the Great for one who has heard of Roger II, and my readers will at once suspect the reason. He was a skeptic, and he was sensual and immoral. The fiction of the necessity of a spiritual attitude in any restoration of civilization has to be sustained by compressing his great work into a paragraph. Sicily made such progress that its architects and engineers were soon invited to work in the large cities of Spain, while the Jews of Sicily became the most skillful physicians of Europe. This was one branch of science that even princes and bishops could appreciate, and the Jewish physicians who were summoned to northern courts did much to restore better ideals. It will be remembered that the first great school or elementary university in Europe, Salerno, was a medical college of these Jews in south Italy. But Roger defied the Church. He declined to help in the Crusades, and he so far despised the ascetic teaching of the Church as—so the story runs—to send a seductive prostitute to a monastery and make a bet that she would captivate its religious abbot. He had quite a number of pleasure-palaces in various parts of the island, and the harem was the most joyous feature of each. He did not, of course, adopt the complete harem-system of the east. Ladies enjoyed complete freedom, and the merry gatherings were more like, indeed were the predecessors of, the free and gay courts of love that would presently extend to the north. The love-poems of Arab literature as

well as the treatises of science were translated—though Roger and his courtiers spoke Arabic as fluently as Italian—and the first chapter of the troubadour movement opened. Moslem and Christian ladies mingled in the harems of Roger and his knights, and they continued to practice their religion with a genial disregard of its ascetic counsels. The freedom was, naturally, copied by the merchants and the people, and the sea-front at Palermo became the gayest place in Europe.

Let me stress the fact that all this sensuality was accompanied, as in Spain, by a very keen intellectual culture and that, instead of leading to decay, it lifted the civilization higher and higher. Sicily would not reach the zenith of its material and intellectual splendor, of the scientific efficiency as well as the luxurious enjoyment of its life, until the reign long afterwards of Frederic II. Through him and his connection with the cities of north Italy and Germany this culture would easily and naturally pass into Christendom. We shall see that development in a later book. Here I complete my survey of the Mohammedan world by these few details about its extension to Sicily and south Italy. The culture was as high as elsewhere, and there was the added and very important interest that under a series of half-skeptical or wholly skeptical monarchs Arab freedom and refinement were thoroughly introduced into a nominally Christian world.

In the last book I carried the story of morals in Christendom as far as the middle of the eleventh century, except in regard to Germany, where there was a peculiar development which we will consider in a later book. It was a world of squalor, profound and almost universal ignorance, boorish manners, and sordid violence, unredeemed by any widespread observance of its own laws of chastity and brotherly love. I have pointed out also the defects of this Mohammedan world—the occasional streak of cruelty or callousness, the occasional corruption of the administration, and so on—but the general contrast is like that of a sunny and refined, music-throbbing city of the south over against a fishing village in Newfoundland. There was no difference in sensuality. It was merely more refined, more picturesque, more splendid in the south. There must have been more sexual freedom in southern cities, but in this there was no violation of a law which men and women professed to venerate above all others; and at least there was not in Islam the repulsive scandal of hundreds of thousands of priests, monks, and nuns professing the sternest asceticism and practicing free love. But I have still to extend this inquiry to the civilizations of Asia, and then we may be able to draw some useful conclusions about the efficacy of ideals and their relation to human welfare and progress.

De Sade on Virtue and Vice

SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF THE MARQUIS DE SADE ILLUSTRATING HIS VIEWS UPON MORALITY AND SEX

Translated by
A. F. NIEMOELLER

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1946
By E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of America

TRANSLATOR'S FOREWORD

Donatien Alphonse Francois de Sade, better known as the infamous Marquis de Sade (though in his later life, after the death of his father, he became a Comte), is an outstanding proof of the contention frequently made that a man is far more remembered for his vices than for his virtues. Not that de Sade was remarkable in any degree for his virtues, but in the field of vice he so distinguished himself that today his name remains memorialized in sexual psychopathology in the term *sadism*—which is no mean accomplishment, when all is said and done, for if in other lines of endeavor a practitioner can manage to have his name made part of the terminology of his art (as for example, an explorer to get a mountain titled after him, an astronomer to have a star made a nominal part of the family, or a physiologist to saddle a lowly bacterium with his Latinized cognomen) it is usually considered a crowning achievement ample to reward a long and arduous career. That de Sade was assiduous at his trade, both in its daily, personal performance and in its literary aspects, there can be no doubt, and he has in consequence deservedly received this ultimate phraseologic accolade.

De Sade was born in Paris, France, on June 2, 1740. He was of an old and noble family extending back to the 13th century at which time the family's founder had adapted its name from that of the village of Saze, in Provence. In the 14th century a member of the line, one Hugues de Sade, had a wife known as Madonna Laura and she, chancing to be seen by the famed poet Petrarch, became the renowned "Laura" of some of Petrarch's most ecstatic sonnets—thus the de Sade lineage boasts pinnacles both of sweetness and light and bitterness and dark.

Not too much is known of de Sade's early life. Some of his youthful years seem to have been spent with his grandmother at Languedoc whence he returned to Paris to continue his education until at the outbreak of the Seven Years War (1756) he was hurried into the army by his family. Shortly after his leaving the service his family decided he should marry and arranged for it to be with Renee Pelagie Cordier de Montreuil, the daughter of a respected Parisian judge. For some reason (probably adherence to some doctrine of wifely duty rather than love) this woman remained devoted to de Sade throughout the innumerable vicissitudes, trials, and embarrassments of his long and checkered career (not least of which were his infatuation and subsequent escapades with her young sister Louise), enduring even the wasting of their fortune and eventual descent into poverty.

Shortly after this marriage de Sade began seriously to apply himself to various refinements of debauchery and to undergo his long series of arrests and confinements, in prisons and in asylums. He consorted with a group of excessively dissolute young noblemen and got himself into no end of trouble and scandal. The "Affaire Keller" in which he was accused of whipping a prostitute for his own pleasure, gained him a short imprisonment and an exile from Paris. The first three years of this exile he passed fairly quietly with his wife and children at a place called La Coste, during which time he devoted himself to writing, distracting himself with a few affairs with chance women (including a dancer) or, lacking better, the servant girls.

Tiring of his retirement, in 1772 he went off on a junket to Marseilles with a faithful valet. It was here that the famous incident of the cantharides-doped bonbons took place, of which there have been so many and different versions. Stripped of all historical hysterics,

this affair appears to have been little more than a private orgy of de Sade, his valet, and three *filles de joie* at which various permutations of the love act were indulged in, to the accompaniment of some flagellation, and de Sade offered the girls some of his high-powered bonbons, but only one of them accepted and she got merely sick, but did not die. This little party, nevertheless, led to a condemnation of poisoning and sodomy carrying a sentence of death, but *in contumacium* or the absence of the accused, however, de Sade and his valet wisely having skipped town. That this judgment must have been railroaded through by enemies of de Sade appears most likely in view of the fact that the sentence was later revoked and de Sade was re-sentenced to a simple fine of 50 francs. To escape the original penalty, de Sade fled to Italy, taking with him the younger sister of his wife, Louise, who died there a short time after. Later, the harsh judgments being revoked, he returned to Paris; but his mother-in-law, venomous over his elopement with Louise, used her influence to have him imprisoned and from 1777 to 1784 he was confined in the prison of Vincennes, after which he was transferred to the Bastille until 1789. It was during his sojourn at the Bastille that he wrote most of the books that we have today—a great amount of his work has been lost in one fashion or another. In July of 1789 he was removed to the asylum at Charenton, just a few days before the mob stormed and took the Bastille, and in March of the following year he was released. Practically penniless, de Sade now turned to writing in earnest to live and turned out a mass of books in many of which he took nasty slaps at leading public figures of the day, including Napoleon and his wife Josephine, with the result that de Sade soon found himself back in the asylum at Charenton. At Charenton he seems to have enjoyed a good deal of privilege and liberty and he there continued to write, received numerous distinguished visitors, and so devoted himself to food as to become grossly obese. He died at Charenton on December 2, 1814.

De Sade was endowed with a keen, penetrating, and indefatigable mind. He thought copiously and constantly upon all conceivable subjects, and simply because his peculiar temperament led him frequently to frame his arguments and conclusions in rather bluntly obscene terms it does not in any wise lessen the validity of his dialectic or the cogency of his deductions. To my mind, if de Sade had any real fault as a thinker it was his tendency toward verbosity rather than in the direction of obscenity. How that man did talk! Even many of his obscene descriptions become wearisome through wordiness. But then, long, solitary years in the Bastille are no more conducive to conciseness of expression than to chastity of thought, and freedom with words was about the only liberty left him during long periods.

Ever the *doctrinaire*, forever attempting to sell some outrageous point of view, de Sade is never more earnest or interesting than when promulgating his attitudes on moral issues, good and evil, or sexual matters. It is a treat in logic to follow his setting up formal premises to arrive at the most unbelievably unconventional conclusions. In this volume is presented a collection of some of the most striking examples of his endeavors along those lines. Though presented in the form of essays, they really are excerpts from his works, and in particular from his novel *Justine*. They are given just as de Sade wrote them and, save for an occasional paraphrase to gloss over an expression a bit too rich for the average American intellectual digestion, the translation is quite literal. Read them and reflect on the position a man can talk himself into if he has a sharp mind, a glib tongue, and plenty of time on his hands.

A. F. N., St. Louis, Mo.

DE SADE'S INTRODUCTION

The chief work of philosophy should be to develop the means Fortune makes use of in order to attain the ends it proposes for man, and to outline according to this some plan of conduct which can make this unhappy bipedal individual understand the manner in which he must walk down the thorny path of life so as to forestall the bizarre caprices of this Fortune which has by turn been named Destiny, God, Providence, Fatality, or Chance, all denominations which are as vicious as they are devoid of good sense, each as much as the next, and which bring to the mind only vague and purely subjective ideas.

If, full of vain, ridiculous, and superstitious respect for our absurd social conventions, it happens in spite of this that we encountered only brambles where the wicked gathered roses, will not the people naturally vicious through system, taste, or temperament calculate, with enough probability, that it is better to abandon themselves to vice than to resist it? Will they not say, with some appearance of reason, that virtue, however beautiful it may be, nevertheless becomes the worst position one can take when it finds itself too feeble to struggle against vice, and when in an absolutely corrupt century, as the one we live in, the surest is to do as the others? A bit more philosophic, if you wish, will they not say, with the angel Jesrad of *Zadig,* that there is no evil from which a good is not born, and that they can, according to this, give themselves over to evil as much as they wish, since it is in fact only one of the manners of doing good? Will they not add, with some certitude, that it is indifferent to the general plan whether such or such be good or wicked in preference; that if misfortune persecutes virtue and prosperity accompanies crime, the things being equal to the intentions of nature, it is infinitely better to take one's place among the wicked who prosper than among the virtuous who come to grief.

It is therefore essential that the fools cease worshipping this ridiculous idol of virtue, which up till now has paid them only with ingratitude, and that the people of spirit, commonly given over by principle to the delicious extravagances of vice and debauchery, take courage on seeing the striking examples of good fortune and prosperity which accompany them almost inevitably along the wanton road they choose. It is doubtless frightful to have to depict on the one hand the terrifying misfortunes with which Heaven overwhelms the gentle and sensible woman who best respects virtue; and on the other, the influence of prosperity on those who plague and mortify this same woman. But the man of letters, philosopher enough to speak the truth, overcomes these imperfections; and cruel by necessity, he pitilessly snatches away with one hand the superstitious finery with which the foolish embellish virtue, and with the other boldly shows, to the ignorant man who was being deceived, vice in the midst of the charms and enjoyments which surround it and follow it unendingly.

ON CONTINENCE

"What a false idea, my dear girl, you have of prudence! and how can you believe that a young person is lacking in it by giving herself to those who will have her? Continence in a woman is an impractical virtue, my child; do not flatter yourself ever to attain it. When the passions shall kindle in your soul, you will see that this manner of being

is impossible for us. Always exposed to seduction, how is it to be wished that a woman be able to resist the attractions of pleasure perpetually offered to her senses? And how make it a crime for her to succumb when everything about her strews flowers on the abyss and invites her to fling herself in? Do not deceive yourself in this, Justine, it is not virtue that is required of us, it is only its mask; and, provided that we know how to dissemble, nothing more is asked of us. She among us who should be prudent, but with the reputation of a slut, would be infinitely less happy than she who would give herself over to all the excesses of debauchery while preserving the reputation of an honest woman. I could give myself to you as an example, Justine. I have been married for 14 years; I have never lost my husband's confidence; he would protest my prudence and virtue on his own life; and, thrown into libertinism from the first years of my matrimony, there does not exist in Paris a woman more corrupt than I. There is not a day that I do not prostitute myself to seven or eight men, and often to three at once. There is not a pimp who does not serve me, not a fine fellow who had not had me: and my husband will swear to you, when you will, that Vesta was less pure. The most complete caution, the most scrupulous hypocrisy, a great deal of art . . . of falsity: those are the means which disguise me, those are the lineaments of the mask that prudence places on my face, and I impose them on everybody. I am a whore like Messalina: they believe me prudent as Lucretia; an Atheist like Vanini: they believe me devout as St. Theresa; false as Tiberius: they believe me as sincere as Socrates, as sober as Diogenes: Apicius was less intemperate than I. In a word, I idolize all the vices. I detest all the virtues; and, if you consulted my husband, if you questioned my family, you would be told: 'Delmonse is an angel!', whilst the Prince of Darkness himself was less inclined to debauchery! For, once again, it is not the sacrifice one makes of his senses to virtues that leads to happiness; doubtless there can be no felicity in such constraint. What conduces to true happiness, therefore, is only the appearance of this virtue to which the ridiculous prejudices of man have condemned our sex."

ON PERSONAL INTEREST

Justine, retaken, was about to be exposed to the greatest dangers, if the noise of a carriage had not just then been heard on the highway. The intrepid Cour-de-Fer left Justine forthwith for his duties. He awakened his men and flew to new crimes.

"Ah, good!" cried the Dubois woman, awakened and sitting up while listening attentively. "Good! There are the cries: the blow is given. Nothing so pleases me as these signs of victory—they prove to me that our people have succeeded, and I am easy."

"But, madam," said our beautiful adventuress, "how about the victims?"

"What matter! There must always be some on this earth . . . How about those who perish at the hands of armies?"

"Ah! that is for causes . . ."

"Infinitely less important than those here. It's not in order to live that tyrants give generals the order to crush nations; it's through pride. Moved by our needs, we attack the passers-by only in the sole intention of living; and this law, the most imperious of all, completely legitimatizes our actions."

"But, madam, people work . . . they have a profession."

"Well, my girl, this is ours! It's the one that we practice from the time of our infancy, it's the one in which we have been raised; and this profession was that of the first peoples of the Universe. It alone reestablishes the equilibrium that the inequality of wealth totally de-

ranges. Robbery was held in honor in all Greece; many peoples still admit of it, favor it, and reward it as a bold action, proving at once both courage and skill . . . as a virtue, in a word, essential to all nations with any energy."

And the Dubois woman, giving herself over to her customary eloquence, was doubtless going to enter upon a detailed discussion, when the band returned bringing along a prisoner.

"There," said Cour-de-Fer, "is something to compensate me for the severity of Justine."

And they perceived, by the light of the moon, a young boy of 15 years, beautiful as love.

"I killed the father and mother," said the scoundrel; "I raped the daughter who was not yet 10 years old; and it seems to me only right that I should not pass by the son."

Thus speaking, he turned to the hay-stack of which the band was making use. Dull cries were hard . . . groans promptly covered by those of that scoundrel's lubricity. The first soon changed into shrieks which gave evidence that the prudent rogue, not wishing to leave any trace of his crime, in order to achieve this enjoyed at the same time the double pleasures of murdering the object of his lust.

"Come," he said, "calm yourself, Justine. There, I am tranquil for the present, to remain so until new desires come to arouse new horrors in me. Let us break camp, my friends," he said to the band. "We have killed six persons; the corpses are along the road, and it's likely that in a very few hours there will be no more safety here for us."

The booty was divided. Cour-de-Fer wished Justine to have her share: it amounted to 20 louis. They forced her to take them; she shuddered at being obliged to keep such money. However, they insisted; then each took up his burden and the band departed.

The next day the robbers, believing themselves in safety in the forest of Chantilly, set about counting their money while their supper was being prepared, and estimated but 200 louis as the totality of the prize.

"In truth," said one of them, "it was not worth the trouble of committing six murders for such a small sum."

"Easy, my friends," answered the Dubois woman, "it was not for the sum that, when you left, I myself exhorted you to show no mercy to those travelers; it was solely for our safety. These crimes are the law's fault, and not ours. So long as robbers are punished, they will murder in order not to be discovered. Besides," continued the shrew, "where do you get it that 200 louis are not worth six murders? One must never evaluate things except by the relation they have to our interests. The cessation of the existence of the sacrificed persons is nothing to us. Assuredly, we should not give a groat in order that these individuals might be alive rather than in the grave. Consequently, if the slightest interest offers itself to us in either of these directions, we ought without any remorse decide it by preference in our own favor; for in a totally indifferent thing we ought, if we are wise and masters of the situation, make it turn in the direction that is profitable to us and take all possible measures for the ruin of the opposer, because there is no reasonable proportion between that which affects us and that which affects others. We feel the one physically, whereas the other comes to us only morally—and moral sensations are deceitful; only material sensations are true. Thus, not only are the 200 louis enough for the six murders, but 30 sous would have sufficed to legitimatize them; for those 30 sous would have procured for us a satisfaction which, although slight, ought nevertheless to affect us a great deal more keenly than had the six murders which do not bother us nor touch us in any way whatsoever. And even from the actual injury we receive only a rather agreeable titillation, according to the natural wickedness of man whose first reaction,

if one wishes to study him carefully, is always a sort of satisfaction in the ills and misfortunes of others.

"The weakness of our organs, the defect of reflection, the accursed prejudices in which we have been raised, the vain terrors of religion and the law; these are what halt fools in the career of crime, these are what prevent their immortalizing themselves. But every person filled with strength and vigor and endowed with an energetic soul, who giving preference to himself over others, as he should, will know how to weigh his interests in his own balance, how to mock God and man, brave death, and scorn the law, well impressed that it is to himself alone that he must refer everything; such a person will feel that the greatest amount of injuries to others, of which he ought physically to experience nothing, can take no place in comparison with the slightest of enjoyments purchased by that unheard-of collection of crimes. The enjoyment pleases him, it belongs to him; the effect of the crime does not affect him, it is apart from him. Now, I ask where is the reasonable man who will not prefer that which delights him to that which is foreign to him, and who will not consent to commit this slight thing, from which he will feel nothing grievous, in order to procure what affects him agreeably?"

ON EGOISM

It is astonishing what one may gather from all the data of egoism; and, unfortunately for the philanthropists, egoism is the holiest and surest of the laws of nature. It would be in vain to tell me that it is a vice; so long as I shall feel its counsels thundering and impressing themselves in the depths of my soul, I shall yield to this impulse and thrust back your errors. The majority of nature's urges being baneful to society, it follows quite simply that it has made crimes of them. But social laws have all men for their object, while those of nature are individual, and consequently preferable; for the law made by man for all men can be erroneous, whilst that inspired by nature, individually in the heart of each being, is decidedly a certain law. My principles are hard, I know, and their consequences dangerous, but what matter provided that they be just? I am the man of nature before I am the man of society, and I ought to respect and follow the laws of nature before listening to those of society: the first are infallible laws, the others will often deceive me. According to these principles, if the laws of nature oblige me to escape from those of society, if they counsel me to brave them or mock them, assuredly I shall do so unceasingly, taking all precautions that my safety will require; because all human institutions based on interests with which I am associated only as one amongst thousands of millions ought never to outweigh what is personal to me.

It was only through weakness that man set up society, in the hope of more easily satisfying his needs; but if this society grants them to him only under onerous conditions, would he not do much better to procure them himself rather than buy them so dearly? Will he not act more wisely to seek his living in the woods than to beg it in the cities, under the sad condition of stifling his inclinations, of sacrificing them to the general interests from which he never draws anything but vexations?

"Ambroise," said Severino, "you appear to me, as does Sylvestre, as quite an enemy of social conventions and human institutions."

"I abhor them," said Ambroise; "they fetter our liberty, they waste our energy, they degrade our soul, they have made of humankind a vile flock of slaves that the first intriguer may lead anywhere that it pleases him."

"What crimes," said Severino, "should reign on this earth without institutions and without masters!"

"There is what is called the reasoning of a slave," answered Ambroise. "What is a crime?"

"An action contrary to the interests of society."

"And what are the interests of society?"

"The mass of all individual interests."

"But if I prove to you that the interests of society are very far from being the sum of individual interests, and that what you consider as social interests are on the contrary only the product of particular sacrifices, will you admit to me that in taking back my rights, although I might be able to do it only through what you call a crime, I shall nevertheless do quite right to commit this crime since it re-establishes the balance and brings back to me the portion of energy I had yielded to your social purposes only at the price of a happiness it refuses me? This hypothesis granted, what then will you call a crime at present? Eh! no, no, no, there is no crime. There are some infractions of the social pact; but I ought to scorn this pact from the time that the impulses of my heart warn me that it cannot contribute to the happiness of my life, and I ought to cherish everything which outrages it."

ON THE NECESSITY FOR LIBERTINISM FOR YOUNG GIRLS

Is it to herself that a young girl can do wrong in being a libertine? Undoubtedly no, for she does nothing but yield to the sweetest impulses of nature which, certainly, would not suggest them to her if they should be injurious to her. Has it not placed in her the desire to prostitute herself to all men among the number of the first necessities of life? And is there a single woman who can say that she does not feel the carnal need of the flesh as imperiously as those of eating and drinking? Now I ask you, Justine, how could nature make it a crime for a woman to yield to the desires which make up the most sublime part of her existence? Shall we consider the libertinism of a being of our species, relative to society? Assuredly, I believe that it is rare to find an action more agreeable to the sex that shares the world with us than that of the prostitution of a pretty woman. And where would it be, this sex, if we all, infected with false systems, with virtues that imbeciles preach to us, were obstinate and never offered anything but refusals to the frenzied desires of the men? Reduced to playing with themselves or working upon each other, it should be necessary for them to give up our commerce completely. For you will confess to me that marriage would not be able to settle the matter; it is quite as impossible for a man to be satisfied with a single woman as it is for a woman to content herself with a single man. Nature detests, abjures, contradicts all these dogmas of your absurd civilization, and the mischief of your imbecile logic does not become part of *its* laws: let us listen only to it and we shall never be deceived. In a word, Justine, believe some one who has some experience, some erudition, some principles, and be persuaded that the best and most reasonable thing a young girl can do in the world is to prostitute herself to all who wish her whilst preserving, as I have just explained to you, an exterior which can awe people.

ADVICE TO YOUNG GIRLS ON THEIR RIGHT TO PLEASURE

Now listen to me, Eugenie. It is absurd to say that as soon as a young girl is off her mother's breast she ought from that moment become the victim of her parents' will, to remain so until her last breath. It is not in a century in which the scope and rights of man have come to be augmented with so many pains, that young girls ought to continue to be-

lieve themselves the slaves of their families, when it is certain that the powers of these families over them are absolutely chimerical. Let us listen to nature on a subject so interesting and let the laws of the animals, so very much closer to it, serve us for a moment as an example. With them, do the parental duties extend beyond the first physical needs? Do not the fruits of the enjoyment of the male and female possess all their liberty, all their rights? As soon as they can walk and feed themselves alone, from that time on do the authors of their being know them? And they, do they believe themselves to owe something to those who gave them life? Undoubtedly no. By what right, then, are the children of men subjected to other duties? And what sets them up, these duties, if it is not the avarice or ambition of the fathers? Now I ask if it is just that a young girl who is beginning to feel and reason submit herself to such restraints? Is it not, then, prejudice quite alone which prolongs her chains? And is there anything more ridiculous than seeing a young girl of 15 or 16 years, burned up by desires that she is obliged to conquer, wait in torments worse than those of hell until it please her parents, after having made her youth unhappy, further to sacrifice her ripe age by immolating her to their perfidious cupidity in associating her, in spite of herself, with a husband who either has nothing to make himself loved or who has everything to make himself hated? Ah, no! no! Eugenie, such bonds will soon destroy themselves; it is necessary that, releasing the young girl from the paternal roof at the age of reason, after having given her a national education, she be left her own mistress at 15 years to become what she will. She will fall into vice? Eh! What matter!

Are not the services that a young girl renders in consenting to make the happiness of all those who apply to her, infinitely more important than those she offers her husband in isolating herself? The destiny of woman is to be like the she-dog, like the she-wolf: she ought to belong to all who wish her. It is manifestly an outrage to the destiny that nature imposes on women to enchain them with the absurd bond of solitary wedlock.

Let us hope that people will open their eyes and that in assuring the liberty of all individuals they will not forget the lot of the unfortunate girls. But if they are so to be pitied through being forgotten, let them, themselves taking a stand above custom and prejudice, boldly trample underfoot the shameful irons with which people presume to enslave them: they will then soon triumph over custom and opinion. Man, becoming wiser because he will be freer, will feel the injustice it would be to scorn those who would act thusly, and that the action of yielding to the impulses of nature, regarded as a crime among a captive people, can no longer be so among a free people.

Lay down, then, the legitimacy of these principles, Eugenie, and break your irons at whatever price it may be, despite the vain remonstrances of an imbecile mother to whom you legitimately owe only hate and scorn. If your father, who is a libertine, desires you early, let him enjoy you, but without enchaining you; break the yoke if he wishes to enslave you: more than one girl has acted the same with her father. In a word, use your body as you will: it is for that you are placed in the world; no limits to your pleasures but those of your strength and will; no exception of time, place, or person; all hours, all places, all men ought to serve your sensual pleasures; continence is an impossible virtue for which nature, its rights violated, soon punishes us with a thousand misfortunes. So long as the laws shall be such as they are today, let us use some evils: public opinion constrains us to it; but let us compensate ourselves in private for this cruel chastity we are obliged to have in public.

Let a young girl strive to procure a close woman friend who, free and acquainted with the world, can help her secretly taste the pleasures. In default of this, let her try to seduce the Arguses with which she is

surrounded; let her entreat them to prostitute her, and promising them all the money they will be able to draw from her sale either these Arguses by themselves or through the women they will find, which are termed "procuresses," will soon round out the young girl's views of things. Let her then throw dust in the eyes of all around her, brothers, cousins, friends, parents; let her lend herself to everything if necessary to hide her conduct even to making, if it should be required, the sacrifice of her tastes and affections: an intrigue which will have displeased her and to which she will have given herself over only through policy, will soon lead her into a more agreeable situation, and there she is "launched." But let her no longer return to the prejudices of her childhood: menaces, exhortations, duties, virtues, counsels, let her trample all of them underfoot; let her stubbornly reject and scorn, in a word, everything that does not tend to deliver her into the bosom of wantonness.

Those predictions of misfortunes along the way of libertinism are extravagances of our parents. There are thorns everywhere, but roses are to be found above them along the course of vice—it is only in the miry paths of virtue that nature has never brought any into being. The only rock to fear in the first of these roads is the opinion of men; but where is the girl of spirit who, with a little reflection, will not rise above this contemptible opinion? The pleasures received through esteem, Eugenie, are only moral pleasures, suitable solely for certain heads; but those of fleshly love please all, and these seductive attractions soon compensate for that illusory scorn which it is difficult to escape in braving public opinion, but which many sensible women have derided to the point of making an additional pleasure of it. Enjoy your body, Eugenie, enjoy it, my dear angel; it is yours, yours alone; it is but you alone of the world who has the right to enjoy it and to make it enjoy what seems good to you.

Profit from the happiest time of your life; they are all too short, these happy years of our pleasures! If we are fortunate enough to have enjoyed them, some delicious memories will console and amuse us in our old age. But should we lose them, bitter regrets and frightful remorse will rend us and will join with the torments of age to fill the dismal approaches to the grave with tears and brambles.

Do you have the passion for immortality? Well, it is through the use you make of your body, my dear, that you will remain in the memory of men. The Lucretias have long been forgotten, whilst the Theodoras and Messalinas make up the sweetest and most frequent conversations of life. How then, Eugenie, can you not prefer a condition which, crowning us with flowers here below, further leaves us hope of a worship well beyond the tomb? How, I say, can you not prefer this condition to one which, making us vegetate stupidly on earth, promises us after our existence only scorn and oblivion!

ON EVIL

It is in nowise necessary that misfortune be revenged. It hopes it because it desires it; it flatters itself with it because it wishes it. This colossal idea consoles it, but it is none the less false. Things are better. It is essential that misfortune suffer; its humiliation and griefs rank among the laws of nature and its existence is useful to the general plan, like that of prosperity which crushes it. Such is the truth which ought to stifle remorse in the soul of the scoundrel and malefactor. Therefore, let them not constrain themselves, let them give themselves blindly to all the injuries the ideas for which the politic aims of nature suggest in them: it is the only method this universal mother knows for making us the agents of her laws. When her secret inspirations dispose us to EVIL, it is because evil is necessary for her; it is because she wishes it; it is

because she has need of it; it is because the sum of crimes being incomplete—insufficient for the laws of equilibrium, the only laws by which she may be governed—she demands these further ones as the complement of her balance. Let him not take fright, then, nor pause, he whose soul inclines toward evil; let him commit it without fear, from the time that he feels the impulse; it is only in resisting it that he would outrage nature.

ON VIRTUE AND VICE

In a totally vicious society, virtue would serve nothing: our associations not being of this sort, one must absolutely either feign virtue or make use of it in order to be less fearful to all those who follow it. Let a person not adopt it, he will become useless. Therefore, I am not wrong when I maintain that his necessity is only of public opinion or circumstance. Virtue, let us not deceive ourselves, is not of an incontestable value; it is only a manner of conducting oneself which varies according to each climate and which, consequently, is in nothing more real than the styles in usage in a certain province and not in others. It is only what is useful in all ages, to all peoples, in all countries, that might really be good; but what has not a demonstrated utility, and what perpetually changes, should not be able to pretend to the character of goodness. Thus it comes about that the theists, in establishing a chimera, place immutability in the ranks of the perfections of their God. But virtue is entirely deprived of this characteristic. Not only are there virtues of religion, style, circumstance, temperament, and climate, but there are also some of government. The virtues of a revolution, for example, are indeed far removed from being those of a tranquil government. Brutus, the greatest of men in a republic, had been jaded in a monarchy; Labarre, executed under Louis XV, had perhaps merited crowns some years later. In general, there are no two people on the face of the earth who may be virtuous in the same manner: therefore, virtue has nothing real, nothing of intrinsic good, and in no way deserves our worship. One must make use of it as a prop, hypocritically adopting that of the country in which one lives, in order that those who practice it by taste, or who must revere it through their position, leave you in peace; and in order also that this respected virtue you hold to may secure you, by its weight of convention, from the crimes of those who profess vice. But, once again, all this is circumstantial, and nothing of all this assigns a real merit to virtue.

And so it is with virtue, which is simply impossible for certain men. Recommend chastity to a libertine, temperance to a drunkard, benevolence to a ferocious man; nature, stronger than your recommendations and laws, will break all the restraints you would impose, and you will be forced to agree that a virtue which opposes or combats the passions can only be highly dangerous. Amongst these men I have just cited there will assuredly be vices opposed to these virtues that will become preferable, since they will be the only manner, the only way of living which will best conform with their physique or organs. There will be, according to this hypothesis, some very useful vices. Now, how could virtue be useful if it is demonstrated that its opposite may be also? To this you will be told: virtue is useful to others, and on this score it is good; for if it is allowed to do only what is good for others, I in my turn shall receive only good. Let us here take great care: this reasoning is only a sophism. For the little good I receive from others, by reason of their practicing virtue, I make, through the obligation of practicing it in my turn, a million sacrifices which in no wise compensate me; receiving less than I give, I thus make a bad bargain; I experience a great deal more ill from the privations I endure from being virtuous than I receive good from those who are so. The pact not being equal, I ought

therefore not to submit to it. And surely if in being virtuous and not doing others as much good as I receive pain in constraining myself to be so, would it not be better that I renounce procuring them a happiness which must procure me so much ill? There now remains the wrong I can do others in being vicious, and the ill that I in my turn shall receive if everyone resembles me. In admitting complete circulation of vice, assuredly I run a risk, I agree; but the vexation I experience through what I risk is compensated by the pleasure from what I make others risk. Thenceforth, everybody is equally almost happy, which is not and could not be in a society where some are good and others wicked, because perpetual snares result from this *melange* which do not exist in the other case. In the mixed society all interests are diverse: there is the source of an infinitude of misfortunes. In the totally vicious association all interests are equal; each individual who composes it is endowed with the same tastes, the same penchants, all march toward the same goal, all are happy; not so when one is agreed to worship the good. But, the fools tell you, evil does not make happiness; no, not when one is agreed to worship the good. But scorn, vilify what you call good, no longer revere anything but what you have the stupidity to call evil and all men will take pleasure in committing it, not because it will be permitted (this would often be a cause for diminishing its attraction), but because the law might no longer punish and because through the fear it inspires it lessens the pleasure that nature has placed in crime.

I am supposing a society in which it will be agreed that incest (let us embrace this moral offense like all others), that incest, I say, be a crime. Those who give themselves over to it will be unhappy because opinion, law, worship, all will come to chill their pleasure; those who will desire to commit this evil, or who will not dare because of these restraints, will be equally unhappy: thus the law which proscribes incest will only have made unfortunates. But if in an adjacent society incest be not a crime, those who will not desire it will not be unhappy, and those who will desire it will be happy; therefore, the society which will have permitted this action will better suit men than the one which will have set up this same action as a crime. It is the same with all other things clumsily considered as criminal. By regarding them from this point of view, you make a mass of unhappy people; by permitting them, no one complains. For the one who loves anything whatsoever gives himself over to it in peace; and the one who does not care for it either remains in a sort of indifference which is in nowise dolorous, or compensates himself for the injury he might have received through it by a number of other injuries with which in his turn he harasses those whom he does not like.

Therefore, in a criminal society everyone finds himself highly content, or in a state of heedlessness which has nothing of pain and which consequently has nothing good, nothing respectable, nothing at all of what is to render one happy according to what is called virtue. Let those who follow it not pride themselves on that species of homage that the nature of the constitution of our societies forces us to render it: it is purely an affair of circumstance. But in reality this worship is ridiculous, it is chimerical, and the virtue which for a moment obtains it is not finer for it. Vice, on the contrary, is full of charm; in its practice alone is all the happiness of life; it alone inflames, warms the passions; and he who like me has acquired the habit of living in it no longer even has the faculty for adopting another course. I know that prejudices combat it, that opinion sometimes triumphs over it; but is there anything in the world more contemptible than prejudices, and anything which so merits being braved as opinion? "Opinion," said Voltaire, "is queen of the world." Is this not to admit that it, like queens, has only a conventional power, only an arbitrary authority? And what is the opinion of men to me? What matter what they think of me personally provided that I find happiness in the principles I have made myself?

One of two things: either they hide this opinion from me, and from that moment they do me no ill; or they give evidence of it to me, and from then on I experience a further enjoyment. Yes, undoubtedly, an enjoyment: the scorn of fools is such for the philosopher. It is delightful to brave public opinion, and the acme of wisdom doubtless is to reduce it to silence. General esteem is praised to us: and what does it gain one, I ask you, to be esteemed by others? This sentiment is costly to man; it affords pride: I may sometimes love the one whom I scorn, never the one whom I revere; this latter will always have a great number of enemies, while the other will scarcely be minded. Let us not, then, swing between two modes of which the one, virtue, leads only to the most stupid and most monotonous inaction, and the other, vice, to everything most delightful on earth that man can hope for.

ON THE INUTILITY OF VIRTUE

It is not the choice that man makes of virtue which causes him to find happiness; for virtue, like crime, is only one of the manners of conducting oneself in the world. It is therefore not a case of following one of these manners rather than the other, but is only a question of walking along the main road; he who keeps away from it is always wrong.

In a world entirely virtuous I should counsel you to virtue, because the rewards being thereto attached happiness would infallibly go with it; but in a world totally corrupt, I should never counsel you to anything but vice. He who does not follow the route of the others inevitably perishes; everything he encounters hurts him, and as he is the weakest he must necessarily be broken. It is in vain that laws would re-establish order and lead men back to virtue. Too prevaricating to undertake it, too ineffectual to succeed in it, they may manage to lead away from the beaten path for a moment, but they will never have it quitted. When the general interest of men will lead them to corruption, he who will not wish to corrupt himself with them will thus struggle against general interest. Now, what happiness can one expect who perpetually opposes the interest of others? Will you tell me that it is vice that opposes the interests of men? I should grant you this in a world composed of equal parts of good and wicked people because then the interest of one would visibly clash with that of the other. But this is no longer so in a completely corrupt society. My vices, then, outraging only the vicious person, determine in him other vices which compensate him, and we both find ourselves content. The reciprocation becomes general; it is a multitude of mutual clashes and injuries where each one at once regaining what he has just lost, finds himself unendingly in a happy position. Vice is dangerous only to virtue which, feeble and timid, dares undertake nothing. But when it no longer exists on earth, when its wearisome reign is ended, then vice, no longer outraging any but the vicious, will cause other vices to hatch out, but will no longer alter virtues. How would you not have a thousand times run aground in your life, Justine, by continually taking in the reverse direction the road that everyone follows? If you had given yourself up to the torrent you would have found port like me. Does he who would go up a river cover as much ground in the same day as he who would come down it? You always speak to me of Providence. Eh! who proves to you that this Providence loves order, and consequently virtue? Does it not endlessly give you examples of its injustices and irregularities? Is it by sending men war, plague, and famine; is it by having formed a universe vicious in all its aspects that it manifests in your eyes its extreme love for good? Why would you have it that vicious individuals displease it since it itself acts only through vices, since all is vice and corruption in its works, since

all is crime and disorder in its caprices? But from what else do we take these impulses which lead us to evil? Is it not its hand which gives us them? Is there a single one of our desires which is not its work? Therefore, is it reasonable to say that it would allow us or give us inclinations for a thing which would be injurious to it or which would be useless to it? If, then, vices serve it, why should we resist them, by what right should we work to destroy them, and whence does it arise that we stifle their voice? A bit more philosophy in the world would soon place everything back in order and we would make magistrates and legislators see that the crimes they blame and punish with so much severity sometimes have a degree of utility much greater than those virtues which they preach without themselves practicing them, and without ever rewarding them.

ON THE IMAGINATION

It is singular, you pretend, that filthy and crapulous things can produce in our senses the excitation essential as the complement of their delirium; but before being astonished at this, it must be felt, dear girl, that objects have only that value in our eyes that our imagination gives them. It is therefore quite possible, according to this invariable truth, that not only the most bizarre things, but even the vilest and most frightful can affect us quite perceptibly.

The imagination of man is a faculty of his mind in which, through the medium of his senses, objects come to paint and modify themselves, and then form his thoughts in accordance with the first perception of these objects. But this imagination, itself resulting from the sort of organization with which man is endowed, adapts the objects received only in such or such a manner, and then creates thoughts only according to the effects produced by the clash of the perceived objects. Let a comparison facilitate for your eyes what I expound. Have you not seen, Justine, mirrors of different forms: some which diminish objects, others which enlarge them, these which render them frightful, those which lend them charms? Do you imagine, now, that if each of these glasses united the creative faculty with the objective faculty it would not give an extremely different portrait of the same man who looked at himself there; and would not this portrait be in accordance with the manner in which it would have perceived the object? If to the two faculties we have just lent this glass it now joins that of sensibility, would it not have for this man, seen by it in such or such a manner, the kind of sentiment that it would be possible for it to conceive for the sort of being that it would have perceived? The glass which would have seen him as frightful would hate him, the one which would have seen him as beautiful would love him; but this nevertheless would always be the same individual.

Such is the imagination of man. The same object presents itself there under as many forms as it has modes; and according to the effect received on this imagination through the object, whatever it may be, it determines to love or hate it. If the encounter with the perceived object strikes it in an agreeable manner, it loves it, it prefers it, although it may have in it no real charm; and if this object, although of a certain value in the eyes of another, strikes the imagination upon which it acts only in a disagreeable manner, it will draw away from it, because none of our sentiments either take shape or realize themselves save in accordance with the effect of the different objects on the imagination. According to this, is there anything astonishing in that what keenly pleases some may displease others; and conversely, that the most extraordinary and monstrous thing finds disciples? The disfigured man also finds mirrors which render him handsome.

Now, if we admit that the enjoyment of the senses be always dependent upon the imagination, always regulated by imagination, one will not need be astonished at the numerous variations that the imagination will suggest in its enjoyments, at the infinite multitude of different tastes and passions that the various digressions of this imagination will give birth to. These tastes, although lustful, will not necessarily be more striking than those of a simple sort. There is no reason for finding a fancy for the table less extraordinary than a fancy for the bed, and in both cases it is no more astonishing to idolize a thing that the generality of men find detestable, than it is to love one commonly recognized as good. The unanimity gives proof of conformity in the organs, but nothing in favor of the thing loved. Three-quarters of the universe may find the odor of the rose delicious without this being able to serve as a proof, either for condemning the quarter who should find it evil, or for demonstrating that this odor be truly agreeable.

ON THE VARIETY OF TASTES AND COLORS

What is most singular is that so long as it is a question only of futile things, we are not astonished by the difference of tastes; but as soon as it concerns lust, there is everything in an uproar. The women, ever watchful of their rights so that their weakness and small worth engage to lose nothing, tremble at every moment lest some one carries off something from them, and if, unfortunately, in amusing oneself with them one employs any behavior which shocks their cult, there we have crimes worthy of the scaffold! What inconsistency! What atrocity! Ought not then the pleasures of the senses repay a man better than the other pleasures of life? In a word, ought the temple of generation better fix our inclinations, more surely awaken our desires, than the part of the body either the most contrary to or the farthest removed from it, than the most fetid or most disgusting emanation from this body! It ought not, it seems to me, appear more astonishing to see a man carry singularity into the pleasures of libertinism than it ought to be to see him employ it in the other functions of life; once again, in the one or the other case his singularity is the result of his organs. Is it his fault if what affects you is nothing for him, and if he is moved only by what is repugnant to you? Where is the man who would not instantly reform his tastes, affections, and inclinations to the general plan, and who would not prefer to be like everybody than to be an oddity, if he were master of it? It is the most stupid and barbarous intolerance to wish to ill-treat such a man; he is no more guilty toward society, whatever may be his errors, than is, as I have just said, the one who should have come into the world blind in one eye or lame! And it is as unjust to punish or mock the former as it would be to torment the other or banter him. The man endowed with singular tastes is a sick man; he is, if you wish, a woman with hysterics. Would the idea ever come to us to punish or oppose the one or the other? Let us be equally just with the man whose caprices surprise us. Completely comparable to the sick man or the hysteric, he is like them to be pitied and not to be blamed. Such is the moral excuse of the people whom this concerns; the physical one will doubtless be found with the same facility; and when the science of anatomy shall be perfected the relation of the organization of man to the tastes which will have affected him will readily be demonstrated. Pedants, turnkeys, legislators, the tonsured rabble, executioners, what will you do when we shall have come to this? What will become of your laws, your morality, your religion, your gallows, your paradise, your gods, and your hell, when it shall be demonstrated that such or such a stream of liquors, such a kind of fibres, such a degree of acridity in the blood or in the animal spirits suffice to make a man the object of your penalties or your rewards?

ON THE TASTE FOR SCANDAL

I suppose that you are too free from religious errors not to be deeply persuaded that everything which tends to deride the piety of fools can have no sort of consequence. These fantasies have so little of it that they ought to warm only very young heads, for which all rupture of restraint becomes an enjoyment; it is a species of minor criminal prosecution which kindles the imagination and which, doubtless, can amuse on some occasions. But these sensualities, it seems to me, ought to become insipid and cold when one has had time to inform himself and become convinced of the nullity of the objects of which the idols we jeer at are only a puny representation. To profane the relics, the images of saints, the host, the crucifixes, all this in the eyes of the philosopher ought to be only what the degradation of a pagan statue would be. Once one has dedicated these execrable baubles to scorn, he must leave them there without bothering himself further with them. It is good to save only blasphemy from all this. Not that it is any more real, for from the moment there is no more god, what does it serve to insult his name? But in the intoxication of pleasure it is essential to pronounce strong or filthy words, and those of blasphemy serve the imagination well. Nothing must be spared: these words must be ornamented with the greatest luxury of expression possible; they must scandalize as much as possible, for it is very sweet to scandalize. In this there exists a little triumph for the pride which is in nowise to be disdained. I confess to you this is one of my secret sensualities; there are few moral pleasures more active upon my imagination. Try it, and you will see what it results in. Display a prodigious impiety for everything when you find yourself with persons of your age who are still vegetating in the shadows of superstition. Advertise debauchery and libertinism; make a show of playing the "girl," or letting them see your breast; if you go with them into secret places, tuck up your clothes indecently; with affectation let them see the most secret parts of your body; demand the same thing of them; seduce them, preach to them, make them see the ridiculousness of their prejudices; set them about what is called "evil;" swear like a man with them; if they are younger than you, take them by force, amuse yourself with them, and corrupt them either by example, by counsel, or, in a word, by everything you can think of most capable of perverting them. Likewise be extremely free with the men; advertise irreligion and shamelessness with them; far from taking fright at the liberties they will endeavor, grant them mysteriously everything that can amuse them without compromising you. Let yourself be handled by them, play with them, have yourself played with, even go so far as to grant their unnatural desires; but since the chimerical honor of women is dependent upon their anterior firstlings, be more difficult on this. Once married, take some lackeys, but no lover, or pay some reliable young men. From this time on, everything is covered; no more injuries to your reputation, and without anyone's ever having been able to suspect you, you have found the art of doing everything that pleases you.

ON SODOMY

"You have not reassured me on the enormous crime that I have always heard sodomy said to be, and especially between man and man... Let us see, Monsieur, how your philosophy explains this sort of offense: it is frightful, is it not?"

"To begin with, Eugenie, nothing in libertinism is frightful because everything that libertinism inspires is equally of nature. The most bizarre, the most extraordinary actions, those which seem apparently to clash with all laws, with all human institutions (as for Heaven, I do not speak), indeed! Eugenie, even these latter are not frightful, and there is not a one of them that cannot show itself in nature. It is certain that the one of which you speak, pretty Eugenie, is the relative to which is found so singular a fable in the flat romance of Holy Scriptures, the tedious compilation of an ignorant Jew during the bondage of Babylon; but it is false, beyond all probability, that it was in punishment of those errors that these cities, or rather these straggling villages, had perished by fire. Situated on the craters of some old volcanoes, Sodom and Gomorrah perished like those cities of Italy that the lavas of Vesuvius swallowed up. There is the whole of the miracle, but it was nevertheless from this quite simple occurrence that people went on barbarously to invent the torture of fire against the unfortunate beings who in one part of Europe gave themselves over to this natural fantasy."

"Oh! Natural?"

"Yes, natural, I maintain. Nature does not have two voices, one of which daily takes the task of condemning what the other inspires, and it is quite certain that it is only through its medium that the men infected by this mania receive the impressions that lead them to it. Those who wish to proscribe or condemn this taste pretend that it is injurious to population. How dull they are, these imbeciles, who never have anything but this idea of population in their heads and who never see anything but crime in anything that deviates from it! Is it then demonstrated that nature has such great need of this population as they would have us believe? Is it quite certain that a person outrages it each time that he swerves from this stupid propagation? Let us for a moment scrutinize, in order to convince ourselves of it, both its course and its laws. If nature did nothing but create and never destroy, I should be able to believe with these wearisome sophists that the most sublime of all acts would be to work ceaselessly at the one which produces, and in consequence of this I should grant them that the refusal to produce should necessarily be a crime. But does not the slightest glance at the operations of nature prove that destructions are as necessary to its plans as creations; that both of these operations link and even bind themselves together so intimately that it becomes impossible for one to act without the other; that nothing would be born, nothing would be regenerated without some destructions? Destruction is therefore one of the laws of nature like creation. This principle admitted, how can I offend this nature by refusing to create? This, to suppose evil in the action, would doubtless become infinitely less great than that of destroying, which nevertheless finds itself in its laws, as I have just proved. If on the one hand I thus admit the inclination that nature gives me to this waste, and on the other I look into its necessity for it and that in giving myself over to it I but enter into its plans, where then will be the crime, I ask you? But fools and populators, which are synonymous, still object to you that this productive sperm can be placed in your loins for no other use than that of propagation: to turn it away from that is an offense. First, I have just proved that it is not, since this waste would not even be equivalent to a destruction, and since destruction, much more important than waste, would not itself be a crime. Secondly, it is false to suppose that nature wishes that this spermatic liquor be absolutely and entirely destined for producing. If this were so, not only would it not permit that this flow take place in all other cases, as experience proves to us since we lose it both when and where we will, but further it would oppose these wastes taking place without coition, as happens both in our dreams and in our memories. Sparing of a liquor so precious, it would never be save in the vessel of propagation that it would permit its flow. It absolutely would not wish that the voluptuous-

ness with which it then crowns us might be able to be felt when we should turn away our homage, for it would not be reasonable to suppose that it could consent to give us pleasure even at the moment when we should be overwhelming it with outrages.

"Let us go farther. If woman was born only in order to produce, which would assuredly be the case if this production were so dear to nature, would it come about, taking the longest life of a woman, that there nevertheless are only seven years, all deductions made, in which she is in a condition to give life to her kind? What! Nature is avid for propagation; everything which does not tend toward this end offends it, and of a hundred years of life the sex intended for producing will be able to do so only during seven years? Nature wishes only propagation, and the semen that it lends man to serve this propagation is cast away as much as it please man! He finds the same pleasure in his waste as in the useful employment, and never the least inconvenience! . . . Let us cease, my friends, let us cease from believing in such absurdities: they make good sense shudder. Ah! far from outraging nature, let us on the contrary quite persuade ourselves that the sodomite and tribade serve it in stubbornly refusing themselves to a conjunction from which there only results a progeny wearisome for it. This propagation, let us not deceive ourselves about it, was never one of its laws, but a tolerance at most, I have told you. Eh! what matter that the race of man die out or annihilate itself on earth! It laughs at our pride in persuading ourselves that everything should end if this misfortune took place! But it would scarcely be aware of it. Do you imagine there has not already been some extinct races? Buffon counts several of them, and nature is so dumb to so precious a loss that it is barely aware of it. The entire species could be destroyed, yet the air would be no less pure for it, the stars no less brilliant, nor the progress of the universe less exact. What imbecility it requires to believe that our species is so useful to the world that he who should not work to propagate it, or he who should disturb this propagation, would necessarily become a criminal! Let us cease blinding ourselves on this point and let the example of peoples more reasonable than we serve to persuade us of our errors. There is not a single corner on earth where this pretended c r i m e of sodomy has not had temples and votaries. The Greeks who, so to speak, made a virtue of it, erected a statue to it under the name of Venus Callipyge; Rome went out to seek laws at Athens and brought back this divine taste from it. What progress do we not see it make under the emperors? In the shelter of the Roman eagles it spread itself from one end of the earth to the other. At the destruction of the empire it takes refuge near the tiara, it follows the arts in Italy, and it comes to us when we become civilized. Do we discover a hemisphere, there we find sodomy. Cook drops anchor in a new world: it reigns there. If our balloons had been to the moon, it would be found there quite the same. Delicious taste, child of nature and pleasure, you must be everywhere that men are to be found, and everywhere that you are known they will erect altars to you!

"Oh, my friends, can there be an extravagance comparable to that of imagining that a man must be a monster worthy of losing his life because in his enjoyment he preferred its approach through a *cul* to that of a *con*, because a young man with whom he finds two pleasures, those of at the same time being lover and mistress, appeared to him preferable to a girl who promises him but one enjoyment! He will be a scoundrel, a monster, for having wished to play the role of a sex that is not his! Eh! why has nature created him sensible to this pleasure? Examine his conformation; you will there observe some complete differences from that of men who have not received a share of this taste. The character of this man, again different from that of the others, will be softer and more flexible; you will find in him almost all the vices and virtues of women, you will even recognize their weakness; all will have their passions and some of their traits. Thus, would it be possible

that nature in assimilating them in this manner to women could become irritated because they have their tastes? Is it not clear that his is a class of men different from the other and which nature created thus in order to diminish this propagation whose too great spread would infallibly be injurious to it? . . .

"Ah, my dear Eugenie, if you but knew what delicious joy there is to be found in the practice of this sport! No, no, in the whole world there is not an enjoyment to equal this: it is that of the philosophers, it is that of heroes, and it would be that of the gods, if the parts of this divine enjoyment were not themselves the sole gods that we should adore on earth!"

ON THE FELICITY OF CORRUPTION

Let us guard well against ever resisting the sort of corruption the species of immorality into which our penchants drag us; there is not the least harm in giving ourselves over to them.

Man was indeed stupidly deceived when he said there was a sort of natural justice, ever engraven in the heart of man, and that the result of this law was found to be the absurd precept not to do to others what we would not have done to us. This ridiculous law, the fruit of the weakness of the inert being, could never hatch in the heart of the individual endowed with any energy; and, if I had some moral principles to establish, it would not be in the soul of the weak being that I should go to seek precepts. He who fears to receive evil will always say that it must not be done; whilst he who mocks the gods, men, and the laws, will never leave off committing it. What is necessary is to know which of the two is good or bad; and it seems to me that such a thing should never even be placed in question. I defy the virtuous man to maintain to me in good faith that he has felt, in giving himself over to a good action, even a quarter of the pleasure experienced by him who has just committel an evil one.

Whence does it follow, therefore, being free to choose, that I shall come to prefer the manner which does not stir one to that from which here is perpetually born the most tumultuous and agreeable agitations that man may ever experience? Let us extend our ideas; let us judge the whole of society; and we shall easily convince ourselves that the happiest of all will of necessity be he who is the most gangrened, and this generally in all his aspects. I am far from limiting myself to a few partial depravations; I do not wish that one be simply libertine, drunkard, robber, impious, etc. . . . I demand that he try everything, that he give himself over to everything, and always to extravagances that appear the most monstrous, because it is only by extending the sphere of his disorders that he ought the sooner to arrive at the measure of felicity promised by disorder. The false ideas we have from the creatures who are about us are still the source of an infinitude of morally erroneous judgments; we fabricate for ourselves chimerical duties toward these creatures, and this because they believe themselves bound to the same toward us. Let us have the strength to renounce what we expect of others, and our duties toward them will soon destroy themselves. What, I ask you, are all the creatures of earth compared with a single one of our desires? And for what reason should I deprive myself of the slightest of these desires in order to please a creature who is nothing to me and who in nowise interests me? If I fear something of him, assuredly I ought to treat him with caution, not for him but for myself, because in general it should be only for myself that I act in this world. But if I have no cause for apprehension concerning him, I ought quite certainly to draw from him everything I can to better my pleasures and to consider them all only as beings created purely to serve them. Morality, I

repeat, is therefore useless for happiness; I say further, it is injurious to it. And it ever will be only in the bosom of the most extended and general corruption that individuals, like societies, will find the greatest measure of earthly felicity.

ON PROSTITUTION

By what right do you pretend that women ought to be excepted from the blind submission to the caprices of men which nature prescribes for them, and then by what other right do you pretend to enslave them to a continence impossible for their physical make-up and absolutely useless to their honor?

It is certain that, in the state of nature, women are "vulgivaque," that is to say enjoying the advantages of the other female animals and belonging, like them and without any exception, to all males. Such were, without any doubt, the first laws of nature and the only institutions of the first assemblages made by men. "Interest, egoism, and love" degraded these early viewpoints, so simple and so natural. A person thought to enrich himself by taking a woman, and with her the property of her family; there the first two sentiments I have just indicated are satisfied. Still oftener, he stole this woman and attached her to himself; there is the second motive in action, and, in all cases, injustice. Never can an act of possession be exercised upon a free being, it is as unjust to possess a woman exclusively as it is to possess slaves. All men are born free, all have equal rights; let us never lose sight of these principles. According to this, the legitimate right can never be given one sex exclusively to take possession of the other, and never can one of the sexes of one of the classes possess the other arbitrarily. In the purity of the laws of nature, a woman cannot plead as reason for the refusal she makes him who desires her, the love she has for another, for this reason becomes an exclusion, and because no man can be excluded from the possession of a woman from the moment that it is clear that she belongs decisively to all men. The act of possession may be exercised only upon a fixture or an animal; it can never be done on an individual who resembles us, and all bonds of whatever sort you may suppose which can chain a woman to a man are as unjust as they are chimerical. If it therefore becomes incontestable that we have received from nature the right to express our desires indifferently to all women, it likewise develops that we have that of obliging her to submit to our desires, not exclusively, for I would not contradict myself, but momentarily. Let no one say that I contradict myself on this and that after having established above that we have no right to bind a woman to us, I destroy these principles by saying that we have the right to constrain her. I repeat that it here is only a question of enjoyment and not of ownership; I have no least right of the ownership of the spring I encounter along my road, but I have certain rights to its enjoyment, I have the right to profit from the limpid water it offers to my thirst. Likewise, I have no real right to the ownership of such or such a woman, but I have an incontestable one to her enjoyment, and I have a right to constrain her to this enjoyment if she refuses it to me for any reason whatsoever. It is incontestable that we have the right to set up laws which force her to yield to the fires of him who desires her; violence itself being one of the effects of this right, we can also employ it. Eh! has not nature proven that we have this right by endowing us with the strength necessary to submit them to our desires?

In vain must women make talk for their defense either of decency or their attachment to other men. These chimerical pleas are null. We have seen above how factitious and contemptible a sentiment decency was; love, which may be called "the folly of the soul," has no

greater title to legitimatize their constancy: satisfying but two individuals, the loved person and the loving person, it cannot serve the happiness of others, and it is for the happiness of all and not for that of a privileged few that we have been given women. Therefore, all men have a right to the equal enjoyment of all women; thus there is no man who, according to the laws of nature, can set up for himself a unique and personal right. The law which will oblige them to prostitute themselves, so far as we will wish it, in the houses of debauchery that have just been in question, and which will constrain them to it if they refuse, which will punish them if they fail in it, is therefore one of the most equitable of laws and against which no legitimate or just reason could be opposed. A man who would enjoy any woman or girl whatsoever will thus be able, if the laws that you promulgate are just, to have her summoned to appear in one of the houses I have spoken of; and there, under the protection of the matrons of this temple of Venus, she will be delivered to him to satisfy, with as much humility as submission, all the caprices it will please him to indulge in with her, however odd and irregular they may be, because there can be none of them which is not in nature, none which may not be allowed by her. It then would no longer be a question of fixing an age, for I maintain that this cannot be done without hindering the liberty of him who desires the enjoyment of a girl of such and such an age. He who has the right to eat the fruit of a tree may assuredly pick it ripe or green, according to the inspiration of his taste. But, it will be objected, there is an age at which the proceedings of the man will decidedly injure the health of the girl. This consideration is without any value: from the time that you grant me the right of ownership upon enjoyment, this right is independent of the effects produced by the enjoyment; from this moment it becomes all one whether this enjoyment be advantageous or injurious to the object which must submit to it. Have I not already proven that it is legal to constrain the will of a woman on this matter and that as soon as she inspires the desire for enjoyment she must submit herself to this enjoyment, abstraction being made of all egoistic sentiment? It is the same with her health. From the time that the respect one might have for this consideration destroys or weakens the enjoyment of him who desires her, and who has the right to appropriate her to himself, this consideration of age becomes null because here in nowise is it a question of what can be experienced by the object, condemned by nature and law to the momentary assuagement of the desires of the other. In this examination it is a matter only of what suits him who desires. We shall restore the balance.

Yes, we shall restore it, and undoubtedly we should do so; these women whom we have just so cruelly enslaved, we should indemnify them.

If we admit, as we have just done, that all women ought to be subject to our desires, assuredly we can likewise permit them amply to satisfy all theirs. Our laws should on this score favor their fiery temperament, and it is absurd to have placed both their honor and their virtue in the unnatural strength they use in resisting the inclinations they have received in greater profusion than we. This injustice in our manners is all the more crying as we consent at the same time to render them helpless through seduction and then punish them for yielding to all the efforts we have made to provoke their fall. All the absurdity of our manners is engraven, it seems to me, in this inequitable atrocity, and this exposure alone should make us feel our extreme need for changing them for purer ones.

Therefore I say that women having received much more violent inclinations for the pleasures of the flesh than we, they should give themselves over to them as much as they wish, absolutely disengaged from all the bonds of Hymen, from all the false prejudices of shame, completely restored to the state of nature. I would that the law permit them

to give themselves to as many men as seems good to them; I would that the enjoyment of all the sexes and of all the parts of their body be permitted to them as to the men; and under the special condition of giving themselves equally to all those who will desire them, it is necessary that they have the liberty of enjoying equally all those whom they will believe worthy of satisfying them. What, I ask, are the dangers of this license? Children who will have no fathers? Ah! what matter in a Republic where all individuals need have no mother other than the homeland, where all those who are born are children of the fatherland? Ah! how much better will they love it who, having known only it, will from the time of their birth be sure that it is from it alone that they must expect everything! Do not think to make good Republicans while you isolate in their families the children who should belong only to the Republic. By there giving to a few individuals alone the measure of affection that they should distribute to all their brothers, they inevitably adopt from these individuals prejudices which are often dangerous; their opinions, their ideas, become isolated, particularized, and all the virtues of a man of the State become absolutely impossible for them. Abandoning, finally, their heart entirely to those who have given them birth, they no longer find in their heart any affection for the one that should make them live, make them known and illustrious, as if these other benefits were not more important than the first. Since there is the greatest objection to allowing children thus to imbibe in their family interests often quite different from those of the fatherland, there therefore is the gratest advantage in separating them from it. And is this not brought about naturally by the means I propose, since by destroying completely all bonds of marriage there will no longer be born any fruits of the pleasures of woman other than children to whom the knowledge of their father is absolutely forbidden, and with this the means of belonging to one particular family instead of being, as they should, solely children of the fatherland?

Therefore there will be houses intended for the libertinism of women and, like those for men, under the protection of the government; there they will be furnished with all the individuals of both sexes that they could desire, and the more that they will frequent these houses, the more will they be esteemed. There is nothing so barbarous and so ridiculous as having connected the honor and virtue of women with the resistance they make to the desires they have received from nature and which ceaselessly inflame those who have the barbarity to censure them. From the tenderest age (the Babylonian girls did not wait for their seventh year to carry their first-fruits to the temple of Venus. The first stirring of concupiscence that a young girl experiences is the time that nature points out for her to prostitute herself, and without any other sort of consideration she ought to yield from the time that nature speaks; she outrages its laws if she resists), a girl relieved from paternal ties, no longer having anything to save for marriage (completely abolished by the laws I desire), above the prejudices formerly hindering her sex, will thus be able to give herself over to everything that her temperament will dictate to her in the houses established for this purpose. There she will be received with respect, satisfied with profusion, and upon returning into society she will be able to speak as publicly of the pleasure she will have tasted as she does today of a ball or a promenade. Charming sex, you will be free; like all men you will enjoy all the pleasures that nature makes a duty for you; you will restrain yourself on none of them. Ought the most divine part of humanity thus receive chains from the other? Ah! break them, nature wishes it; no longer have any other curbs than that of your inclinations, any other laws than your own desires, any other morality than that of nature; languish no longer in those barbarous prejudices which withered your charms and held captive the divine outbursts of your heart. Women do not know to what degree their lasciviousness adorns them. Let one compare two

women of closely similar age and beauty, one of whom lives in celibacy and the other in libertinism: it will be seen how much this latter has the advantages in brilliancy and freshness. All violence done to nature wears much more than the abuse of pleasure; there is no one who does not know that the couch beautifies a woman. You are free like us, and the career of the combats of Venus is open to you as to us. Fear no longer any absurd reproaches; pedantry and superstition are destroyed. No longer will you be seen to blush for your charming extravagances. Crowned with myrtle and roses, the esteem that we shall conceive for you will be only in proportion to the greatness of the extent to which you will have allowed yourselves to be given to them.

ON THE DEBAUCH OF THE SENSES

"If there is anything delightful in the world," said Rodin, when he was calm, "it is libertinism. Where will one find a passion that holds all our senses in a more lascivious titillation? Is there anything on earth that makes one happier? It is libertinism that breaks childhood's toys; it is it that lights the torch of reason, that gives energy to man. And if this is so, ought not he to infer that it is for this pleasure alone that nature has created him? Let him place all the others parallel with this and he will see that it is different; he will see if there is a single one which grips him with as much ardor. Its empire over the soul is such that as soon as it is filled with it the soul can no longer think of any other thing.

"Examine a truly debauched man and you will see him always occupied either with what he is doing or with what he is planning to do. Perfectly indifferent to everything that does not concern his pleasures, you will see him pensive, concentrated in himself, as if he feared to give way to a tendency which could for a minute distract him from the libidinous ideas that are inflaming him. One would say that once attached to the cult of this god it becomes absolutely impossible for him to be stirred by anything whatsoever, and that nothing is capable of distracting his soul from the delightful passion that captivates it. Therefore it is to this alone that we should sacrifice all: this alone should be respectable in our eyes. Sovereignly scorn everything that takes you from it or combats it; and in order better to make proof to it of our homage, let us plunge ourselves blindly into all the extravagances of its vices. Let nothing be sacred for us save what characterizes it or serves it; let us feel, exist, breathe only for it; it is only fools who find it dangerous. Eh! how could a refinement of pleasure ever be that? Is libertinism anything else? Undoubtedly, no. Well, how much the readier may it have some inconveniences? I say further, these very inconveniences, did they exist, would they not still be preferable to all the dangers of temperance . . . to all the boredom of prudence? Is not the state of inertia of the sober man the picture of the sleep of death? The cold and indifferent man is the repose of nature: what does he serve in the universe? What does he set in movement? What does he execute? What is his pedantry good for? If he is null, is not this condemnable? And is he not from then on a burden to society? If temperance and sobriety unfortunately dominated the world, everything there would languish, would vegetate, there would no longer be either movement or force, and everything would fall back into chaos. That is what our moralists will not understand, because ceaselessly supporting their principles on religious bases, they cannot conceive a state outside the plans of their deity, whereas there is no deity and this monster of man's overheated imagination can never count for anything in the calculations of philosophy. But one quite singular thing is that the curbs man places upon libertinism are only the spurs of libertinism itself: is not shame, the

first of these curbs, one of the most active stimulants of this passion? It is essential to lust. One is angry that another knows of our fantasies; it seems that they should be understood only by us, and that everyone who is not US should not have the wit to comprehend them. Such was the first motive that caused veils to be thrown over impure actions; one did not wish to do before everyone what it seemed everyone should not know of; but the curtain was drawn only to redouble the excesses. Let us not doubt that there had been less libertines if cynicism were the style. One hides himself only because he wishes to leave the usual order; and the first one who, in the infancy of societies, made his mistress pass behind a bush, was the most libertine of the tribe.

"Let us corrupt ourselves, then, my children, let us then soil ourselves with all possible impurities; let us pursue the pleasures of the flesh without rule or measure; let us loose the bridle on all our inclinations; let us cherish our tastes; and let us be certain that the more we shall give ourselves over to the DEBAUCH OF THE SENSES, the more shall we approach the happiness with which lubricity will always crown those who cherish and serve it!"

ON THE CRUELTY OF NATURE

One day while examining Etna, whose bosom was vomiting flames, I desired to be this famous volcano.

"Mouth of Hell," I cried out, contemplating it, "if like you I could engulf all the cities that surround me, what tears I should not make flow!"

Scarcely had my invocation been pronounced when I heard a noise nearby: a man was listening to me.

"You have just formulated a strange desire," said this person to me.

"In the state in which I am," I answered him humorously, "one formulates still more extraordinary ones."

"So be it," responded my man; "but let us hold to the one we have just spoken of, and learn from me that it is possible! I am a chemist; I have passed my life studying nature. Immortality nurturing my studies, it is for 20 years now only to the misfortune of men that I consecrate my discoveries. You see, as I am speaking to you, your singular desire has convinced me of the confidence I could have in you. Learn, then, that one may counterfeit the terrible eruptions of this mountain. If you wish, we shall try it together."

"Sir," I said to the man, inviting him to sit down with me near a tree, "let us talk, I beg you. Is it quite true that you can imitate a volcano?"

"Nothing is easier."

"And we shall produce, by the effervescence of this factitious volcano, the same effects as an earthquake?"

"Absolutely!"

"We shall destroy cities?"

"We shall entirely destroy them; we shall upset the whole island."

"Let us act, sir, let us act; I shall cover you with gold if you succeed."

"I ask nothing of you," my man answered me. "Evil amuses me, and when I give myself to it I never have myself paid. I sell only recipes that are useful to men; I distribute for nothing all those that are injurious to them."

I could not grow weary of contemplating this person.

"How happy one is, sir," I said to him with enthusiasm, "when he encounters people who think as himself! And tell me, heavenly man! what is the motive that makes you do evil, and what do you experience in doing it?"

"Listen to me," said Almani (this was the name of the chemist), "I

am going to answer your questions. The motive which engages me to give myself to evil is born in me of the profound study I have made of nature. The more I have sought to surprise her secrets, the more have I seen her solely occupied with injuring men. Follow her in all her operations, you will never find her anything but voracious, destructive, and wicked, ever inconsistent, provoking, and devastating. Cast your eyes for a moment upon the immensity of the evils her infernal hand strews upon us in this world. What does it serve to create us in order to make us so unhappy? Why does our sorry individual, as well as all those she produces, leave her laboratory so full of imperfections? Would not one say that her murderous art had wished to fashion only victims, that evil is her sole purpose, and that it is only in order to cover the earth with blood, tears, and mourning that she is endowed with the creative faculty, that it is only in order to display her scourges that she uses her energy? One of your modern philosophers styled himself the lover of nature; ah, indeed! I, my friend, I declare myself her executioner. Study her, follow her, this atrocious nature, you will never see her create except to destroy, arrive at her ends only through murders, and grow fat, like the Minotaur, only by the misfortune and destruction of men. What esteem, what love could you therefore have for such a force, whose effects are always directed against you? You will never see her dispense a gift without a grave pain accompanying it. If she lights up 12 hours for you, it is to plunge you into the shadows for 12 others. She allows you to enjoy the sweetness of summer, but it is only by accompanying it with the horrors of lightning. Near the most healthful herbs, her treacherous hand makes poisons germinate. She has the most beautiful country of the world bristle with volcanos which put it in ashes. She for a moment adorns herself for your eyes, only to cover herself with frost for the other part of the year. She gives us some vigor during the early part of our life, but it is only to overwhelm us during old age with torments and griefs. For a moment she allows you to enjoy the bizarre picture of this world, but only so that in surveying the dismal course of things that present it, you are at each step frightened at the terrible misfortunes that lurk there. See with what wicked art she intermingles your days with a little pleasure and a great deal of pain; examine coldly, if it is possible for you to do so, the maladies with which she overwhelms you, the divisions she causes to spring up amongst you, the frightful consequences with which she wishes your sweetest passions to be mingled: close to love is frenzy; close to courage, ferocity; close to ambition, murder; close to sensibility, tears; close to wisdom, all the ills of conscience. In what a woeful situation does she place you, in a word, since disgust of life becomes such in your soul that there is not a single man who would wish to begin living again if one should offer him it on the day of his death. Yes, my friend, yes, I abhor nature; it is because I know it well that I detest it. Instructed in its terrible secrets, I turned my thoughts inward and I felt (there is my answer to your second question), I experienced a sort of ineffable pleasure in copying its baseness.

" 'Indeed,' I continued to tell myself, 'is there a being as contemptible, as odious, as the one that gave me life only to have me find pleasure in everything that injures my kind! What! (I was then 16 years old), I am barely out of this monster's cradle when I am carried away by the same horrors as those which delight her! This is no longer corruption, for I am scarcely born; it is inclination, penchant. Her barbarous hand therefore knows how to mould only evil; so evil diverts her, and I should love such a mother? No. I shall imitate her, but while detesting her; I shall copy her, she wishes it, but it shall be only while cursing her. And furious at seeing my passions serve her, I am going to unravel her secrets so well that I may be able to become, if it is possible, even more wicked in order better to hurt her all my life. Her murderous nets are stretched over us alone; let us try to envelop her there herself while

polluting her, if we can. Let us obstruct her in her works, in order to insult her more keenly; and let us confound her, if possible, so as far more surely to outrage her.'

"But the whore made sport of me; her resources surpassed mine: we struggled too unequally. While offering me only her effects, she concealed from me all her causes. I have therefore limited myself to the imitation of the first; not being able to divine the cause that placed the dagger in her hands, I have been able to steal the weapon from her and with it I have served everyone as she."

"Oh! my friend," I cried out in enthusiasm, "I never saw an imagination more ardent than yours. . . . What energy! . . . What vigor! . . . And what evil you must have done in the world with so keen a head!"

"I exist only through evil and for EVIL," Almani answered me; "evil alone moves me; I breathe only by committing it; my organism is delighted by it alone!"

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

Reprinted from The American Freeman, Published at Girard, Kansas.

Sailor: "At this California naval base, we've had a little amusing excitement that Freeman readers may like to hear about. A rumor swept the place that all the officers are fairies, that this base has become the navy's center to which all officer-swishes must be shipped as soon as their patterns of behavior are discovered. A thorough inquiry was ordered to learn how such a rumor got started. Finally, it was discovered to have resulted from the fact that the base's rest rooms come in threes—one labeled Men, one labeled Women, and one labeled Officers."

* * *

Soldier: "Spam is a ham that didn't pass its physical."

* * *

Husband: "Let's have some real fun tonight." Wife: "Okay. Leave the hall light on if you get home before I do."

* * *

Oscar Levant, to starlet: "Drinking makes you beautiful." Girl: "But I haven't been drinking." Oscar: "I know, but I have."

* * *

W. C. Fields: "There's a literary phony in Hollywood who doesn't even hesitate to palm off Oscar Wilde's best epigrams as his own."

* * *

Woman: "My ol' man's gone fishin'. If you're set on findin' him you wanna walk a piece down to the crick an' keep walkin' until you find a pole with a worm on each end."

* * *

They were spending their 50th Winter together in the old, beautiful, spacious farmhouse. It had been snowing. The world was covered with a lovely mantle of snow. The logs were burning quietly in the huge fireplace. There was peace, security and harmony in every sound and move. Finally, the old woman said, slowly and sweetly: "I've been thinking how long we've been living together and that it couldn't go on forever like this. The time will soon come when one of us will have to go. Now, I'm not worrying about that now, but I was just trying to decide that when it does happen whether I should go to California or Florida."

* * *

Cafe owner: "I'm the guy who made the discovery 20 years ago that a few slivers of chicken draped esthetically over a mediocre portion of dressing has all the looks of a hefty helping of both. This deceives both the guys and the gals, which shows it's foolproof."

* * *

Dr. Patsy O'Bang, professor of English literature, closed a Harvard lecture with this announcement: "Tomorrow we shall study Sir Walter Scott's 'The Lay of the Last Minstrel' and try to find out why he didn't even mention her."

* * *

Bishop Beerbelch, to Patsy O'Bang: "The trouble with you materialists, O'Bang, is that you believe only what you can see and touch, and you trust too completely in Reason." Patsy O'Bang: "Make up your mind, Bishop Beerbelch. I can't see or touch Reason."

* * *

In his younger days, Bishop Beerbelch served the Ethereal Esquire as a missionary in the wilds of Borneo, where, after hard work, he

converted a whole tribe of cannibals. A year later, they invited Beerbelch to a grand feast to celebrate their first year of salvation and grace. "This meat," said young Beerbelch, "is exquisitely delicious. What is it?" "My favorite wife," beamed the chief. "We didn't think you'd mind one slight deviation to celebrate the grand occasion of our conversion."

* * *

Ivan Russky, explaining a problem in Americanese to another Muscovite: "'Okie-dokie' is the feminine of O. K."

* * *

Sign in grocery. "Three hours ago our milk was grass."

* * *

Bernard Shaw: "In heaven, an angel is nobody in particular."

* * *

Groucho Marx: "They're the kind of non-departing guests that when they stand up they think they've gone."

* * *

Sign in a delicatessen store: "If you don't smell it, we ain't got it."

* * *

Henry David Thoreau (whose writings are admired by many H-J customers) on city life: "Millions of people being lonesome together."

* * *

Groucho Marx: "If you're goofy enough to want to tell the truth, for Gawd's sake speak quickly and leave in a hurry."

* * *

A candidate for coroner in Missouri got elected on this platform: "You'll have to be really dead before I bury you."

* * *

Patsy O'Bang, to restauranteur: "Eating here has helped me solve a delicate problem in zoology. Now I know that the hare and the turtle finally came together. How? By the hair I've found in this turtle soup."

* * *

Heard in passing: "Gee, I wish I had enough money to go to Ecuador. Not that I want to go to Ecuador. I just want the money

* * *

Another judge deplores the degeneracy of the age. "There are", he says, "girls of 12 who seem to have developed as much as women of 19 and 20, and sometimes they have not only the appearance but the instincts of grown-up women." Does he want to go back to the days when girls were so educated that the young women of 19 had the mentality of a girl of 12? These degenerate girls of our time have done a fine job of work in the last three years even if they have had to retire occasionally.

* * *

"I painted this picture to keep the wolf from the door" the artist said to the dealer. "Then keep it on the door," said the dealer, "preferably the back door."

* * *

The soldiers sent a lance-corporal to complain to the orderly officer that the bread was stale and hard. "Tell them not to make a fuss about trifles," the officer said. "If Napolean had had that bread when he was crossing the Alps he would have eaten it without a word." "Yes sir," said the corporal, "perhaps it was ffesh then."

* * *

The distinguished British historian G. M. Trevelyan, a Rationalist (if you press him), said recently in the course of a public lecture. "It is a relief to escape from our own mechanical age to an age when the craftsman was more and the machine less, when imagination was more and science less." We fear that though it is not free from ambiguity, this will be quoted as one more tribute to the beauty of the Ages of Faith wrung from a great Rationalist. As a matter of fact Trevelyan is one of the scholars who has never moved a finger for Rationalism. All the same he would have been burned alive in his beautiful Middle Ages, and the craftsmen he extols lived on an average less than 30 years and were despised and exploited by princes, knights, bishops, and all the rest of their "betters."

* * *

An archbishop about the same date as Trevelyan showed how the theological mind approves the vague language which too many of our historians who are not specialists on the Middle Ages now use. He said: "Those were the days when men built cathedrals, monasteries, and universities: now they build gasworks, factories, and technical

high schools." We must, he went on, get rid of this corroding atheism. Of course, we don't build universities today or hospitals (which hardly existed in the Middle Ages), or princely places of entertainment, baths . . . But there is no need to extend the list. For one man or woman who had a good time in the Middle Ages a hundred did not; and a bishop ought at least to know that the rich one-tenth in the Middle Ages were shockingly immoral, very cruel, dishonest, and contemptuous of the people they exploited. The great age of Cathedral-building and craftsmen, the thirteenth century, was one of the lowest, morally, in the history of civilized Europe.

* * *

A bishop has been telling his people very energetically that the Church does not advertise itself sufficiently. He says that they have an unreasonable prejudice against using the press, radio, the cinema, etc. "to bring home the eternal truths of Christianity to a generation that has forgotten God." It sounds ominous. As things are you can scarcely open your daily or Sunday paper without seeing some lip-homage to the churches. Sermons and services are droned into your ears from the radio. Occasionally even your cinema gives you a bilious attack by making you sit through a dreary mystic picture instead of cheering you up with Bob Hope or Barbara Stanwyck. The outlook is dark enough without this new horror.

* * *

The wife of one of the staff at a fishing camp had a baby, and there was the usual fuss about it. Someone borrowed the spring-balance of one of the anglers in the camp and weighed it. To their astonishment the new-born baby weighed 25 pounds.

* * *

A new translation of the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius is out, and the editor meditates a good deal on Marcus. In particular he finds it an insoluble mystery how an emperor with such a beautiful moral code could so fiercely persecute Christians. He would find a good 'eal of light on the mystery if he read a little critical history instead of the lives of the saints. He would find in fact that there is almost no persecution to explain. It is doubtful if Marcus ever heard of this Greek-speaking group, with no chapel, across the river (outside the city) who called themselves Christians and quarreled like ladies in a harem. The only "martyr" of Marcus's time that we quite definitely know is Pope "St" Callistus, of whom his contemporary saint and bishop Hippolytus has left us a very bad biographical sketch. He was sent to the mines under Marcus for fraud.

* * *

The fire occurred just at the close of the annual firemen's supper. They managed to get there but it was noticed that one man kept muttering, while he directed his hose on the burning building: "Say when, Say when."

* * *

"No, a thousand times no," said the girl. "O.K." he said, "but there's no need for the thousand. I only asked you once."

* * *

Another attempt to reconcile science and religion. Perhaps says the inventor, who has been reading a little science, religion is not a vestige (or a disappearing organ) but a rudiment (or one only just beginning to develop). What next? Religion has flourished all over the earth for at least 50,000 years (judging from the cultural level of savages), but it has shrunk steadily and notably in the last 150 years. And they call this the rudiment or beginning of a new growth!

* * *

A pretty girl called at the country-mansion hospital and asked to see Captain Eric Fortescue. "I am his sister," she explained to the apparent matron at the door. "I am delighted to make your acquaintance," said the matron sweetly. "I'm his mother."

* * *

Mystics who cling to the prehistoric idea that the mind is a spirit always point triumphantly to the influence of mind on body; the abdominal effects of fear, for instance, which were known in the days of Rabelais. A team of scien-

tific experts has issued an interesting report on these effects of the emotions. As a matter of argument we did not need it. Common sense tells most of us that in such cases we have merely the action of one organ on others just as when a bilious attack gives you a headache or makes you kick the cat.

* * *

One of the most curious bits of plastic surgery during the war is described with names and details in a medical journal. A soldier had his thumb shot away. The surgeons amputated his forefinger and grafted it on the base of the thumb. It sounds like robbing Peter to pay Paul, but the point is that it gave the soldier at least some power to grasp objects.

* * *

A curious and unexpected result of the hot bath has recently been discovered. It has been ascertained —wild horses will not drag us to describe the experiments—that it reduces fertility in men and lessens the chances of conception in women. What is more curious is that a warm bath with a lavish use of soap does much the same to women. So when next you see a photo of one of the lovely ladies of Hollywood peeping out of a mass of soap-foam you may think of this.

* * *

At a recent teachers' conference one educationist found the true bases of his profession in texts from the gospel. One he quoted was: "It is expedient for you that I should go away." The sound meaning of his advice is clear enough—the business of a teacher is to stimulate the young to educate themselves—but many classes would have been hilarious if they had heard him say that. Other speakers, as usual, stressed the importance of "spirit". One, who may have been reading our challenge to give a precise definition of that sloppy word, said that in spite of its ambiguity pupils must be taught the importance of spirit. It is the first time we heard a teacher recommend something that he admitted to be ambiguous.

* * *

Edward G. Robinson, Hollywood art collector and actor: "An art dealer is a man who sells a painting he doesn't like to a man who doesn't want it at twice its value." . . . To a fine artist, from whom he had just purchased three pictures: "You have done much good work in your long and useful life, and now, from a financial viewpoint, it would be an excellant idea for you to die, though I take it there would be personal objections. You should think of the people who have been buying your numerous masterpieces. They love your work, but would like to see you croak, because their pictures would rise 500 percent in value just on the basis of a tiny newspaper paragraph reporting that you had shuffled off this mortal coil. The more you paint the more you depress values; the moment you die the supply is cut off and the vultures begin bidding for what you've left behind."

* * *

Music teacher: "To play like zee angel, you have to work like zee devil."

* * *

Bishop Beerbelch: "I do not approve of this new American version of the Bible. If the King James version was good enough for St. Paul, it is good enough for me."

* * *

In one of those one-building colleges run by some moth-eaten, fly-specked, sun-bleached, broken-down preachers there was a student who had been unlucky enough to fall under the influence of Ingersoll, Paine, Darrow and McCabe. His room contained hundreds of wicked Little Blue Books, which were sure to damn his soul to hell. Caught in the act, the student told the president that he could find no evidence of the existence of God. "Well, young man," said the Man of Gawd tartly, "if you do not find a God by five o'clock this afternoon, you will leave this college!"

* * *

From a cemetery association's circular: "Lots on the hill command a higher price because of the view."

* * *

Farmer: "I ain't greedy 'bout land. I only want what jines mine."

* * *

About 30 years ago, when W. C. Fields was doing one-night stands

in the Middle West, he turned in for the night at a hotel, dead tired. But he was assigned a room containing three single beds, two of which already had occupants. One of them, Fields learned later, was an old, pious deacon. Soon after the lights were turned off the other occupant began to snore so loudly as to prevent both Fields and the deacon from getting to sleep. The tumult increased as the night wore away, until it became absolutely fearful. Some two or three hours after midnight the snorer turned himself in bed, gave a frightful groan, and became silent. The deacon had supposed Fields asleep, but at this juncture he was heard to exclaim: "He's dead! Thank God! The bastard's dead!"

* * *

Gypsy Rose Lee. "There's no 'ism' in Hollywood but plagiarism."

* * *

Charlie Chaplin: "Jo Davidson is the last of the savage head-hunters."

* * *

Mlle. Alix, expensive dressmaker: "Nobody will be able to get out of bed this season before 5 in the afternoon. There are practically no dresses designed to wear before that time."

* * *

Overheard: "I'm having trouble with my chauffeur. He objects to my husband."

* * *

Groucho Marx: "She says she's 32. In other words, she admits to 40."

* * *

Heywood Broun, presenting a new contract to his employer, was afraid he might be particularly vulnerable, so in order to make sure of a model contract, Broun said: "I want to be sure nothing has been left out of this contract. So, let's add a clause that if anything is left out that should be in—it's automatically included!"

* * *

Robert G. Ingersoll: "Whoever produces anything by weary labor, does not need a revelation from heaven to teach him that he has a right to the thing produced."

* * *

Milllonaire soap manufacturer: "I attribute my success first to clean living. But I could never have won my fortune without pluck, pluck, pluck! Don't ask me to tell you whom I plucked."

* * *

Thomas Jefferson: "The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God."

* * *

Viscount Maugham, in a speech in the House of Lords: "A bath is very largely a luxury and water-closets are not really necessary in many rural places at all."

* * *

From the speech of a popular birth control advocate: "Early to bed and early to rise makes a man healthy, wealthy, and the father of a large family."

* * *

An almanac records that an old Jamaica custom permitted persons of wealth to be buried in the church, while those out of funds were buried outside in the churchyard. An inscription on a tombstone reads:

Here I lie outside the church door,
Here I lie because I'm poor;
The further in the more they pay;
But here I lie as snug as they.

* * *

Robert Benchley: "When people are talking about labor they mean work; when they begin to shout about it, they almost certainly mean organized workers."

* * *

Thomas Hart Benton, Missouri's atomic artist: "I have no prejudice against anyone except, of course, people of refinement." Mrs. Priscilla Prissy-Pratt, personification of refinement and prissiness, once told Benton that she didn't like the nude in his almost life-size "The Rape of Persephone," because, she argued, "the woman is just too naked-looking." Benton retorted, "What do you expect, when she hasn't any clothes on?"

* * *

Robert Benchley: "Old party politicians get campaign contributions from the rich and votes from the poor on the ground that they will protect one from the other."

* * *

Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times

A STUDY OF THE SEXUAL RELATIONS OF MAN AND ANIMALS IN ALL TIMES AND COUNTRIES

By

A. F. NIEMOELLER

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1946
By E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of America

BESTIALITY IN ANCIENT AND MODERN TIMES

Bestiality is among the most ancient of the sexual perversions—it is mentioned and decried, and penalties are set for it, in the Old Testament—yet of all the perversions it is the one of which least is known by the average person. Many, even, are ignorant of its very existence and totally unaware of what the term connotes. In the majority of cases, not even professional men have more than a slight acquaintance with the subject. Further, there is in general such a blind, unfounded horror of the whole matter (due, no doubt, in large part to this general ignorance of which I speak) which, coupled with the fact of there being extremly little data on the subject available to the general public, that there has been small opportunity for this condition to alter. The element of unreasoning horror should vanish through the application of logic and intelligence—while there may well be horror in the performance of a certain practice, knowledge of the features and occurrence of that practice but constitute the wise man's personal defense against its pitfalls and furnish him the highly necessary equipment to meet and combat it sociologically. Just as ignorance is no excuse in law, so is ignorance no defense of innocence. The second difficulty to enlightenment—the lack of ready data—it is hoped this little book will remedy in part.

Bestiality may exist as a perversion, a perversity, or (to make an alliterative pun) perforce, the two latter being loosely allied. By *perforce* I mean to say merely that bestiality may be resorted to by a person to whom individuals of the opposite sex are for any reason inaccessible but to whom animals are handy, as shepherds alone in the hills with their flocks for long periods, in which case the act becomes nothing more than a makeshift, as in many cases of masturbation, and will be left off as soon as normal conditions are re-established. But the scientific, medical aspects of bestiality will be found considered at another place; in this study it is our purpose briefly but competently to sketch the long history of bestiality from antiquity to the present and to point out various significant and curious features connected with it.

Our first concern should naturally be with definition. But here at the very outset of our study we run into difficulties engendered by this universal veil of prudish obfuscation that has for so long been tangled about the whole subject. The law, which certainly should be clear on this matter since it has for centuries taken it upon itself to condemn those accused of the act to death or torture, is most indefinite, merely lumping the whole complex matter without qualification under the broad, highly inexact term *sodomy,* and treating it accordingly. But, again, the legal aspects of bestiality will be found taken up at another place, so we leave it here.

The word *bestiality* itself has as a rule been taken in too broad a sense and granted too many vague alternate meanings to achieve the definiteness desirable for scientific study. Etymologically, *bestiality* refers merely to the nature of a beast, and is not restricted to sexual practices only. Consequently, the prevailing looseness of terminology is understandable and excusable, though the time has now indisputably come when a bit more preciseness could reasonably be expected.

This variety of connotations of the term is detailed by George A. Barton in the article on bestiality in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*:

"Bestiality, *i.e.,* the possession or exhibition of the qualities or

nature of a beast, may manifest itself in human life, and so touch the religion or ethics of a people, in three ways: in eating and drinking, in sexual matters, and in the manifestation of wanton cruelty. Apparently among all primitive peoples bestiality is in some degree exhibited. It is eradicated only after a considerable intellectual and moral development."

So we see that the broad usage of the term has its justification in the past, but certainly not in the future. Language must keep abreast of our culture and knowledge, and in scientific terminology the tendency must ever be toward greater exactness if possible. Hence, I suggest reserving *bestial* and *bestiality* for the sexual phase of the matter, leaving the terms *beastly* and *beastliness* to cover other animal qualities or leanings. The necessity for this is indicated in the final sentence of the above quotation. Bestiality, it affirms, "is eradicated only after a considerable intellectual and moral development." This statement, in so far as it concerns sexual bestiality, is patently inadequate in the great majority of cases, for there it is a matter of perversion, of a diseased mental condition, and moral and intellectual development can play little if any part in the matter. The same would hold true of "wanton cruelty" when it borders upon sadism. The statement can apply only to a primitive, uninhibited people; a people, that is, essentially quite close to animals, and then, surely, the term *beastly* is in order, as it should be throughout in the matter of eating and drinking.

However, our interest here is in sexual bestiality, and a fairly comprehensive definition of this is to be found given by Dr. Jacobus X. . . . in his *Crimes of the Genital Sense*:

> "Bestiality is any intercourse, through the genital or other channels of the man or woman, with a living being which is not of his or her species. This definition, thus widened, includes the generality of the cases; not only the anal or vaginal coition of the man with a male or female beast, the counterpart of the lascivious woman or of the passive man-pederasts, but also the labial pollutions to which certain animals are trained."

That is to say, any sort of manipulation or action involving in any way an animal and having for its object the gratification or, broadly, the excitation of sexual desires, will fall under the generic category of practices known as bestiality.

Before taking up the occurrence and prominence of bestiality in the history of man, it may be profitable and conduce toward a completer understanding if we pause to consider some of the general features of our subject. For the doctor's point of view, we may consult Forel:

> "A human sexual appetite exclusively directed toward animals is certainly not common. Coitus between man and animals usually takes place for want of the opportunity for normal satisfaction, or else as the result of satyriasis, nymphomania or desire for change. I have observed it especially in idiots and imbeciles who are ridiculed by girls. To console themselves, they give vent to their feelings with a patient cow or goat in the silence of the stable: for this act they get several years imprisonment, for the law on this point is severe. Certain degraded libertines satisfy their hyperesthetic and perverted appetites with goats or even large birds or rabbits.
>
> "There are, however, cases where a pathological sexual appetite is specially directed toward animals, and it is curious to observe the frequent preference of certain individuals for small animals which they skin (fowls, geese, rabbits), and thus put to death.
>
> "Bestiality is not rare in women who are also subject to this filthy, obnoxious and degenerative practice. Even if we put aside

cases of torture inflicted on small animals and if we avoid all prejudices, we can still, in all normality, consider bestiality as a crime, manifested by the depraved mind. In fact, considered from the point of view of law and humanity, bestiality is one of the most indecent of all the pathological aberrations of the sexual appetite. Human imagination only has marked it with the stigma of moral depravement and made it a crime. But it is recognized scientifically that it is a state of mental inferiority and often a sign of idiotic tendency, usually accompanied by a case history, tainted heredity and highly neurotic constitution.

"In cases of this kind which I have known and which were brought to justice, I consider that the real sinner should be confined to an insane asylum under medical attention, and not, as at present, to be condemned to imprisonment, thus making a martyr of him for no reason, and putting the ban of society upon him."

Forel, a doctor of the older school but imbued with the modern spirit, demonstrates the struggle that was necessary, and still is often necessary, to throw off the prejudices and biases of a bygone age and view this matter in the proper attitude of scientific detachment, devoid of all automatic hysteria. He tries to envisage it coldly as a docor should, but in the next sentence he is in spite of himself referring to it as a "filthy crime," or the like. Further, he shows himself to be not at all closely familiar with the subject by referring to its occurrences as "certainly not common." Mantegazza seems to be somewhat nearer to the facts in his statement:

"Man has cohabited with every kind of animal whose proportions allowed such connections: sheep, goats, chickens are preferred; horses, geese, ducks. There are many cases of horses being infected with syphilis by men. The Chinese are known for their especial love of geese and for their habit of torturing the birds in the most cruel manner after using them, to receive additional pleasure from the moribund convulsions of the geese.

"In Rimini a young man of the high Appennines, suffering from digestive and nervous disorders, told me that he had almost daily been guilty of committing love with goats. It appears that pigs, too, are not excepted from this favored class of animals."

But the catalogue of the animals used in this way and the variety in their modes of employment are well-nigh endless. In A. W. Herzog's *Medical Jurisprudence* we may find further details:

"Bestiality in men is encountered in many forms. Horses, cows, donkeys, pigs, goats, sheep, dogs and barnyard fowls are the animals most frequently used. In male animals the rectum is generally used, although in one reported case a man used the nostrils of a horse. In female animals the penetration may be into either the rectum or the vagina. In birds the penis is introduced into the cloaca of the bird and coitus thus accomplished....

"In most cases where four-footed animals are used in bestiality the man plays the active part in pedicatio, but there are instances where the animal is the active agent, the human male taking the part of the pathic; thus there is a case recorded where a farmer . . . was seriously injured, because he used a bull as the active agent.

"In other instances large dogs are used either for the active or passive agent in pederasty. Where the dog is used as the active agent, if the act is interrupted, before the dog has ejaculated, owing to the swelling of the glans of the penis, which occurs during coitus and which disappears only after ejaculation, the sudden withdrawal of the penis while the glans is swollen will often cause a laceration of the anus."

This practice is commonly considered so revolting and disgusting that it is likely to be regarded as falling within the province of men only, women being too fair and delicate creatures to have any part in such a horrible thing. However, this is decidedly not the case, and though exact records on this matter are naturally not obtainable, the indications are that women at least hold their own with men in this regard. Mantegazza has something to say in this connection:

"Nor is woman either spared the shame of bestiality. From the most ancient times, as Plutarch relates, women gave themselves up to the unchaste vagaries of the sacred goat in Mendes. Now, after a long series of centuries, it is the dog that takes the place of the goat. More than once do lovely women, in the highest spheres of cultural Europe, adore their lap-dogs, in a way they would not admit to a living soul. Sometimes, but more seldom, it is not a lap-dog, and then the aberration is still more base and despicable and instead of the bestial tribadism we have an example of bestial coition, of an infamous and shameful connection between the loveliest of creatures with the ugliest and worst-smelling of domestic animals."

But Herzog deals in more detail with the extremes and refinements to which women resort in their bestial indulgences:

"Bestiality in women is a great deal more prevalent than it is in men. Not only lap-dogs and large dogs, both male and female can be used for cunnilingus, but large male dogs are frequently used for actual coitus. Where large dogs are used for actual coitus in novices to this practice, there are generally marks from the claws of the dog, which can be found on the abdomen and on the inside of both thighs, in parallel arrangement.

"Not only dogs have been used by women in the practice of bestiality, but a case is related where a number of congenial souls amused themselves with fishes, by inserting the tail ends of the live fish into the vulva and then by pressing the head of the fish, would start it to squirming, thus tickling the vulva. Stekel relates a case where a young lady managed to use flies for her purpose. She would lie down on a sofa and separating her thighs would smear honey on and in the vulva. The flies thus attracted by the honey would tickle her until her sexual appetite was appeased."

It may thus be seen what a tender and never-failing mother is necessity to invention in all fields, and when necessity assumes the garb of fleshly desire the mother becomes hyper-fecund. It appears that no bestial device has been left untried in the assuaging of hot lust, and to this opinion all authorities who have studied the matter will unhesitatingly subscribe, as, for example, Iwan Bloch:

"There is hardly any animal which has not been in some way and at some time utilized for the gratification of human lust; but naturally in most cases the animals always available were employed, such as dogs, cats, sheep, goats, hens, geese, ducks, horses. Martin Schurig, as early as 1730, in his *Gynaecologia* (pp. 380-387), records a large number of cases of bestial aberrations in which, in addition to the animals above mentioned, apes, bears, and even fishes were employed. In antiquity snakes were often the objects of unnatural lust on the part of women, playing the part of the modern lap-dog. Bestiality is very widely diffused. Countries especially celebrated for the frequency of this practice are China and Italy; in the former country geese, in the latter goats, are preferred for sexual malpractices. In India, and also among the Southern Slavs, horses and donkeys play the principal part as objects of bestial love."

Bloch mentions bestial connection with one animal that I am sure will excite extreme revulsion in the great majority of readers, namely,

the snake. People are likely to pass this off hurriedly as an aberration of highly infrequent, even isolated, occurrence in the history of bestiality, but the facts, as we have them, would indicate quite otherwise. Forberg, in his famous *Manual of Classical Erotology,* treats this matter:

"It is an undoubted fact that the Roman matrons cherished a species of inoffensive snake, the cold skin of which served as a refrigerator in summer. Martial, vii, 87:

" 'If Glacilla winds an icy serpent around her neck . . .'

"Lucian, *Alexander* (Works, vol. iv, p. 259):

" 'In that country one sees serpents of an enormous size, but so quiet and mild that they are fondled by women, sleep with the children, do not get angry on being trodden or handled, and suck the nipples of the breast like a nursling.'

"This being so, our eminent Bottiger was probably right when he wrote on page 454 of his Sabina, a profoundly scientific work in German, that very likely snakes were used as instruments to satisfy the lubricity of amorous women. You may now understand what happened, or what might have happened to Atia, the mother of Augustus, of whom Suetonius (*Augustus,* ch. 94) wrote:

" 'I read in the treatise of Asclepiades of Mendes, called the *Theologumena,* how Atia the mother of Augustus having gone at midnight to the temple of Apollo to assist at a solemn sacrifice, fell asleep, and so did the other women present; how a serpent suddenly glided close to her, and after some little time withdrew again, and how on waking she purified herself, as though she had left the arms of her husband.'

"There would be nothing surprising in the fact that a serpent of that sort should have investigated, even without incitation on Atia's part, a certain locality which was well known to it by the lubricity of other women, and that Atia felt on awakening the very same sensation as though she had undergone a real coitus."

Nor do further recorded examples lack. Pausanias (iv, 14) speaks of the mother of Aratus, Aristodama, as having had intercourse with a serpent, and he says that the mother of Scipio was supposed to have had a conception of a serpent. He reports the same thing, conception through connection with a snake, of Olympias, the mother of Alexander.

To supplement this super-revolting aspect of bestiality, it may be mentioned here that not even such unlikely and untempting bedfellows as crocodiles have been scorned. Plutarch, in his treatise *On the Sagacity of Animals,* declares: "Quite recently our excellent Philinus, on returning from a long voyage to Egypt, told me that he had seen at Antaeopolis an old woman sleeping with a crocodile stretched comfortably beside her on her pallet." And the female crocodile, too, is at times taken advantage of, according to Giulo d'Aspremont who in a little story appearing in the *Mercure de France* states that the inhabitants of the Thebaid are from time to time not above "profiting by the clumsy position of the female crocodile awaiting her male" and "replace this latter in monstrous couplings."

Just as about all possible animals find a place in the practice of bestiality, so do about all conceivable attitudes toward it exist. The Church has long regarded it as completely and inevitably damnatory of the soul. The great majority of civilized peoples envisage it as a horrible and detestable crime, punishable by the severest penalties. Many primitive peoples look on it merely with amused contempt. Medical men place it in the sphere of disease and disorder. But it will surprise many to learn that there are even nations that tolerate it and see in it a thing permissible under certain circumstance. Such are Mohammedan countries, and Koranic law makes definite allowances for the act. A good interpretation of Islamic law in this respect may be found in *El Ktab,* an interpretation of Koranic law in all that pertains to sex by the Arab scholar Omer Haleby (bk. I, ch. v.):

"Do not couple, then, O men! nor fornicate with other men or animals! . . . This told, I ought to speak of the cases where, according to many doctors, who are in conformance on this with the opinion of famous physicians, it is permitted to fornicate with animals of large size, such as the goat, mule, etc. These cases are purely in the medical domain and can be put into practice only as a curative means and in the sole interest of health. It is thus that one is permitted to fornicate with *female animals* when he is attacked with simple or syphilitic gonorrhea, strong inflammations of the *Dkeur* (penis), and other affections, allowing of neither ulcers, chancres, nor sores of any sort.

"Experience has demonstrated that, under the influence of this fornication, man unburdens himself of the virus causing his maladies, without the animal's contracting them, for this virus is immediately destroyed by the great heat residing in the animal's vulva, and by the bitter and acid qualities of the secretions of its mucous membranes.

"If, then, O men! you are sick and without medical aid, or if this latter has been powerless, you may fornicate with animals, as has been said above; but this fornication should cease, under penalty of the infraction of the law of Islam, from the time that you will have regained your health."

The notion that sexual conection with animals is a cure for venereal disease, and especially gonorrhea, is old and widespread in all countries, and is an ever-present factor in the occurrence of the act among uneducated, superstitious people. Consequently, it is of singular interest to find that there is a belief, also quite old and reasonably common, which is the exact contrary of the other, namely, that syphilis had its origin in the bestial commerce of man. Paul LaCroix in his *History of Prostitution* gives some account of this:

"Two learned physicians of the 16th century, who had not, however, observed more than the secondary effects of this terrible contagion, proceeded to hurl, so to speak, the last stone by endeavoring to demonstrate, with more reason than success, that the origin of the venereal plague must be attributed to sodomy and to bestiality: 'A holy layman,' says Jean-Baptiste van Holmont in his *Tumulus Pestis*, 'in seeking to divine why the *verole* had appeared the century past and not before, was ravished in spirit and had a vision of a mare eaten with the farcin, from which he suspected that, at the seige of Naples, where this malady appeared for the first time, some man had had abominable relations with a beast of this sort, which had been attacked with the same plague, and that afterward, as a result of divine justice, he had unhappily infected the human species.'

"Later, in 1706, an English physician, John Linder, did not hesitate, in seeking for the secret causes of the American syphilis, to advance the opinion that 'this malady came from sodomy practiced between men and large apes, which are the satyrs of the ancients'."

It is quite a jump from these localities to Peru, but nevertheless we there find the same notion current according to the report of Mantegazza:

"David Forbes who lived for a long time in Peru and studied its geology says that they believe that syphilis is a special disease of the alpaca and is transmitted to man by this animal because of this vice (bestiality). There was also an ancient law in Peru forbidding bachelors from having alpacas in the house."

It is almost self-evident, and is borne out by the facts, that bestiality is far more prevalent in rural districts than in cities, and more spontaneous. For this there are various obvious reasons—as greater

accessibility, feeling of kinship, etc.—which are more aptly summed up by Havelock Ellis:

"Bestiality is very rarely found in towns. In the country this vice of the clodhopper is far from infrequent. For the peasant, whose sensibilities are uncultivated and who make but the most elementary demands from a woman, the difference between an animal and a human being in this respect scarcely seems to be very great. 'My wife was away too long,' a German peasant explained to the magistrate, 'and so I went with my sow.' It is certainly an explanation that to the uncultivated peasant, ignorant of theological and juridical concepts, must often seem natural and sufficient. . . .

"But it is by no means only their dulled sensibility or the absence of women, which accounts for the frequency of bestiality among peasants. A highly important factor is their constant familiarity with animals. The peasant lives with animals, tends them, learns to know all their individual characters; he understands them far better than he understands men and women; they are his constant companions, his friends. He knows, moreover, the details of their sexual lives, he witnesses the often highly impressive spectacle of their coupling. It is scarcely surprising that peasants should sometimes regard animals as being not only as near to them as their fellow human beings, but even nearer.

"The significance of the factor of familiarity is indicated by the great frequency of bestiality among shepherds, goatherds, and others whose occupation is exclusively the care of animals. Mirabeau, in the 18th century, stated, on the evidence of Basque priests, that all the shepherds in the Pyrenees practice bestiality. It is apparently much the same in Italy. In South Italy and Sicily, especially, bestiality among goatherds and peasants is said to be almost a national custom. In the extreme north of Europe, it is reported, the reindeer, in this respect, takes the place of the goat.

"The importance of the same factor is also shown by the fact that when among women in civilization animal perversions appear, the animal is nearly always a pet dog. Usually in these cases the animal is taught to give gratification by *cunnilinctus*. In some cases, however, there is really sexual intercourse between the animal and the woman."

Almost any person who has passed any considerable portion of his life in the country is able to relate one or more instances of having happened upon, in barns or the woods, farm lads *in flagrante delicto* with various of the domestic animals, the cow seeming to be the favored creature in the Middle West. So true is this that country boys even have a slang expression to cover the case: to *stump* a cow means nothing less than to employ some convenient tree-stump to make up for the discrepancy in significant heights between boy and Bossie. This ever-present obstacle to ready satisfaction was surmounted in another fashion by an ingenious young fellow of J. R. Parke's acquaintance: "A farmer's son, personally known to the writer, had, with considerable care and labor, trained a young heifer to submit to his attentions. The act was performed by the boy in a sitting posture, while the animal was lying down; and of one of the performances I was privileged to be an actual unseen eye-witness."

But enough of generalizations. Let us now examine as well as we are able the history of the occurrence of bestiality in the world.

For its beginnings in recorded history it seems we must go back to ancient Egypt, to the Egypt of Herodotus who tells us that there bestiality was an accepted religious formality, that regularly women were offered, that they offered themselves, to the caresses of the sacred goat of Mendes. Dulaure, in his *Gods of Generation*, speaks of this:

"'Whilst I was in Egypt,' says Herodotus, 'an astonishing thing happened in the Mendesian Nomes: a goat publicly had commerce with a woman; and this adventure was known to everyone.' This monstrous union did not take place every time it was solicited; and here the gross instinct of an animal showed itself superior to the human mind, degraded by religion. 'It must not be astonishing,' Plutarch informs an interlocutor, 'if the goat of *Mendes* in Egypt, shut up with many beautiful women, shows no desire for them, and is inflamed only for she-goats'."

Nor is Herodotus the only authority for the existence of such a practice. Quoting Dulaure further:

"'Nothing is so certain,' says the translator (Larcher) of Herodotus, 'as the infamous custom of shutting up women with the goat of Mendes. The same thing was practiced at Chemmis (a city of the Delta). A thousand authors have spoken of it.' Some verses of the poet Pindar, cited by Strabo, a passage from Clement of Alexandria, and several other writers of antiquity, attest to the existence of this religious and revolting practice."

Such a subject, naturally, gives anyone who, like Voltaire, loves to dwell upon the weaknesses and inconsistencies of man, a wonderful opportunity.

"It is certain," he says, "that in Egypt many women gave with goats the same example that Pasiphae gave with a bull. Herodotus says that when he was in Egypt a woman publicly had this abominable commerce in the Mendesian Nomos. He says that he was highly astonished by it, but he does not say that the woman was punished.

"What is yet more strange is that Plutarch and Pindar, who lived in centuries so far removed from each other, both agree in saying that women were presented to the sacred goat. This makes nature shudder.

"Pindar says, or rather some one has him say:

'Dear maids of Mendes, please declare
What lovers gather from your mouths
Those kisses sweet that I would share?
What's that! It is the she-goat's spouse!'"

A more modern authority who touches this matter is Lang:

"It is not to be doubted," he writes, "that many Egyptian women may have carried their superstitious infamy to the point of submitting their bodies to he-goats, while the men committed the sin of impurity with she-goats. This depravation has been very common in warm countries where flocks of goats are guarded by young men or young girls.

"In Lydia and Phrygia the cults of Ceres and Atys gave place to fetes in which the sacred orgies brought about the most monstrous debauches. It was these times of general rejoicing that brought about a disordering of passions, an unheard of exuberance, wild pleasures, and monstrous vices."

But sexual congress between goats and human beings in antiquity cannot be restricted to any one people or country. It is almost certain to be a factor of greater or lesser importance in the manners of any pastoral people, ancient or modern, just as it has had no insignificant place in our own West among the sheep-herders—so much so that to this day the term *sheep-herder* will in some regions carry opprobrium and even insult..

Another nation which in antiquity seems to have been especially addicted to this vice was the Hebrews. That bestiality was indeed prevalent in Canaan is made evident by the manner in which the Bible speaks of it (Lev. xviii, 23): "Neither shalt thou lie with any beast, to

defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it *is* confusion." But it apparently required more than mere prohibitions to stop the Jews in their bestial indulgences for we find (Lev. xx, 15-16) extremely severe penalties set for violation of this dictum: "And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death; and ye shall slay the beast. And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman and the beast; they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them." This penalty is reiterated in Exodus, xxii, 19.

Voltaire has not neglected to make observation upon these Biblical passages and the prescriptions of the Old Testament for the Hebrews to abstain from making offerings to the "hairy ones."

> "This remarkable expression," he declares, "plainly proves that beasts passed as having intelligence. Not only had the serpent and the she-ass spoken, but God, after the Deluge, had made a pact, an alliance with the beasts. That is why very illustrious commentators find the punishment of beasts that had overcome women, quite analogous to all that is said of beasts in Holy Scriptures. They were capable of good and evil.
>
> "As for the *hairy ones*, it is believed in all the Orient that they are apes, but the Orientals are certainly mistaken in this, for there are no apes in the Arabian desert. They are too shrewd to come into an arid country where it is necessary to go a long way to eat and drink. By the *hairy ones* one must absolutely understand goats. It is principally a question of he-goats and she-goats in these laws which unhappily had become necessary to the Hebrew people. It is to he-goats and she-goats, to *asirim* that it is said the Jews prostituted themselves: *asiri*, a he-goat or a she-goat; *asirim*, he-goats or she-goats."

Most of the facts of bestiality in antiquity have come down to us greatly confused with and distorted by legend. Nevertheless, the very frequency of this motif in legend and fable is in itself indicative of the frequency with which the practice occurred in ancient life. Naturally, these are no proofs and the circumstances prohibit finding any support for the stories, but they are certainly strong indications.

Thus, for example, early travelers in Peru tell that the women of the high mountains there ordinarily coupled with apes and that they lay with monsters who resembled men only in appearance and in their private parts. Again, Saxo the grammarian declares that a certain king of the Goths was the result of the commerce between a noble virgin and a bear. The Indian people claim to be the descendants of a woman of great beauty who had connection with a dog of extraordinary stature and remarkable vigor. The annals of Portugal contain the case of a woman who had intercourse with an ape and bore two children as a result. Job Fincel maintains that he saw men at Padua have commerce with beasts.

And so it goes. Legend, of course, always contains a large portion of folk-imagination, but authorities agree that it is never *all* imagination, that there must be a core of fact around which imagination may cluster.

There may be some profit in glancing at the attitude of primitive peoples toward bestiality since these would seem to furnish our closest modern approximations to the mental processes of the ancients. It requires a relatively advanced degree of culure for people to be stricken positively powerless with horror over some manifestation of a natural function, even when that manifestation may be somewhat perverse or out of the ordinary. The primitive man is more likely to take things as he finds them (contrary to modern man who insists on finding things as he wants them) and if they are not to his liking he will merely turn up his nose and turn his back with a minimum of hysteria. Conse-

quently, if his own inclinations tempt him from the so-called normal path he is able to follow his appetites without any great amount of striving against that pressure of inhibitions known as horror. We may adduce Havelock Ellis in support:

> "As regards the prevalence of occasional sexual intercourse between men or women and animals among primitive peoples at the present time, it is possible to find many scattered references by travelers in all parts of the world. Such references by no means indicate that such practices are, as a rule, common, but they usually show that they are accepted with a good-humored indifference."

The chief advantage to the primitive attitude of free and open acceptance of the natural sexual activities is that it renders the unnatural practices rather pointless and consequently subject to deserved contempt. Malinowski, in speaking of the Trobrianders, describes this viewpoint quite clearly:

> "The natives regard such practices as bestiality, homo-sexual love and intercourse, fetishism, exhibitionism, and masturbation as but poor substitutes for the natural act, and therefore as bad and only worthy of fools. Such practices are a subject for derision, tolerant or scathing according to mood, for ribald jokes and for funny stories. Transgressions are rather whipped by public contempt than controlled by definite legal sanctions. No penalties are attached to them, nor are they believed to have any ill results on health. . . . The Trobriander's contempt for any perversion is similar to his contempt for the man who eats inferior or impure things in place of good, clean food, or for one who suffers hunger because there is nothing in his yamhouse.
>
> "The following are typical remarks on the subject of perversions: 'No man or woman in our village does it.' 'No one likes to penetrate excrement.' 'No one likes a dog better than a woman.' "

It may thus be seen that the very freedom from prejudice in these matters that allows the primitive man to be not overly revolted by bestiality, also permits him to face the natural sexual functions so uninhibitedly as to minimize the necessity for any aberration. Perversion always appears as a result of some circumstance, psychic or social; relieving the aggravating circumstance, will bring about a corresponding diminution in the perversion. But it is only to be expected that people living thus closely to animals throughout life will feel a certain real kinship toward them that will make bodily union with them not nearly so unthinkable as to a modern city-dweller. Felix Bryk, who spent some years amongst the natives of equatorial Africa, has some words on this:

> "How much truth there is in the stories told about the Somali 'covering' she-asses, the Kavirondo cows, the Nandi goats, I do not venture to decide. My Uganda boy, who was an *ashkari* for a time, maintained quite definitely that he had once surprised a Bantu of the Kavirondo tribe with a cow.
>
> "That the blacks, as true nature people, examine intensely the genitalia of animals, is attested to by what they say about the vagina of the zebra, the clitoris of the hyena, or the penis of the ape, 'which looks just like that of a human being.' It is possible for such observations to arouse sodomitic desires in a weakling with pathologic tendencies, such as he could not resist, since he has a good argument for the justification of his acts in the negro's 'pantheistic' conception of nature, which draws no sharp line of demarcation between man and animal, and sees no important difference between them. . . . Is it any wonder then, that a shepherd boy with heated imagination, tired of masturbating, finally mounts a goat or a calf?
>
> "Such arguments must at least be considered in the generally

widespread sodomy of the Suaheli. I have been told by many people, both black and white, that the Suaheli and Arabians of the coast, especially around Mombassa, are notorious for their sodomitic acts on slain sea-cows (dugong). The missionaries had a difficult job in combatting this kind of necrophilous sodomy.

"This bestial lechery is motivated, according to the reports of many, by a superstition . . . it was absolutely necessary for the hunter of the dugong to cohabit with the animal he had slain, or at his next catch he would be dragged into the depths of the sea by another animal. But cohabitation with his prey would, on the other hand, insure him for the future against such an accident on the open sea. This sodomy, consequently, is part of magic, as a preventive act of safeguarding.

"Whether caused by superstition or not, but according to many reports the dugong, when dragged up on land, is to be mounted by none but fishermen. This is such a general occurrence that the people who buy the meat of the sea-cow make the Islamic fisherman swear by the Koran that he has had no sexual intercourse with the sea-cow he is offering for sale. They do not buy the meat from him unless he swears. They do not want the flesh of a creature that has served man as a beast of pleasure. That is cannibalism."

This business of what might be termed amphibious bestiality reminds one of that legend, current among the Eskimos, of the young girl who was married to a whale. The girl's brothers decided to put an end to this unnatural union, and they built a boat of magic speed in which they forced the girl to take flight, first taking the precaution to attach a rock to the rope by means of which the whale customarily pulled his wife to the sea-bottom. The animal discovered what was taking place and gave chase, which was facilitated for him by the fugitive's spreading along the boat's path everything to which she could lay hand. At last the whale overtook the boat, seized his wife, and together they escaped from the enraged brothers.

Classical times furnish a period whose very name is often taken as practically synonymous with debauchery and sexual excess, and it is only reasonable to expect to find bestiality, as well as the other perversions and perversities, occupying an integral place in the manners and customs of the people. To be sure, we find it well-established in the theology, mythology, and daily life of the times. The very gods themselves set the example, and it is dubious if deities were ever emulated more piously than these. The bestial exploits of the Roman gods are concisely and comprehensively summed up in a note to the Cosmopoli edition of the *Priapeia* (the work, probably, of Sir Richard Burton), and I can do no better than to quote it:

"The amatory adventure of the Roman Gods under the outward semblance of animals cannot but be regarded with the suspicion that an undercurrent of truth runs through the fable, when the general laxity of morals of that age is taken into account. Jupiter enjoyed Europa under the form of a bull. Asterie (whom he afterwards changed into a quail) he ravished under the shape of an eagle. Leda lent herself to his embraces whilst he was disguised as a swan. He changed himself into a speckled serpent to have connection with Deois (Proserpine). As a satyr (half-man, half-goat) he impregnated Antiope with a twin offspring. He changed himself into fire, or, according to some, into an eagle, to seduce Ægina; under the semblance of a shower of gold he deceived Danae; in the shape of her husband Amphitryon he begat Hercules on Alcmene; as a shepherd he lay with Mnemosyne; and as a cloud embraced Io, whom he afterwards changed into a cow. Neptune, transformed into a fierce bull, raped Canace;

he changed Theophane into a sheep and himself into a ram, and begat on her the ram with the golden fleece. As a horse he had connection with the goddess Ceres, who bore to him the steed Arion. He lay with Medusa (who, according to some, was the mother of the horse Pegasus, by him) under the form of a bird; and with Melantho, as a dolphin. As the river Enipeus he committed violence upon Iphimedeia, and by her was the father of the giants Otus and Ephialtes. Saturn begat the centaur (half-man, half-horse) Chiron on Phillyra whilst he assumed the appearance of a horse. Phœbus wore the wings of a hawk at one time, at another the skin of a lion. Liber deceived Erigone, in a fictitious bunch of grapes, and many more examples could be added to the list. (*Vide* Ovid, Metam. lib. vi. *v.* 103-126.)

"According to Pliny, Semiramis prostituted herself to her horse; and Herodotus speaks of a goat having indecent and public communication with an Egyptian woman. Strabo and Plutarch both confirm this statement. . . . Plutarch mentions the case of a woman who submitted to a crocodile; and Sonnini also states that Egyptians are known to have connection with the female crocodile. Vergil (Bucol. iii, 8) refers to bestiality with goats. Plutarch quotes two examples of men having offspring, the one by a she-ass, the other by a mare. Antique monuments representing men copulating with goats bear striking testimony to the historian's veracity."

Speaking of various monuments and representations portraying bestiality, there are in truth not a few extant. That wonderful German work on all phases of erotology, *Bilder Lexikon der Erotik,* contains many plates reproducing certain of these, and the curious may consult these volumes. The National Museum of Naples contains at this day a marvelous marble depicting most realistically an amour between Pan and a she-goat. A good picture of this group may be found, among other places, in Hans Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece,* p. 368.

As has been indicated, classical legend and theology abound in instances of uncensured bestiality, not among the common people, as one might think, but among deity and royalty, in the very highest places. The most famous example of this is the story of Pasiphae and the bull. Pasiphae was the queen of King Minos of Crete, one of the mightiest and proudest kings of the time. Pasiphae conceived an intense passion, a passion that would not be denied, for a certain snow-white bull in the flocks of her husband, and she pursued the bull untiringly in an endeavor to have her burning desires assuaged. But to no avail; the bull ever slipped away from her and went to join the cows. Desperate, she appealed to the inventive genius of resourceful Dædalus who constructed for her a hollow cow of wood (or some say brass) which he covered with the skin of a cow and into which Pasiphae could fit so that proper things came at proper places. This was then smeared with the secretions of an amorous heifer and the bull was led in. So signally successful was the experiment that some time later Pasiphae gave birth to the famous Minotaur, that legendary creature that is half-man and half-bull.

Naturally, we have no exact case-histories of bestiality coming down to us from classical times—they were not in vogue then—but the tone of the writers of the day leaves us no room to doubt that it was a fairly common occurrence in daily life. It even formed an accepted theme in theatrical presentations. Some of these, of course, were under the cloak of the mythological stories. The adventure of Pasiphae, to be sure, was a favorite. But later even this dubious veil of mythology was dropped. "That such scenes," says Hans Licht, "were not unheard of in Greek theatres in imperial times is shown by the fact that the mythological motive and the disguise with the animal's skin was given up, and

scenes of weddings between a human being and an animal were put on the stage *in puris naturalibus.*" A favorite of this sort was Lucian's *Lucius or the Ass.*

Juvenal, in his Sixth Satire, after describing the different forms of debauchery indulged in by the Roman women at their nocturnal orgies, declares that after they had worked themselves into a state of burning desire and there was no lover, slave, or any sort of man at hand, ". . . no more delay is there; she hastens to make a donkey ride her from behind." Also, the tone of Apuleius, in his celebrated book *The Golden Ass,* suggests that the passion of his matron for the yellow donkey is no isolated occurrence. An even better indication than all these of the extent of bestial practices is in the fact of the presentation of bestial episodes at the great public games and spectacles. Suetonius, speaking of the games of Nero, reports that: "During this diversion, a bull covered Pasiphae, concealed within a wooden statue of a cow, as many of the spectators believed." Martial, too, adds a bit of similar evidence in his description of the games of Titus and Domitian: "Believe in the union of Pasiphae with the Dictæan bull; under your eyes this myth of ancient times has been renewed. And let not antiquity, Cæsar, boast of itself; all that Fame has published the Arena presents before you." When the practice of bestiality can be freely portrayed at public spectacles it indicates that the act holds much more of interest than horror for the people.

During the Middle Ages, all seemingly unnatural or perverted actions or happenings were popularly attributed, largely through the instigation of the Church, to the powers of Darkness and Evil, to Satan and demons, and when the matter touched upon the sexual this was especially true. Thus, the terrible penalties of burning alive and torture were able to endure probably because it was felt that the devil was being struck at as much as was the transgression. Bestiality, of course, appearing as one of the most horrible and unnatural of all the sins, was almost invariably connected during this period with black magic and witchcraft. Concerning this phase of the matter Dubois-Desaulle has a fine chapter in his excellent work on bestiality, *Etude sur la Bestialite,* and for relevant data I translate certain portions of this:

> "The witches united in great nocturnal assemblies called Sabbats. These often took place in forests, in spots remote from all habitation. The demon was a guest there and appeared under various forms, man or beast. After the incantations and burlesque ceremonies of the cult, scenes of debauchery took place between the initiates; the Devil was their master and taught them a wild and abominable lustfulness.
>
> "At the Sabbat, according to the confessions of the witches, Satan appeared to them, sometimes in the form of a great, red man, 'tortured, tormented, and flaming, like a flame that comes from a fiery furnace,' sometimes as a bearded goat, because the goat is a 'stinking, salacious, and lascivious beast.' In order to pay him great homage the witches offered candles giving a blue flame to Satan, and then kissed him on the shameful parts from behind.
>
> "Also there were demons who took the form of goats or sheep and who accomplished the carnal act with the witches. The girls and women each held her demon by the hand or hoof. The dances and shakings were followed by scenes of debauchery.
>
> "Francoise Secretain, who was burned alive, admitted that the devil had known her carnally four or five times, sometimes in the form of a dog, a cat, or a hen, 'and that his semen was cold.' This Francoise, who called herself a witch, was perhaps simply given to bestiality and baptized the domestic animal that served to assuage her desires, a demon.
>
> "Some women admitted that they left the Sabbat, sometimes

on a goat, a bull, or a dog, sometimes on a horse, and often submitted to the assaults of the animal, which knew them carnally. There is to be read in a work on the history of France that in the year 1458 a great number of men and women were burned in the city of Arras, accused by one another. They confessed that in the night they had been transported to dances and that they had lain with the Devil, some under the human form and others under the bestial form.

"In Germany, in the country of Constance and of Navensburg, in the year 1485, Jacob Sprenger and his four companions, inquisitors of witches, wrote that they had tried an infinitude of witches who all confessed that they had had carnal copulation with the devil or with a demon under the form of a goat, a dog, or a winged horse. Henry of Coulongue confirms this opinion, and says that there is nothing more ordinary in Germany, Greece, or Italy.

"As for fauns, satyrs, and sylvans, they are nothing but the mischievous sprites who sometimes take the form of an animal in order to obtain possession of women.

"Saint Augustine, in the 15th book of the *City of God*, says that the copulation of women with the Devil is so certain that it would be a great impudence to say the contrary.

"Sprenger goes farther and says that many times the witches were discovered in the fields and in the woods and were having company with the Devil in broad day, and had often been seen unclothed and found by their husbands conjointed with the Devil, sometimes in the human form, very often in that of a goat, a black sheep, or a big dog. Paul Grillard, an Italian jurisconsult, who carried out the trials of several witches, tells in a book of witchcraft that in the year 1576, in the month of September, he was begged by an abbot of Saint-Paul, near Rome, to make trial of three witches, who finished by confessing among other things that they had had copulation with the Devil. . . .

"Boguet, who received the confessions of male and female witches, writes that 'the ugliness and deformity of Satan is the shape in which he knows female witches, sometimes in the form of a very black man, sometimes in the form of a beast, either dog, cat, goat or sheep. Satan knew Thevienne Saget and Antoine Tornier under the form of a black man. When he coupled with Jaquema Saget and Antoine Gaudillon, he took the figure of a black sheep with horns.' The great judge adds that there is nothing astonishing in the Devil's borrowing the body of a beast in order to know women carnally, since formerly one saw at Paris and at Tolose (Toulouse) women who abused a natural dog and that these women were burned to expiate so great a crime.

"The case of Francoise Secretain, who knew the Devil under the form of a hen, seems more extraordinary to the judge: 'I suspect,' he says, 'that instead of a hen she might have wished to say a goose, all the more as the Devil transforms himself into a goose, from which comes the proverb that: Satan has goose feet.'

"Boguet does not contest the power of Satan, who can take such forms as please him; equally well that of a goose, a hen, or a dog. Upon which he reports two examples. The first, of a dog that was said to be a demon, who raised the dresses of certain women of the diocese of Cologne in order to abuse them. The other, of dogs who did not wish to leave from under the beds of certain women of the country of Hesse in Germany.

"Saint Athanasius apprises us that the Devil often takes the form of a beast and thus more easily possesses those whom he covets. . . .

"In the confessions of Rolande du Vernois and of Georges

Gaudillon, one sees that the Devil had had intercourse with them in the shape of a large black sheep with horns, and that he often appeared at the Sabbat as a sheep or a goat."

And so it goes, on and on. Legal records of the Middle Ages, and later, are laden with trials and burnings for witchcraft, and in the majority of cases "knowing carnally the demon under the abominable form of a beast" was one of the stock charges brought against the victim. Superficially, the evidence would seem to point that there was a great deal of witchcraft, or at least witch-hysteria, but the more subtle implication is that actually there was a great deal of bestiality going on.

Reports from the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries concur in demonstrating bestiality as well-established in ordinary life, occurring even in high places from time to time. Havelock Ellis quotes Bayle as giving various authorities testifying to the fact that the Italian auxiliaries in the south of France during the 16th century were accustomed to bringing and using goats for the purpose of satisfying their passions. Also, that in the 18th century Warton learned that Sicilian priests routinely inquired of herdsmen in confession if they had had any commerce with their sows. The priests in Normandy were advised to ask similar questions. In Paris at this period conditions became so alarming that the police at length made a concerted attack on the vice. I translate a bit more from Dubois-Desaulle on this phase of our subject:

"In 1729 the lieutenant-general of police made an intensive drive against the sodomites who were multiplying at Paris.

"The sergeants were especially charged with the repression of the 'infamous ones' who gathered at the Demi-Lune of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, under the arcades of Saint-Louis, in the royal promenades of the Tuileries and of the Luxembourg, at the Porcherons, and the Saint Germain market. At this period the sergeants especially commissioned to this service were sergeants Simonnet and De la Janiere.

"This latter sent a report to the Lieutenant on a man named Saint-Jean, a proven sodomite, who, not content to run after boys, was found accomplishing the carnal act with a dog. This Saint-Jean was a floor-polisher belonging to the house of Mgr. le Prince d'Auvergne. Then 25 years old, he was a worthless fellow, given to all sorts of debauchery. A servant girl of the house one day surprised him in a cellar of the Hotel d'Auvergne. He was, says the report, in 'a posture to make those most laden with crime tremble; he had taken off his breeches, and the man lying on the ground held a she-dog between his legs in the posture . . . that he wished to have it. This man got up all confused, and the person, whose sex permitted her neither to remain nor make any remonstrance, fled dismayed.

" 'This fellow never again placed foot in the Hotel d'Auvergne since that time. He sent back his livery. Mgr. le Prince d'Auvergne begged the Lieutenant-General of Police to keep this crime secret, but to have Saint-Jean arrested and to conduct him to Bicetre in order there to do penance. Saint-Jean said that he wished to join the troops. It is of dangerous consequence to tolerate such a man for fear of the results he might bring on.' . . .

"Among the sodomites of the 18th century, there is also to be seen an abbot of Vienne accused, if not of having committed the act of bestiality completely, at least of having attempted it.

"The abbot Theru, Master of the college of Quatre-Nations, indefatigable hunter of the 'infamous ones,' the name by which sodomites were designated at this period, wrote to the police, in 1721, that being a prisoner at Bicetre, the abbot of Vienne 'had had business with a she-dog.'

"On May 11, 1722, he wrote to M. Rossignol, secretary of the Lieutenant:

"'I ask you in goodness to efface and change a word that is not exact touching the abbot of Vienne, to wit: that he had business with a she-dog since he is at Bicetre, and to put instead that he wished to have business. You were present, if I am not mistaken, when M. Deplaye said so to M. de Baudry. I implore you, without delay, to give this attention and I shall not have an easy mind until this correction is made, for I make it my duty and my honor to say nothing but what is true and certain.'

"Voltaire, in the middle of the 18th century, speaking of bestiality, invoked as proof 'the public notoriety of what goes on in Calabria,' and cited: 'The newly printed notice of the good Lutheran priest of Livonia, who exhorts the young boys of Livonia and Estonia no longer to frequent the heifers, she-asses, ewes, and she-goats so much'."

Approaching nearer to our own period, we find the 19th century not greatly different from any other in respect to the practice we are studying. Dr. Jacobus X——, writing in his *Crimes of the Genital Sense*, observes:

"Without being as widespread as among the ancients, or during the Middle Ages, it is undeniable that bestiality is not uncommon (in the 19th century). It is met with in the Cavalry regiments, and in country districts among ass-drivers and muleteers; but it is above all shepherds, swineherds, goat-herds, cowherds and tenders of geese and turkeys, etc., who indulge in the bestial act with the animals which they tend. There are few villages where there is not one of those degraded beings known by a name employed to designate their foul tastes."

This same source offers a variety of instances of bestiality during this period, and I reproduce here a few of the more curious from among them by way of illustration:

"As for the vaginal coition of the man and the bitch, I have but to consult my memories of childhood. In the small school where I was a boarder, we were half-a-dozen young rascals between 12 and 16 years of age. Onanism in common, and even pederasty, was a rage among us. The schoolmaster, Pere S——, had a fine tall bitch (Newfoundland crossed with spaniel) called Soumise. This beast had been trained by one of us, B——, a masturbator and sodomist, to lick him. A bit of sugar was the honorable recompense. The bitch had come in heat and had been shut by her master in a little room all alone, at the bottom of the yard. B—— got hold of the key, and, during the recreation hour, remained for half an hour in the room with the bitch. He then came back looking very happy, at the end of the time, and said to us: 'Do you know, I have . . . . Soumise.' 'It's not possible.' 'Yes, I tell you' . . . . Three among us, profiting by the undermaster's inattention, who was as deaf as a post and as blind as a bat, slipped into the room, where they operated in the same manner as B——.

"The arrival of the head-master put an end to these lubricities, for, without suspecting what had occurred, he sent the bitch into the country the next day, and she did not come back again.

"Another observation confirms the preceding. M. de P——, Commander of the Marine Infantry in New Caledonia, was obliged to get rid of a bitch that he owned, and which gave herself up willingly to the Hebridean servants of a neighboring colonist. The latter informed him about it. Puzzled at seeing the Colonel's dog always in his servant's hut, he went inside, and saw the dog licking and caressing the . . . . of one of the latter. The man confessed that he consummated coition with the beast only when she was in heat, but that his member could not penetrate beyond

the gland. Under promise of a litre of rum, the Neo-Hebridean operated in his master's presence, who then went and told everything to his neighbor. The latter hastened to have the animal killed. The Neo-Hebridean, the admirer of bitches, was a masturbator and a pederast. I had this fact from the mouth of the colonist, Colonel P—— having left the Colony when I heard about the matter.

"We now let Garnier be the spokesman.

" 'The impossibility for the man to make use of the dog cannot also be maintained in the case of the woman. Numerous instances of bestiality have been positively established, through the vagina, with the dog, in the case of women of evil life. It is therefore a kind of vulvary onanism which is performed. Some are even accused of letting them lick their vulva, as in saphism. Little dogs or young cats would be trained specially for this disgusting office, owing to the keener excitation of the rasping tongue of these animals being preferable to that of a man or a woman.

" 'It even appears that this bestial onanism is far from being uncommon in large towns, among prostitutes and gay women. So *cave canem*—beware of the dog—or girls and widows who drag and carry them about with them with so much care and such kind precautions. When they allow them publicly to lick their mouth, it is very permissable to suppose that they allow them also to lick them elsewhere. The caresses and kisses with which they cover them, the tender names of Jules, Thomas, darling, love, which they lavish upon them, are the signs by which we may recognize that they make lovers of them when they take them into their bed'."

So it goes with practically all authorities: the great consensus of opinion is that bestiality was quite prevalent throughout the 19th century, as it is to the present time. We have seen that amongst the Mohammedans it even has something of sanction by religious law under certain conditions, but despite this national, institutionalized tolerance of the practice, Paul de Regla, a doctor who spent a great part of his life among the Mohammedans, is led to declare: "Bestiality goes back to the night of time. In our day, it is to be met with a bit everywhere, but still more among Christians than Mussulmans." De Regla also gives an interesting anecdote concerning bestiality among Russian soldiers:

"Here is a typical happening which was related to me by an engineer in the service of Russia during the last Turko-Russian war.

"This compatriot was in a carriage following the highway that leads from Braila to the Danube, when his coachman was forced to pull up in order to allow a Russian regiment to pass which was heading, singers and musicians in the lead, for the bridge that would take them into enemy territory.

"In the rear-guard of this regiment, carrying some light burdens, walked a score of she-asses. The fine condition of these beasts, the care they seemed to be surrounded with, and the extreme cleanliness of their hairy coat attracted the attention of our engineer who, speaking in Russian with his coachman, could not refrain from having him notice the cleanliness and beauty of these quadrupeds.

" 'Parbleu!' answered the coachman smilingly, 'they are the regiment's sweethearts.'

"And as our compatriot appeared not to understand very well, the other explained to him the particular service that the she-asses rendered the majority of the soldiers.

—"Later, our engineer, living today at Courbevoie, was able to verify *de visu* the veracity of his coachman's assertions."

Of all beasts that might be employed in bestiality, it is indubitably the ape that occupies the position of greatest interest and seems to have played the most important role, both in fact and fancy. The reason for this, doubtless, is the fact that of all animals it is probably most adaptable to the act, being closer to the human both in anatomy and sensibilities. Sir Richard Burton, in a note to his translation of the *Thousand Nights and One Night*, gives his personal observation on these beasts:

> "The large Cynocephalus is exceedingly dangerous. When traveling on the Gold Coast with my late friend Colonel de Ruvignes, we suddenly came in the grey of the morning upon a herd of these beasts. We dismounted, hobbled our nags and sat down, sword and revolver in hand. Luckily it was feeding time for the vicious brutes, which scowled at us but did not attack us. During my four years service on the West African Coast I heard enough to satisfy me that these powerful beasts often kill men and rape women; but I could not convince myself that they ever kept the women as concubines."

There is some further information on this matter to be found in *Untrodden Fields of Anthropology*:

> "In such disgusting matters the ape plays an important part. In countries where the gorilla and orang-outang live, numerous stories are related of girls carried off by these big beasts, and their sexual connection with their victims. But we have accounts of voluntary intercourse between women and apes. For instance, the Indians on the banks of the Amazon river believe that certain tailed men among the Uginas are the result of such monstrous marriages between Indian women and Coati apes. According to Francis de Castelnau such cohabitation with Coati apes still takes place in those districts. He relates as follows: 'As I was going down the Amazon river, I one day saw near Fonteboa a black Coati of enormous size; it belonged to an Indian woman, to whom I offered a very considerable sum for this curious animal; but she refused, at the same time bursting out laughing. An Indian who was in the hut said to me: your efforts are useless, that ape is her husband'."

There is a superstition that has a certain currency at some places to the effect that so satisfactory is the ape in this capacity, especially to women, that once the innovation is tried the experimenter finds herself loth to return to a human partner. There is a story in the *Thousand Nights and One Night* that makes a feature of this point, and Sir Richard Burton comments upon it in a note:

> "This appears to be the popular belief in Egypt. (See vol. iv, 297 of his *Nights*), which assures us that 'no thing poketh and stroketh more strenuously than the Gird' (or hideous Abyssinian cynocephalus). But it must be based upon popular ignorance: the private parts of the monkey although they erect stiffly, like the priapus of Osiris when swearing upon his Phallus, are not of the girth sufficient to produce that friction which is essential to a woman's pleasure. I may here allude to the general disappointment in England and America caused by the exhibition of my friend Paul de Chaillu's gorillas. He had modestly removed penis and testicles, the latter being somewhat like a bull's, and his squeamishness caused not a little grumbling and sense of grievance—especially amongst the curious sex."

On this head Carveth Wells has a few very positive and highly dogmatic words, based entirely upon his own quite limited personal observation and totally unsupported by any tiniest amount of scholarly research, to settle the matter for us:

> "Gorillas do not carry women into the jungle and raise families as suggested in exciting motion picture films."

In 19th century France bestiality even achieved the dignity of becoming an organized practice, something after the manner of prostitution. In Paris, in the time of Napoleon III, it was one of the allied activities of a society for the advancement of sodomy that met in the *Allees des Veuves*. It was quite a major enterprise, much money being invested in it and fortunes in profits being taken out of it. A police report of July 16, 1864, contains the following information:

"When these assemblies were complete, they closed the curtains, and abandoned themselves to scenes of orgy and of scandal that disturbed the repose of the other dwellers in the house during a great part of the night. They were distinctly heard giving each other feminine names, and they could even be seen between the curtains masturbating and sucking each other. One of the specialities of these soirees was an act of beastliness which they called: *l'Omelette a la Grenouille* (frog omelette), wherein there figured a bitch, which must have been put to great pain, to judge by the howls of the animal that these gentry tried to smother by songs with accompaniment on the piano. These facts were attested to by most respectable persons, lodgers in the house."

In connection with 19th century bestiality, it would be remiss in the extreme to pass over a rather lengthy note appended to the Kama Shastra Society's edition of the *Memoirs of a Russian Princess* as it contains many data pertinent to our study. I quote such part of this note as bears upon our subject:

"In India, in certain of the hill districts, the native women whose occupations take them to the pastures, lie with the small race of ponies everywhere to be found there, and so little do the inhabitants consider the fact particularly noteworthy that an instance is in our full recollection of a native servant requesting us to order the infliction of corporal punishment upon his young and handsome spouse because she spent too much of her time going to and from her corporal enjoyment of the little hill ponies when she ought to have been employed more profitably to her lord and master within the compound. On our expressing our astonishment, the fellow, a *sicee* or groom in our employment, added many pertinent details which he took apparently much delight in explaining, winding up by assuring us that all the younger women of the station did the same and that he begged we would not think the worse of his better half. It was only the scandalous waste of time he lamented. 'Sahib! Sahib! let her be beaten for that.'

"The small black ass, common in Algeria and frequently to be seen in the south of France, is particularly small and a beautiful variety of the race also well known locally to be made use of in a similar manner and we ourselves have seen a negress for our special edification and experience excite one of these animals with a facility and success which fully demonstrated his amiable willingness to profit by the occasion in the most complete manner, had she, as she laughingly admitted she had often done, placed herself *a quatre pattes* and submitted her body to the brute's embrace.

"It is a common trick with these women to impregnate a sponge with the humidity from the sexual parts of the mare when in heat and this sponge is then held to the nostrils of the stallion or 'stone donkey' as he is called in some parts of England. The effect of this sop upon the animal is immediate and remarkable. He commences to exhibit symptoms of virility, he whinnies, snorts and, in stable language, draws. In this condition, if docile, he will permit himself to be further digitally excited with evident delight and in fact, if the opportunity is afforded him, with very little more encouragement he will mount anything on all fours and

complete his gratification without stint provided his organ can penetrate and he can obtain the sexual depository his senses require.

"Without going further afield, we might also mention the numberless instances in which these bi-natural connections have undoubtedly taken place with the domestic dog. There is hardly a village in England, France or Germany where some familiar story does not exist respecting some such misconduct on the part of one or other of its inhabitants. It may be said that these tales are malicious; doubtless it may be so in some instances, but whence does the idea spring, if not in itself the initiation of a plainly practical fact?

"A case of this description occurred in England which is so far typical that we tender it here in proof of our hypothesis. It happened at the assizes held by the judges on what was then called the home circuit, and not so many years ago but that the facts will be in the recollection of more than one celebrity of the bar and bench.

"It was remarked that a girl servant in a country inn crossed the back yard oftener than occasion seemed to require, and that she was on such errands generally followed by a large, black retriever. Two young fellows watched her movements partly out of curiosity and partly having also, as was proved at the trial, a spite against the girl. They went around the back of the premises, climbed a wall and displaced one of the red tiles which formed the roof of the 'garden parlor.' There from their secret post of observation, they swore they saw her enter in company with the dog, bolt the door, expose her legs by raising her clothes and arrange her position in such manner by sitting forward on the seat, that the salacious animal springing upon her actually had connection with her.

"To this they added details so shocking and revolting, as the judge modestly remarked, that the jury plainly discredited their evidence, though they were kept apart by order of the judge and separately examined and therefore could not know to what sort of cross examination they would be subjected. It was evident to all that an acquittal was imminent, when to the amazement of all the court, the prisoner herself suddenly broke down and hysterically weeping declared herself to be guilty, and to this she ever stuck.

"With her hands before her rather pretty face, she proudly told the judge that 'if any woman had once tasted a dog, she would never want a man again.' In this case the judge deferred sentence and there being some technical irregularities in the deposition previously taken before the magistrates, the home secretary subsequently directed an acquittal.

"We could multiply these cases ad infinitum, some curious instances of this extravagant species of debauchery are cited in books recently published in Paris, but it seems the medical officers in the service of the police either wishing to suppress the facts or, as was most likely, from sheer ignorance of the subject, declared the connection impossible.

"Such a conclusion is, however, sheer nonsense from a physiological point of view; the sexual organs of the dog being perfectly fitted to fill the conditions required if only the patients understand how to go to work. Luckily for society they do not and therefore we warn them in the words of the old proverb about the danger of playing with sharp tools.

"It would be impossible in a simple note of this description to do more than glance at the above facts by way of explanation of the text; but we would remark strongly and authoritatively that

the many stories so persistently whispered about, of conception having followed such conjunctions, are utterly false and devoid of foundation. We have heard it affirmed by persons of education and attainments of no mean scientific order, that specimens of such fœtal monstrosities exist in certain surgical and medical museums. We deny this fact upon the best authority, that of the curators themselves. No such conceptions ever did or ever will take place, otherwise the animal kingdom would long ago have been a chaos of monstrosities and the theories of the best and greatest of modern philosophers rotten at the core."

We shall very shortly take up this question of issue from bestial-human commerce, but first we pause to look at a report from F. S. Krauss which is of an order with the one just given:

"If I can venture to credit the reports I have so frequently heard (and it is difficult to believe that they are pure inventions), among the Southern Slavs intercourse between women and horses or asses is comparatively common. How they go to work in this matter I do not know from personal observation. I did, however, once see a Chrowot woman of ideal beauty, who stood at night completely naked in front of a lighted lamp, and in this position had intercourse with a tom cat. She experienced so intense an orgasm that she did not notice me, although I watched the scene barely two paces from the widow."

One more report concerning the occurrence of bestiality I wish to report, and that of fairly recent years: during the World War I. Magnus Hirschfeld's *Sexual History of the World War* is my source:

"In the case of another perversion—sodomy or bestiality, the connection with sex hunger created by war conditions is much clearer. This sort of sexual activity is even in normal times to be attributed to insufficient opportunity for the exercise of coitus, since a pathological sexual impulse which is directed only towards animals is rather rare. Of course in some few cases we must assume another factor in order to understand this type of aberration—satiety with the normal response and a desire for novelty and change. In regard to sodomy, we have the testimony of one of the leading military physicians of the Austro-Hungarian army that on the Italian front at least (he was stationed near Doberdo) such cases could be observed very frequently. The usual offenders in this respect were Hungarian hussars who used for sexual purposes the mares entrusted to their care. Even officers occasionally indulged this perversion and that is why men who were caught at this act were never brought before a military court but were flogged right then and there. The authority referred to above, estimates that on a conservative judgment at least 10 percent of the men in his division participated in such perverted sex activities. Such an enormous spread of sodomy and all experiences that have been gathered on this subject put it beyond question that we are dealing here with one of the sequelæ of abstention from normal sex activity enforced by the conditions of war."

Thus we see that wherever we look, regardless of race, clime, period, nationality, or social station in life, we find the practice of bestiality well-established and never a thing of negligible or even minor occurrence. To adduce further instances (and there are plenty of them) would add nothing essential to the general picture of the situation that we are attempting to sketch and would carry our study beyond the limits of our present work.

But there is one further phase of bestiality that must yet be taken up in order to round our examination properly. I refer to the matter of the possibility of offspring resulting from sexual union between man or woman and an animal.

This whole affair of bestial-human offspring is noteworthy for being surrounded by such a very great amount of superstition, prejudice, dogma, and almost complete lack of any sort of definite scientific data. Opinions there are in plenty, but no carefully controlled tests; at least no published tests. There is still far too much hereditary horror associated with the whole affair to permit even scientists to approach this matter wih the same air of personal detachment as they would, say, the functions of the brain or stomach.

And these opinions, even when emanating from professional men, vary greatly, proving that they have no real basis. Thus, for example, from a recent source (*Encyclopaedia of Sexual Knowledge*) we obtain the following view:

> "According to a fairly common superstition, amorous intercourse with animals may bring about the birth of monsters, half animal and half human. This belief has proved to be unfounded, for it has been scientifically demonstrated that the germ cells of human beings and those of animals are not capable of impregnating each other."

But not everyone is so positive as this. In a quite reputable book, Herzog's *Medical Jurisprudence*, we find the matter still left fairly open:

> "Only a few centuries ago physicians believed and at present a great many people still believe, that monsters resembling animals in some respects are the result of bestiality or maternal impressions. That shock, a sudden fright, may cause such disturbance of the intra-uterine life of the fœtus so that a misshapen child or a monster may result is not only possible but probable; that bestiality may lead to such a result as a monster is improbable, yet it should not be declared impossible."

That belief in the birth of such bestial monsters is extant to this very day is every now and then demonstrated by some particular instance. Vance Randolph, writing of the crude, uncultured folk of the Ozark Mountain region in his book *The Ozarks*, declares that:

> "Sexual acts between human beings and domestic animals are rather common in the Ozarks, and nearly every native believes that these unions are sometimes fruitful. Women giving birth to litters of puppies, mares bringing forth colts with human heads, and a great variety of similar phenomena are related and very generally believed. I have never been able to locate a hillman who has actually seen any of these monstrosities—'th' folks allus puts 'em out o' th' way,' as one old man told me."

But one need not infallibly attach these beliefs only to uneducated, rural persons. In a letter from a county judge of South Dakota that I received as a consequence of his having read a book on bestiality that I published several years ago, I find the following communication:

> "The matter of sexual relations between men and female animals has always been highly disgusting to me; while on the other hand sexual relations of women with animals is quite intriguing. This rather queer mental reaction may be due in part to the impression made on my imagination by coming upon a girl enjoying herself with a dog, some years ago. And while you are quite sure that a dog cannot make a woman pregnant, in a neighboring town I saw a monstrosity the parents called a child, which had a head shaped like a dog, was covered with hair on the face and arms (the rest of the body was not exposed), walked on its hind legs but in a bent over position, growled, grunted and whined in such a manner as to sound very like a dog; and although four years old could not say a word. I was not drunk; and the child was not in a side show, but at home, and kept from public observation as much as possible. This is the only thing of the sort I ever saw. I don't

know what the origin of this creature might have been, but it had all the appearances of a cross between a dog and a woman."

My communicant was eager for me to come down and investigate what he was sure was a genuine instance of bestial issue. While not placing any credence in the story (that is to say, not doubting the judge's veracity but only his interpretation of the case), I nevertheless entered into correspondence with the man to the end of looking into the thing, but when the judge tried to get a little more exact information for me before I went to the trouble and expense of a trip to South Dakota he found that the family had moved away, "no one knew where," and another of the numerous "dog-faced boy" stories that pervade certain localities vanished into thin air, as such stories seem inevitably to do upon close examination.

This problem is no modern one. If anything, it caused far greater concern in former centuries (as the Middle Ages) than it does today. Translating again from Dubois-Desaulle's chapter on bestiality and witchcraft:

> "A great question which prepossessed the inquisitors, judges, theologians, and finally all those who had a voice in the matter of the judgment and condemnation of witches, was to know if the union of male or female witches with the Devil, under whatever form it might be, was able to produce any result. The opinions were varied. Boguet did not believe that anything could be born from the coupling of a witch with a sheep, a cat, or a dog, because of the too great disproportion between them. Nevertheless, he recounts that two women who were burned at Toulouse and at Paris were brought to child-bed by the work of a natural dog that had made them pregnant.
>
> "And what proves that at this period bestiality was quite widespread, is what Boguet adds: 'One would see the earth filled for the most part with the fruits proceeding from such copulations, for it is not just from today that they have practiced it, in spite of the punishments that the law of God inflicts on those who render themselves guilty of this crime, and the fact that death may be the chastisement reserved for the man or the beast.'
>
> "Martin Del Rio writes that the imagination is of such power with pregnant women that women have been seen to give birth to a dormouse, another to a savage rat, and another to a monster resembling a bear. Torquemada thinks that these are punishments that God sends to women who give themselves to disordered and abominable couplings.
>
> "Among other examples: Alcipe gave birth to an elephant. In Switzerland, in 1278, a woman was delivered of a lion. In 1471, at Pavia, a woman gave birth to a dog. Finally, in 1531, another woman gave birth, from the same womb: first, to a male head enveloped in a film; secondly, to a serpent with two feet; thirdly, to a whole pig."

The obvious explanation to these tales of bestial births is by the scientific fact of teratism. Various factors, known and unknown, can affect a quite normally conceived embryo and cause the mother to deliver a horribly malformed monster with misshapen, missing, or multiple parts or organs. So common is this occurrence that there are several hundred accepted technical terms to cover various recognized types of monsters, to say nothing of the many oddities that fall between these types. Gould and Pyle, in their *Anomalies and Curiosities of Medicine*, have an excellent chapter on terata in which they also advance the belief that these monsters furnish the logical explanation to the tales of bestial births, and I can do no better than to quote them:

> "Many reasons were given for the existence of monsters, and in the Middle Ages these were as faulty as the descriptions them-

selves. They were interpreted as divinations, and were cited as forebodings and examples of wrath, or even as glorifications of the Almighty. The semi-human creatures were invented or imagined, and cited as the results of bestiality and allied forms of sexual perversion prevalent in those times. We find minute descriptions and portraits of these impossible results of wicked practices in many of the older medical books. According to Pare there was born in 1493, as the result of illicit intercourse between a woman and a dog, a creature resembling in its upper extremities its mother, while its lower extremities were the exact counterpart of its canine father. This particular case was believed by Bateman and others to be a precursor to the murders and wickedness that followed in the time of Pope Alexander I. Volateranus, Cardani, and many others cite instances of this kind. Lycosthenes says that in the year 1110, in the bourg of Liege, there was found a creature with the head, visage, hands, and feet of a man, and the rest of the body like that of a pig. Pare quotes this case and gives an illustration. Rhodiginus mentions a shepherd of Cybare by the name of Cratain, who had connection with a female goat and impregnated her, so that she brought forth a beast with a head resembling that of the father, but with the lower extremities of a goat. He says that the likeness to the father was so marked that the head-goat of the herd recognized it, and accordingly slew the goatherd who had sinned so unnaturally. . . .

"Plutarch, in his 'Lesser Parallels,' says that Aristonymus Ephesius, son of Demonstratus, being tired of women, had carnal knowledge with an ass, which in the process of time brought forth a very beautiful child, who became the maid Onoscelin. Aristotle mentions this in his paradoxes, and we know that the patron of horses was Hippona. . . .

"Writing in 1557, Lycosthenes reports the mythical birth of a serpent by a woman. It is quite possible that some known and classified type of monstrosity was indicated here in vague terms. In 1726 Mary Toft, of Godalming, in Surrey, England, achieved considerable notoriety throughout Surrey, and even over all England, by her extensively circulated statements that she bore rabbits. Even at so late a day as this the credulity of the people was so great that many persons believed in her. The woman was closely watched, and being detected in her maneuvers confessed her fraud. To show the extent of discussion this case called forth, there are no less than nine pamphlets and books in the Surgeon-General's library at Washington devoted exclusively to this case of pretended rabbit-breeding. Hamilton in 1848, and Hard in 1884, both report the births in this country of fetal monstrosities with heads which showed marked resemblance to those of dogs. Doubtless many of the older cases of the supposed results of bestiality, if seen today, could be readily classified among some of our known forms of monsters. Modern investigation has shown us the sterile results of the connections between man and beast or between beasts of different species, and we can only wonder at the simple credulity and imaginative minds of our ancestors."

Though personally inclined to disbelieve the possibility of issue between beast and man, I yet as a scholar who can find no unequivocal proof to support me must make a certain allowance for such a thing. Not that I for a moment think that union between, say, a dog or sow and a man could by any stretch of the imagination bear fruit—the species are much too far apart in the evolutionary series and the thing would be as impossible as a cross between a horse and a cat. But we do know that hybrids exist: mules are an ever-present evidence of that fact, and their production furnishes a major industry in some sections. But a mule is the product of the crossing of a horse and an ass, two

species that are reasonably closely related in the animal family—not closely enough to give offspring of either species, but closely enough to give offspring of a mixture of the two. Therefore, if issue should ever result from the bestial commerce of man it will undoubtedly be from crossing with an animal species neighboring on the human, such as the anthropoid apes.

The argument so commonly cited in disproof of bestial offspring, namely, that were such a thing possible the world had long ago been filled with weird, grotesque creatures, is patently foolish. It is a known fact of physiology that hybrids, with rare and inconsequential exceptions, are infertile. The mule is produced in great numbers, but he cannot reproduce himself: new mules must always come from new crossings of the contributing species. Consequently, the number of human-animal hybrids that might at any time be present in the world would always be in proportion only to the actual bestial connections that had taken place within an average life-span. These bestial hybrids would be continually dying off without augmenting their own numbers.

But, as I have indicated, if we are ever to have bestial offspring it will doubtless be with an animal after the nature of the ape. And in this connection I wish to quote an interesting note from Sir Richard Burton:

> "In parts of West Africa and especially in Gorilla-land there are many stories of women and children being carried off by apes, and all believe that the former bear issue to them. It is certain that the anthropoid ape is lustfully excited by the presence of women and I have related how at Cairo (1856) a huge cynocephalus would have raped a girl had it not been bayonetted. Young ladies who visited the Demidoff gardens and menagerie at Florence were often scandalized by the vicious exposure of the baboons' parti-colored persons. The female monkey equally solicits the attentions of man and I heard in India from my late friend Mirza Ali Akbar, of Bombay, that to his knowledge connection had taken place. Whether there would be issue and whether such issue would be viable are still disputed points. The produce would add another difficulty to the pseudo-science called psychology, as such mule would have only half a soul and issue by a congener would have a quarter-soul. A traveler well known to me once proposed to breed pithecoid men who might be useful as hewers of wood and drawers of water. His idea was to put the highest races of apes to the lowest of humanity. I never heard what became of his *breeding stables.*"

In view of all this it is of singular interest to read in the *New York World-Telegram* of December 30, 1932, a news item indicating that there has at least been some sort of definite scientific attempt to get at the real truth of this matter. In an address delivered on that date by Dr. H. S. England before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the speaker revealed that Dr. Elie Ivanoff, of Moscow, was endeavoring to produce an ape-man, a hybrid between man and ape, and that he hoped eventually to be able to display a complete chain of specimens from the perfect man back to the perfect anthropoid. His interest, apparently, was purely anthropological (with no commercial angle) and among other things he hoped to establish a concrete proof of evolution. He very cleverly surmounted the hysterical and anatomical obstacles to conception by utilizing artificial impregnation. The project was being financed by the Soviet government. The experimenters had gone into the wilds of Turkestan with nine female chimpanzees about a year previous to Dr. England's address and their last report had indicated that three of the animals had died, but that they were in constant expectation of producing a hybrid.

Let us hope that one day this age-old question will be settled one way or another, beyond all further dispute.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

Reprinted from The American Freeman, Published at Girard, Kansas.

WHAT CIVILIZATION OWES TO THE JEW

Europe is at present experiencing the most bitter phase of anti-Semitism that it has known since the days when everybody believed that the Jews killed Christ. You have, of course, heard the story of the sailor who one Good Friday was found battering a poor old Hebrew in the street because, he said, the Jews had killed Jesus; and when someone pointed out that that was a long time ago he explained that he had only just heard of it. Millions of folk still believe the story of the crucifixion but they seem to have reflected that since, on their own theory, the crucifixion of Jesus was the most blessed event in the whole human calendar it is rather illogical to resent it. In any case they are bound to hold that the Jewish sacred book is part of the revelation to the race, and they all, liberal and fundamentalist alike hold the totally unhistoric belief that in the ancient world the Hebrews were the supreme moral educators of the race.

Most of us do not care a button today about these ancient fairy-tales. We ask if a man is a good citizen, not what his ancestors did many centuries ago. We recognize the peculiar position of the Jew. He is the only man in the modern world (unless you want to count the gypsies) who has not even a few square miles of earth that he can call his country, and, as an effect of this homelessness and centuries of revilement and persecution, he has been hammered into a general attitude of isolation and suspicion. It is all the worse because he is the victim of one of those accidents of history which often have important consequences. Early in their settlement in Syria some of the Jews contracted a conspicuous nasal organ by interbreeding with (most probably) Hittite immigrants from Asia Minor—for a conspicuous nose is not a Semitic feature—and it has spread, oddly enough, to perhaps a sixth of the Jewish race. A large proportion of the milder anti-Semitism is due to it. To what extent all this has led a minority of the modern Jews to organize protectively, wherever his community is large enough, round the synagogue we have no facts or figures to judge. Roman Catholics in our country notoriously organize round their church to promote the profit of members. But the whole sentiment is based upon such a mass of rumors, spurious literature, personal impressions, and individual experiences that it is difficult to get the truth in a definite form.

There is, however, one general charge against the Jew on which one can profitably say a few words. This is that he is always or generally a parasite on the community. Most of the people who repeat this are so ignorant of economics that they do not reflect that in the modern age the distribution of commodities (including banking) and the rendering of services (teachers, doctors, etc.) are as important as the actual production, and in some ways this was even more important at the time when Europe most vitally needed help and stimulation. The fusion of the Teutonic tribes that invaded the Roman Empire with the older inhabitants and the substitution of a stagnant and (socially) uninspiring

religion for the old Greek-Roman culture left Europe a mass of rather sordid and entirely unprogressive folk. Stimulation had to come from without, by the way of trade, and in this the Jews rendered splendid service. The rich Jews of America would do far more for their race by having the facts fully established and then disseminated in popular form than by alliances with churches.

Reading people know, as a rule, that from the 10th century onward the Jews took a full share in the high Arab civilization of Spain and were the chief agents who took its products over Europe and helped to made an end of the Dark Age. But the work began earlier. In what is by a long way the most authoritative history of medieval Europe, the *Cambridge Medieval History* (Vol. VI), there is a good summary of this service. The writer says:

> "Few can have rivalled those 9th-century Jews who are said to have journeyed constantly from Frankland (France) to China, sometimes by the coasting routes of Southern Asia sometimes overland from the Levant, finding at innumerable points of the great journey communities of their own people to aid and protect them. Among these wandering merchants, men bound to no soil and by the law of no single community, there grew up habits of cooperation and a custom of the merchant which was to become the Merchant Law of later centuries."

Yes, you may say, but they just sought profit not the spread of civilization. So do most folk; particularly some of the crusaders for civilization of our own time. It is funny that most of the men who raise this objection pronounce a man a fool or a crook if he professes to do otherwise.

This in the 9th Century was the full development of a trade that had long proceeded. But as far as Europe was concerned it was only a beginning. Large numbers of Jews had settled in Spain in Roman days, and they had been well treated and had prospered. In the 5th Century they had passed under Christian rulers and, had been vilely treated. In the 8th Century a line of skeptical Arab leaders gave Spain a far finer civilization than even the Romans had done, and the Jews were as free to cooperate as the Irish are in America today. They held the highest offices of state and were amongst the most brilliant scholars. For the only time in the last 2,000 years some of them became princes and large bodies of them fought in the Arab armies, while Jewish ladies rode the cities as freely and luxuriously as the Arab ladies did.

You may read a summary of their big share in what is called the Moorish civilization and a chapter on the way they carried the stimulating evidences of that civilization over slumbering Europe in Joseph McCabe's *Splendor of Moorish Spain* (published in Britain, 1935). You will read how they advanced communities beyond Spain to the south of France, from which a higher culture spread over France; how from Arab Sicily they spread over South Italy as far as the poisonous sphere of the Pope's rule permitted them: how the first two universities in Europe and the new medical sciences were due to them. South Europe was awakened to a sense of its boorishness by the blaze of Arab culture on its frontiers and the overflow of Jews across the frontiers; and it was Jewish merchants who took the silks and ivories, the books and astronomical instruments, the washable linen and the use of soap, to the rough nobles of Britain and Central and Northern Europe. The modern Jews would do well to talk to us less about ancient Judaea and more about what they did when they got their great chance.



BUNK ABOUT ART AND RELIGION

Great art is a flower that grows only in the soil that is well watered with gold. You may hear of a humble Burmese spending years in carving an exquisite ivory or bronze or of fine sculptors or musicians being occasionally discovered in dingy attics or sleepy villiages, but the periods of efflorescence of great art occured only in countries that rose from poverty to a high degree of wealth. The intelligent traveler remembers this when he visits the sites of ancient civilizations and finds that the memorials of them that have survived the hand of barbaric invaders and the corrosion of perhaps thousands of years of time are religious mounments. Of the one more or less ancient civilization of America it is the Teacalli, the temple pyramids, that generally survive. In Egypt the chief monuments of the ancient civilization are either temples or other remains of religious significance. In the desert that was once Babylonia the largest mounds mark the sites of temples. In Greece it is the temples that immortalize the great race of long ago. The finest monument of old times in Rome is the Pantheon, the temple of all the gods. The Taj Mahal in India and the Great Mosque in Cordova testify to periods of Moslem wealth, and the cathedrals and other works of art of medieval Europe belong to an age when wealth came to each land after many centuries of poverty and squalor.

One thinks of the periods when the temples of Karnak and Luxos, the Parthenon at Athens, or the cathedrals of France and Britain arose as springtimes in the history of the countries where they were built, and one feels that it is just as natural as the bright eruption of flowers in the spring. The psychology of the development is not so simple but we still wait for some expert psychologist to make a serious study of it. We shall probably have to wait a long time because the spiritual police would cast an invidious eye upon any such attempt. In the last century, when the clergy of most countries finally lost the power of persuading by iron and had not yet come to realize the power of persuasion by gold, when they looked around desperately for arguments to support the tottering faith, they seized upon this predominantly religious character of the ancient monuments and claimed that amongst the priceless benefits which religion conferred upon the race was the fact that it—many said it alone—inspires the higher art.

The point is not important except in so far as it illustrates the flimsiness of the reasons which are given to persuade folk to join or remain in churches; and if anybody suggests that it is a trifling matter that they do remain in churches let him reflect again. Not only is it socially mischievous that the community should be distracted with obvious results between a social code of conduct and an ancient ascetic code that contradicts it on many points, but it is intolerable that clerical organizations which put their own interest above the national interest should live parasitically on the working community and dictate, with disastrous results, to its appointed administrators. On the strength of demonstrably mendacious statements about the effects of religion in directing social behavior they divert a vast amount of wealth from normal circulation, and their interference in national or international affairs is generally mischievous. They are, in national affairs, heavily biassed in favor of rich employers, and in international affairs they have shown especially in the last 10 years that they do not put the interest of the nation or the race first. They not only raised no warning voice from 1935 to 1939—as regards Japan to 1941—about the coming war, which was plain enough to see, but in the interests of their assassins who were sharpening their swords, recommended leniency to them today,

and either favor or refuse to denounce those who are driving America to stir up a third World War.

The Roman Catholic Church is obviously the worst offender in these respects and, while it is, on the superficial ground that it was the ruling church in Europe during the Renaissance, loudest in the claim that it inspires art, its claim is almost more absurd than that of the other churches. Britain, for instance, had no great painters before the Reformation, but it has had far more than any Catholic country since Spain became the richest country in Europe just when it finally expelled the Moors and crushed the Jews, yet its period of great art did not last 100 years. Italy, which had been splendid in every art during the skeptical and licentious Renaissance, became drab and tawdry when it shut itself in its "Catholic atmosphere." Catholic Ireland does not exist in a manual of art, and even in its modern freedom its level of taste is low. Poland, restored to freedom and independence in 1918, remained just as artistically sterile, as did also Portugal. American Catholicism became hundreds of times richer than even Italy was in the days of the Renaissance. What sort of a museum of American Catholic art could it, with all its wealth, put together?

It is a truism of history that periods of great art, which are nearly always periods of widespread defiance of the established religion, are temporary. They blossom gorgeously for a time and wither. That is why we do not find the great art of the Renaissance maintained after the 16th century; just as Athenian art or Persian or Moslem art had its day and decayed. But one art, music, had its greatest development in modern times, and it is an art that is particularly suited to serve church purposes.

What is the Catholic record in the field of great compositions? The American or the German (before 1936) church would pay unlimited sums for new and great Catholic compositions. But strictly Catholic countries, or those in which (as in America) the church is enormously rich and powerful, are confined to a body of first-class foreign music that is evtraordinarily small in comparison with the volume of great secular music. For solemn masses they use Beethoven, who was a serious philosophical apostate from the church: Haydn (a Freemason): Mozart (a Freemason and so notorious an apostate that the church refused to bury him): Weber (a gay and loose-living Catholic whose best music is secular): Brahms (a skeptic): Gounod (whose biographer describes him as vacillating between piety and sensuality). For other purposes they use well-known apostates like Cherubini and Schubert.

The only art, in fine, that has been as great in modern times as any, and far greater than in the Middle Ages, is literature. Of the 100 best writers of modern times beginning with Goethe, Schiller, Shelley, and Byron (all skeptics) how many were Catholics? You can count them on the fingers of one hand. How many great Catholic poets have there been since Dante—and Goethe and others challenge his inclusion—nearly 700 years ago? The Catholic would be bold if he claimed five out of the leading 50; and a literary critic would quarrel with him.

❖ ❖ ❖

A cozy little chain gang on a dusty southern road,
Was my late lamented daddy's permanent abode.
Now some were there for stealing, but my pappy's only fault
Was an overwhelming weakness for criminal assault.
His philosophy was simple and free from moral tape:
"Speculation is for sissies, but a he-man wants his rape."
Now daddy's list of victims was embarrassingly rich,
And though one of them was mammy, he couldn't tell me which.
Well, I never went to college, but I got me a degree,
And I reckon I'm the model of a perfect S.O.B.
I'm a debit to my country, and a credit to my dad,
I'm the most expensive Senator this nation ever had.
But I remember pappy's warning that raping is a crime,
Unless you rape the voters, a million at a time.

❖ ❖ ❖

Billy Rose's ad for an angel to finance an artistic opera: "Wanted: A Chump. Need man who is willing to lose $200,000. No education required, but must be able to sign checks. Excellent opportunity to lose derriere." . . . This ad was written after he was visited by Sir Thomas Beecham, who asked Rose to finance a new symphony orchestra, of which he and Stokowski would alternate as conductors. Asked if the project could pay for itself, Sir Thomas thundered: "Of course not! Good music must always lose money. With Stokowski and me you will lose more than usual."

* * *

Billy Rose: "Her face had more character before she got her nose bobbed, she eats like after a fever, and she has a new Pomeranian—a Pomeranian with pants."

* * *

Overheard: "My friends know he's filthy rich, but they say he's too old to be considered eligible, but I insist he's too eligible to be considered old."

* * *

A Kansas deputy sheriff: "That's a 'pitcher joint,' which is police vernacular for an establishment that keeps only a small amount of liquor on hand in a pitcher and serves mixed drinks. When a raid is staged, the pitcher is broken into the sink to keep officers from getting evidence of possession. When the pitcher is emptied by mixing drinks, it's usually refilled by bringing in a single bottle from an outside cache."

* * *

The New Yorker's good piece of writing on what happened in Hiroshima after the A-bomb hit the city was grim, realistic and disturbing, but in one place it gave me a wry smile. It was when the Jesuit realized that God really had been good to him. Here was a city destroyed and 100,000 people murdered—and a priest thanking God for his great love. You see, not only was he spared, but his suitcase also was undamaged—in a house that was battered to rubble. God's hand was as plain as the flash that atomized the city.

* * *

Who's ox is gored? Nobody has shown up the yapping about "Paternalism" indulged in by apologists for Capitalism better than Judge Jacob Panken, of New Lork. "Capitalists," wrote Judge Panken recently, "have always opposed what they called 'government paternalism.' Whenever unemployment insurance was urged, when old age pensions were talked of, when health insurance and medical service for all the people is discussed, capitalists oppose these services because they 'destroy individualism.' But subsidies handed out to the 'free enterprisers' do not to them appear to be a form of paternalism. We oppose those things which hurt us. We gratefully receive what benefits us. That is free enterprise. Summing up the continuous drivel about free enterprise, one must bear in mind that Capitalism was born of the competitive system; that is, the purpose of large-scale production and distribution was to destroy competition. Those who talk of free enterprise on the basis of small industry have not learned the lesson that the industrial revolution taught, nor have they watched the steps taken in the development of the capitalistic system."

* * *

Adam Stephen of Schenectady, N. Y., president of the Central New York division of the Polish American Congress, accusing our representatives of "sacrificing entire continents and hundreds of millions of people to totalitarian tyranny," recently affirmed that "we are faced with two alternatives, Pax Americana or Pax Sovieta." If we don't face them, we shall "be enveloped by the might of barbarous totalitarian dictatorship." Stephen obviously has Soviet Russia in mind, that "godless nation" so distressing to Christ's vice-regent in the Vatican. Could he include Franco? One might judge from his remarks that we should attack Russia forthwith, atomic or no atomic war.

* * *

George Orwell's donkey speaking: "God gave me a tail to keep the flies off, but I'd sooner have had no tail and no flies."

* * *

Gypsy Rose Lee: "The enemy of Rationalism is the dogmatic, whether he wears a theological or an anti-theological mask."

* * *

SEX AND SMELL

A STUDY OF SEXUAL OSPHRESIOLOGY, OR THE PART PLAYED BY ODORS IN SEXUAL ATTRACTION AND STIMULATION

By A. F. NIEMOELLER

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1947,
By E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in United States of America

INTRODUCTION

Among most civilized peoples smell in general, save for a few accepted elegant odors as those of expensive perfumes, delicate flowers, and appetizing foods, is a thing at which the elite nose is to be turned up. This elevation of the olfactory organ is not only literal in the case of any scent deemed offensive or even unrefined, but it also is figurative to perhaps an even greater degree at the suggestion that smells and the sense of smell have played, and still do play, a highly important part in our lives, development, and functions, and in particular in our sexual functions. Many a fine lady who is growing ever vainer over the number of men who are paying their addresses to her and who complacently attributes it to her own beauty, charm, "personality," and couture, would be more than indignant were it intimated that her peculiarly individual body odor might be a more powerful factor in her fatal attraction than all those other items put together. Blatant advertising of cosmetic and soap manufacturers (or rather of the opportunistic advertising agencies engaged by them) has pretty thoroughly convinced the general public, and in especial the female public, that "body odor" is such a detestable, repulsive, and inexcusable blight that it may well forever ruin one's business, social, and love lives, separately or collectively. Now what these charlatans refer to as "body odor" (which is so fearsome a thing that it must be glossed over as "B.O.") is really nothing of the sort at all, but rather is, on the whole, the scent emanating from the stale, sour, and rancid sweaty, oily, and other skin excretions that gather on the body, in hair, and above all in the clothing. Many a person sheds most of his B.O. along with his clothes, and so far as personal sweetening up is concerned a little "Duz could do it" in the laundry tub far better than an expensive deodorant in the axillae. What usually passes for B.O. is often actually the body odor of yesterday (or frequently of yester-week, or even yester-year) retained and altered for the worse for today.

As a mattr of fact, though it may be altered or inhibited by means which often are none too healthful for the skin or system, or it may be temporarily covered by drowning it in a flood of extraneous scent, true body odor cannot be destroyed. It is the result of a number of factors, among which racial and familiar heredity and individual personal peculiarities stand out, but it is there and it is as much a characteristic of a person as his pigmentation or the color of his eyes and hair. It is not, as "refined" folk airily imply, simply the result of slovenliness in personal hygiene. A healthy, normal Negro may step from a thorough scrubbing in a hot bath and by the time he has dried his skin his natural racial odor will be perceptible, and this is equally true of a white person, though in a lesser degree which is the consequence only of his racial background and not of any superior personal care of his body. Indeed, were it not for these characteristic body odors it is extremely doubtful that man or animals would have achieved anything like their present degree of evolution and development, so powerful is the part of smell in sexual selection and stimulation. Naive girls eagerly buy the highly self-touted commercial deodorants in the pious belief that they will facilitate the capture of an eligible man by destroying or preventing body odor and thus rendering them "dainty and kissable" (to quote from the nauseous ads), whereas the truth is that did these preparations actually destroy their body odor it would be a great disservice to the mating instinct which is much impelled and controlled by this odor. But body odor is but one of the elements (though a large one) in the story

of the relationship between sex and smell, and we shall go into it a bit more thoroughly farther along in its proper place..

It is a common mistake to think of physical love and sexual gratification as primarily arising in the genitalia and there being satisfied through coition. This is a most superficial and unthinking viewpoint which even a moderate amount of observation and self-examination will disprove, and if it should be true of any persons they would be found to be incomplete human beings. In order to be complete and wholesome, sexual pleasure requires that each sense enter into it, contribute its part, and derive its proper portion of gratification from it. Most people will admit that perhaps sight and touch may play some part in sexual reaction, but will hesitate to concede that taste may be equally important and smell perhaps even more so. So keen an observer of human affairs and motives as Shakespeare put the attraction of odor on a par with that of sight, and the French authority Cadet-Devaux, writing in the "Revue Encyclopedic," states that he considers the odorous emanations of the female the most important sexual attraction. And our own Oliver Wendell Holmes has voiced the opinion that physical and intellectual qualities do not exercise a greater influence on sex-affinity than those felt through the organs of smell.

One reason for the overlooking of the importance of smell in sex is the fact that the average modern human nose is not considered especially keen—certainly nothing to compare with that of a male dog who can scent a bitch in heat a mile off. There are some savages whose widely opened and sensitive nostrils enable them to detect enemies and even to track down game. Fournier, in the "Dictionnaire des sciences medicales," refers to a French woman living at Naples who had such an acute sense of smell that even slight odors were often intolerable to her and that sometimes she could not endure to be near certain persons. From a large group of women she could immediately pick out those who were menstruating. So hypersensitive was her sense of smell that she could not bear to sleep in a bed that had been made by someone else, and because of this she was at last forced to dismiss her maid and take care of her bedchamber herself. Fournier also mentions a young man who by smell alone could recognize his wife from other persons, and when in the army he could smell out the enemy like a dog. This last is especially credible in view of the tales told by many of the soldiers and marines who returned from duty in the Pacific during World War II: they said that in advancing through the jungle they took care when possible to proceed up-wind so as not to be spotted by Japanese snipers for, they said, they could often detect the presence of these snipers at a distance of up to 100 yards by a characteristic fishy odor which they attributed to the preponderance of fish in the diet of the Jap soldiers. There is a tale given in the Parisian *Journal des Savans* of 1864 about a Hungarian monk who claimed to be able to tell whether a woman was chaste or not simply by her odor. Dr. Monin in his book, "Les odeurs du corps humain" (Odors of the Human Body), refers to a certain women's specialist "who can admirably detect by smell, and without ever making a mistake, when any of his clients have their menstrual periods." It is said that the elder Baruel could invariably distinguish between samples of men's blood and women's blood by smell alone. And many more such outstanding examples could be multiplied would it serve any purpose, but we have enough here to indicate how keen and discriminating the olfactory sense may consciously be, and to imply how far-reaching and profound its unconscious effects may in general be.

The association of scent and sex may be traced back to the dawn of recorded history, and how much farther it recedes into the dim past is a conjecture, but it is more than probable that it extends back to the origin of man in view of the powerful factor it is in the sex life of the lower animals and the anthropoid apes whose instincts undoubtedly approximate those of emergent man.

Possibly the most ancient and certainly the most perfervid bit of erotic writing occurs in the Old Testament. It is known as the "Song of Solomon" and is redolent with odors, both symbolic and literal, as descriptive of the fascinating charms of the beloved and as used to enhance the ecstasy of the love meeting of the couple. The girl insists that "Because of the savour of thy good ointments, thy name *is as* ointment poured forth, therefore do the virgins love thee." She further declares that her beloved has cheeks which "*are* as a bed of spices; his lips *like* lilies, dropping sweet smelling myrrh." Even the intentions of this biblical love-sick girl are aromatic: "A bundle of myrrh *is* my well-beloved unto me; he shall lie all night betwixt my breasts. My beloved *is* unto me *as* a cluster of camphire." Of herself she modestly asserts: "I *am* the rose of Sharon, *and* the lily of the valley." And perfumes were evidently present in profusion for when she arose to let her beloved in the door her "hands dropped *with* myrrh, and my fingers *with* sweet smelling myrrh, upon the handles of the lock." Luxury and love seem ever to have been intimately associated with perfume and sweet scents, and to the fact that to this ancient Hebrew life was no exception the Bible bears ample witness in many places.

The ancient Greeks, with whom the refinements of love were a fine art, were by no means unaware of the close connections between sex and smell, as is amply borne out by numerous passages in such of their literature as has come down to us. Aristophanes in his "Lysistrata" makes some pointed references to sexual smells. And Philostratus, in the 18th of his collection of "Epistles," writes in warm terms to a boy to request him to return after a while some roses that he had sent him to be scattered over his bed, "since they then will have, not only the smell of the roses, but also the fragrance of your body." In ancient, luxury-loving Rome the extent to which the generality of the people came to indulge in bathing for eliminating objectionable odors (along with other purposes) and employed perfumes and ointments for substituting agreeable ones, at last attained almost the magnitude of a national scandal.

The pages of history are crowded with allusions to persons who were remarkable for the odors exhaled by their bodies, both on the agreeable and disagreeable side. Plutarch, in his "Convivalium Disputationum," records that Alexander the Great's body gave off a distinct scent similar to that of violets and that the garments he wore next to his skin were always redolent with this natural perfume. Martial goes into some detail on the excessively repulsive odor of the courtesan Thais and the inadequacy of the means she tried to combat it. Some persons give off a strong, penetrating sulphurous odor, and Schmidt tells of a 23-year-old journeyman saddler whose hands emanated a smell of sulphur so powerful as to fill a room with it in a short while. Rayer reports the case of a valet-de-chambre who consulted him because he could never hold a place long as a result of the odor he left behind him in any room where he had been working. Holy people of previous years were especially noted for their well-defined scent, the much referred to "odor of sanctity," which Hammond, however, attributes more to abnormal emotional and nervous states, constant association with incenses, and a confirmed neglect of washing than to any especial degree of sanctity. It is said that when the blessed Venturni of Bergamons was officiating at the altar the people would strive to get as close as possible to him in order to enjoy the delicious odor he exhaled; and that after St. Francis de Paul had subjected himself to a lengthy period of disciplinary inflictions and fasting, he gave off a most noticeable and pleasant odor. Not a few of these "human flowers," as Goethe termed them, emitted a distinct and pleasant odor of musk, some of them to such a degree as to have been made a matter of record, as in the case of Malherbe, Cujas, Haller, and some others. Our own Walt Whitman was noted for his attractive scent, and it is to be wondered if much of his power over the ladies did not stem as much from this as from the vigor and earthiness of his poetry.

One fact stands out: be it agreeable or disagreeable, attractive or repulsive, everyone has a more or less distinctive, personal odor about him, and it shall be our business in this paper to examine its various aspects in relation to sex.

SEX AND SMELL IN ANIMALS

It is fairly well known generally just what an important role smell and the sense of smell plays in the sex life of animals. Althaus has gone into some detail to show to what extent animals of opposite sex are attracted to each other through their olfactory sensations, and he points out that with few, if any, exceptions they give out at the time of their rutting (the season in which they are strongly prompted to mating) a strong and characteristic scent from their genitalia, which odor not only is recognized by the other sex of that species at some distance, but also excites a strong sexual desire which in some instances almost approaches frenzy. The distance over which this influence is operative in some cases approaches proportions that are almost unbelievable. As has already been mentioned, it is not uncommon for a dog to sense it at a mile, and there are carefully observed cases on record where a male dog has been attracted to a bitch in heat (the canine equivalent of *rutting*) over a distance of several miles or more. That smell is no purely adventitious factor in the sex life of dogs, but is a basic necessity, was amply borne out by the experiments of Schiff who removed the olfactory nerves from a number of puppies and found that when they attained their growth the males were unable to distinguish the females from the other males and failed to react sexually to females in heat. Naturalists have often tried the experiment of carrying some virgin moths of the Bombyx species in boxes in their pockets and walking to the center of a large field where they were far from the natural cover of the insects, and before long there would be male moths of the same species fluttering about them, obviously as a result of the attractive odor of the females operating over a considerable distance. Not a few animals have special little glands in their genitals, often in the case of the male in the prepuce, whose function it is to produce these sexually attractive odoriferous substances, and some produce them in such profusion as to make feasible their collection for purposes of medicine and perfumery—as in the case of the highly prized musk which is obtained from preputial glands in the Thibetan musk-deer, or castor which is similarly got from the beaver.

In general among animals it is the female who exhales the specific sexually attractive odor when she is physiologically ready for coition, which Nature has arranged to coincide with the time in her cycle most propitious for procreation, and it is the male who reacts to it. Since human beings are also of the animal family it is only to be expected that they exhibit traits in common with them, and the human female gives off a characteristic odor around the time of her menstruation, that is in addition to her normal body odor, which undoubtedly in the dim history of mankind made an important factor in his mating habits and which is less important today only because of the sophisticated pressures of modern civilization and the blunting almost to the point of extinction of the acuity of the great majority of mankind's sense of smell. But the influence is still by no means gone, as we shall examine into a bit later on. Humankind, however, or at least the modern version of it, differs somewhat from the animals in that the female is frequently as much or even more moved by the odor of the male than the other way around.

An interesting example of the power that may be exerted by the sexual odors of animals not only in their own functions but in the course of world history, is furnished by the anecdote of how Darius came to be

king. When King Cyrus died he left no son to succeed him in his kingship, so the chiefs all got together and agreed that they would all ride out early and await the rising sun (taken as a god by the Persians) on a certain hill, and he whose horse should be the first to neigh in salute to the sun would become king. Darius' stable master learned of this agreement and decided to give fate a little help in making up its mind, so on the evening before the chiefs were to ride out to the agreed upon hill he took a mare in heat there, staked her out, returned to the stables, took the stallion which his master invariably rode, led it to the odoriferous mare, and let Nature take its course. When on the next morning the chiefs rode out to the hill as per arrangement, Darius' stallion sniffed about a bit, pawed the ground and, the ecstasies of the previous night all coming back to him, neighed lustily for the mare to come back for a repeat performance. While this was going on the sun came up and all the other chiefs dismounted and got down on their knees to hail the new king. It might be added in passing that more than one page of French history has been altered by a king's susceptibility to feminine scent, natural or artificial.

The power of smell in the sexual processes of animals is well demonstrated by the use cattle breeders make of it. Certain females, especially among cows, give great difficulty in getting them fecundated — the French call these "Robinieres." One of the chief causes of this difficulty is the revulsion the male will exhibit toward these particular females, though he will be quite virile and eager with the majority of females. This antipathy has been traced to the peculiar odor of these shunned females, and breeders have succeeded in hiding or altering this odor with other scents in such a way as to overcome temporarily the repugnance felt by the male and thus getting him to fecundate the female.

These persuasive scents may be either natural or artificial; that is, they may be from other females which are not repulsive to the male, or they may be from plants and herbs. Among these latter, breeders have found that with mares strong infusions of French honeysuckle, wild thyme, sage, and other aromatic herbs are effective. With cows infusions of various green herbs seem to function quite well; and with rabbits infusions of white nettle or of wild thyme are of service. These infusions are spread over the animal, particularly toward the buttocks, or shallow injections of weaker solutions are sometimes made into the genitalia in order to cover over or lessen the odors from the genital secretions which repel the male.

It is especially difficult in the breeding of mules to get the male to mate with a mare of a different species, and in these cases recourse is usually had to the natural odors of a female of his own species, preferably of a female which is a favorite of his. A customary procedure is to have the strange female stay in the same stable with and close to the favorite for several days beforehand so as to take on the odors not only of the favorite but of the familiar stable as well. Just before the time of connection some of the genital secretions of the favorite are removed and placed similarly on the stranger, the male is led in, often blindfolded so that his eyes cannot uncover the fraud that his nose abets, and the covering is allowed to proceed naturally. Sometimes, however, this is not sufficient to persuade the male and he still refuses to cooperate, in which event the stranger is removed, the favorite is brought in and the male is allowed to smell her until he has himself in a sufficiently aroused condition, after which the stranger is again brought into position and the action permitted to conclude.

Stock raisers say that if the olfactory sense of a stallion is affected or perverted to any considerable degree it may result in his losing as much as three-quarters of his vigor, and that if this sense of smell is entirely destroyed he is most likely to fall into a condition of relative or even complete impotence.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SMELL AND SEX

As has already been indicated, the part smell plays in sexual selection in man, that is the mechanism through which an individual selects this or that person of the opposite sex with which to satisfy his mating urge rather than merely haphazardly seizing upon the first that happens to offer, has been considerably lessened in modern civilization. It is not improbable that primitive man snuffed a suitable mate out from among the trees or rocks with as much vigor and enthusiasm as is yet today displayed by a dog in the same endeavor, with little regard for the other person's more extraneous qualities. It is difficult to say whether smell plays a lesser role in modern society because of a diminution of olfactory acuity, or if the blunting of the keenness of the sense of smell came about as a result of disuse through its reduced prominence in sexual selection in consequence of the gradual substitution by civilization of other less direct, more sophisticated, and more or less extraneous criteria and stimuli. An artificial social structure, a highly competitive economic system, and the development and pampering of rather a squeamish attitude toward the "animal" side of human life all have contributed to lessening the importance of smell in sexual selection. Many women who are today married because of their family, social, or financial background, would have been promptly rejected on more fundamental physical or biological grounds had their mates been guided in their choice primarily by a primitive, unspoiled sense of smell. Also, present-day civilization makes it impossible for even an acute sense of smell to function properly in this connection, for that squeamishness which we have just mentioned prompts many persons to feel ashamed of and attempt to hide or disguise their natural, normal body odor with any of a great variety of factitious scents. Not that artificial scents cannot be sexually attractive, as we shall see later when we study perfumes, but in most cases they are chosen so ineptly as to defeat their purpose by repelling rather than attracting.

However, this is all merely a matter of the status quo; actually it has been shown that latent in the structure of our olfactory system there lies all the potentialities of sexual appeal through smell, and should conditions ever alter so as to warrant or make it desirable there is little doubt but that man's sexual responses would after a time again become conditioned to odorous stimuli. Indeed, there are some unusual or abnormal persons in which such a condition persists, some cases of which have been quoted previously. Neurasthenic persons, hypersensitive artists, perverts, and similar persons whose psyche is not chained and governed by the usual inhibitions are frequently highly susceptible and reactive to olfactory perception, thus demonstrating that the mechanism for delicate response to impressions of smell is still there if only we can discover how to use it.

Though considerably reduced, the sexual influences of smell are still no negligible factor among civilized people, even those who are psychically normal. The chief differences between primitive man and modern man in this connection are that in the latter the reactions are less pronounced as a rule and operate only over short distances, often only upon close personal proximity. Of course, there is to be found considerable difference between various individuals on this score. Some there are in whom the olfactory element may be the deciding factor in sexual attraction or repulsion; others there are for whom smell may be only

a contributory factor, an additional influence that enters to render an already attractive person of the opposite sex either a little more or a little less appealing; whilst there are still others upon whom personal odors appear to exert no ascertainable effect one way or the other, unless perhaps they happen to be extraordinarily pronounced. It seems likely that the major portion of the cultured persons of today would fall into the middle category.

An interesting and curious manifestation of the sexual power of smell is to be found in the ancient custom of the olfactory kiss, sometimes called the "smell-kiss." In this, instead of the labial contact of the usual kiss, the nose of each of the kissers is placed alongside the cheek of the other and the odor of each other is inhaled. The nose-rubbing salute of the Eskimos is a variation of this same thing. We of the Western World complacently think of our labial kiss as the only genuine article and like to regard the other as something of a perversity of "a few ignorant savages." The truth is that our labial kiss is the upstart and newcomer on the scene. The general introduction of the lip kiss seems to be of European origin, and the ancients rarely refer to it. Throughout the Orient, and particularly among the Mongol and Indian races, the olfactory kiss predominates, and over a large portion of the globe it is the accepted form of salutation between friends and lovers. Indeed, there are races of people who instead of saying as we would, "Give me a kiss," say "Smell me." Incidentally, our labial kiss simply substitutes one sense for another, that of taste for smell, but taste plays and has played a much less profound part in sex than the other.

Smell is undoubtedly the most intimate of all our senses. The rest of them play more or less over the surface of the object or person perceived, but it is given to smell alone in some degree to enter *into* the inner nature of that object, to sense and interpret its innate character. It is the only sense through which the psyche comes into direct contact with the perceived object, a condition that has led some to term smell the "sublimated thing-in-itself." In the words of Heinrich Steffens:

> "Smell is the principal sense of the higher animals; it represents for them their own inner world; it envelops their existence. Upon smell, wherein sympathy and antipathy are represented, is based the whole security of the higher animal instinct; for carnal desire is comprehended in this sense. . . . Indeed, in sexual union the subjective sensation which is developed by means of smell blends completely with the objective, and from the monistic union of the two arises the intenser libido, wherein the unfathomableness of the procreative force and the whole power of sex are absorbed."

Ernst Haeckel, and after him Kroner, goes even farther and envisages the two sexual cells as possessing a sort of low-grade psychic activity which enables them to sense each other's proximity, and he feels that this sensitivity which draws them together is comparable to the sense of smell. The seat of this sensitivity he declares to be in the nuclei of the sexual cells, and he labels it "erotic chemotropism," and he holds it to be the psychical basis of sexual attraction and desire.

As has been mentioned, among animals sexual desire is periodic, and the chief control lies in the female. When she is in a condition proper for conception she not only feels intense desire for coition herself but her genitalia give off a strong odor (the rutting odor) which powerfully inclines toward copulation any male of the same species who smells it. The periodicity of desire, therefore, lies fundamentally in the female and is present in the male only insofar as it occurs in those stimulating odors reaching him. Among a number of females of various rutting periods the male would be aroused at harzard as he encountered this or that rutting female, but if restricted to a single female his periods of desire would conincide with hers.

There is little doubt that somewhere back in the evolutionary chain humankind also had its rutting season and the male's sexual activity was pretty well confined to those periods when the female gave off the stimulating odor. As with the animals, of course, this odor originated in glands in primitive woman's genitalia, and there are authorities who are convinced that the little glands known as the glands of Bartholin which are found in the genital organs of present-day woman are nothing more than the vestige remaining from the odoriferous glands which functioned so importantly when primitive woman was subject to rutting periods. Today, in general, such odor as exhales from these Bartholin glands is largely only contributory to sexual excitement in the male, the stimulating emanation now seeming to rise pretty much from the entire surface of the female body. There are men, however, who experience intense gratification simply from inhaling the smell from female genitals. Some Oriental peoples have gone even farther and have worked out an entire system of classification of their women based on the type of odor given off by their genitals.

Distinction must be made, of course, between the normal, fresh odor arising from the female genitalia which are given their proper hygienic care, and that emanating from the stale secretions accumulated in and around the neglected vulva of an unfastidious woman. These old secretions soon alter and the scent they give off will almost invariably be repellent rather than attractive to the normal male—it is only an occasionally pervert who may find these unwholesome smells stimulating. Continued neglect can render such odors almost overpowering, and to this may be attributed much of the great popularity of perfumes in the "elegant" court of Louis XIV and neighboring times, when superficial finery and tinsel covered over a personal filthiness of the quality folk almost beyond comprehension; indeed, the unbathed fine ladies of this period openly and complacently boasted of the number of years that had passed since last they had washed their private parts, holding that it was only women of immoral lives or downright prostitutes who found it necessary to do such an "unnatural" thing. So valid is the hygienic factor in this matter that it may be noted even amongst animals, and it has been affirmed through careful observation that females who fail to keep themselves clean by licking during heat will find few males who care to join with them, saving only as a rule some males whose olfactory sense has in some manner become impaired or inverted, just as may, and does, happen with human beings.

The functioning of the sex-stimulating odor of women is such that not infrequently it operates to augment itself. Certain especially passionate women have been found who, under masculine provocation, will undergo an almost instantaneous increase in body temperature of from 1.8 degrees to as much as 3.6 degrees F. This temperature increase naturally augments the odorous emanations from her body, and her greatly heightened emotional tension will tend to promote accelerated secretion of her odoriferous glands, all of which will work to stimulate the male to a yet greater degree.

This erotogenic odor of women is not, naturally, a constant thing for all individuals: its quality, amount, and potency are as much elements of an individual woman's personality as are, say, the color, amount, and texture of her hair. It is on this basis that may be explained the great success of certain rather plain women with the "gorgeous hunks of men" whom all women pursue whilst their far more beautiful and shapely sisters stand around relatively ignored. It is not unusual for some of these by-passed beauties impatiently to demand: "Now, what's she got that I haven't got," and it is amusing to envision what would be their utter amazement if some honest and informed person would step up and tell them simply: "The right smell." As has been hinted at earlier, hiding or altering the natural body odor has in

all probability ruined more romances for women than it has made, popular advertising to the contrary.

When people think at all about sex and smell they usually think of it from the standpoint of emanating from the woman and affecting the man. This has probably been quite true in the past of evolution, but there is every reason to believe that it is not so one-sided with modern humankind. Though in different manners and to different degrees, many women of today are affected sexually by male odors just as profoundly as the other way around. The 18th century agitator, Wilkes, who was renowned as one of the ugliest men of his time, habitually boasted that if he were given an hour's start with a beautiful woman he would without fear of defeat compete with the handsomest of men for her favors, and it is said that on many occasions he made good his boast. His success was commonly attributed to his brilliant conversational powers, but more astute persons are inclined to find its basis in a personal odor he probably possessed which was peculiarly compelling to women. And 19th century Paris was all agog with the choice scandal of the Princess de Chimay (a Miss Clara Ward before she made the right marriage) who shamelessly chased around after a poor, uneducated, and rather uncouth gypsy violinist from a Parisian cafe; and here again it was obviously a case of a woman meeting a man whose personal odor she simply could not resist regardless of how many other good reasons there might be against such a connection.

Naturally, such extreme instances are the exception and as a rule with present-day women, as with men, the excitation of the smell of the opposite sex is contributory rather than fundamental in the arousing of the libido; but on the whole it is still far from a negligible factor, and the fact that many women will hotly deny its influence is due far more to its operating on them without their awareness of it than to its nonexistence.

It stands to reason, and is borne out by experience, that there is an intrinsic difference between the nature or quality of the male and female odors. It has already been pointed out that with women normally the chief seat of sexual odor is the genitals, and to this the rest of the body may contribute in varying degrees; whereas with men the scent arises primarily from the body as a whole, and this may be added to some extent by the genitals. Of course, with either sex there is always the possible added element of "associated scents" which are extraneous, non-body odors (as a certain perfume with a woman or a tobacco with a man) which by always being present on a beloved person eventually through association or conditioning come to wield upon the other of a couple a stimulating power comparable to that of the erotogenic smell itself, and in certain cases even greater. There are women who find themselves definitely moved by this general male scent, but to whom the specific odor of the male genitalia is not attractive or even repellent —"fishy," as some disgustedly describe it.

The odorous emanations from a healthy, robust, well-functioning male body seems to exert the greatest effect upon the majority of normal women. The exigencies of civilized, urban living much affect and disturb the wholesomeness and processes of the body, which in turn soon vitiates the purity of its odor, and this has probably been no small factor in the decline of the importance of smell in sex in modern times. More than one woman has waxed ecstatic over the "perfume" of some bronzed, lean peasant lad who works hard all day in wind-swept fields under the purifying sun, without quite realizing the implications of her reactions. In this connection it is to the point, we feel, to duplicate the lyrical description of this intoxicating aroma as given by a female correspondent of Havelock Ellis:

> "One predominant attraction of these men (peasants) is that they are pure and clean; their bodies in a state of healthy normal

function. . . . This 'natural fair perfume of the flesh' is a peculiar attribute of young men who live in the open air and deal with natural objects. Even their perspiration has an odor different from that of girls in ballrooms: more refined, ethereal, pervasive, delicate, and difficult to seize. When they have handled hay—in the time of hay-harvest, or in winter, when they bring hay down from mountain huts—the youthful peasants carry about with them the smell of 'a field the Lord hath blesed.' Their bodies and their clothes exhale an indefinable fragrance of purity and sex combined. Every gland of the robust frame seems to have accumulated scent from herbs and grasses, which slowly exudes from the cool, fresh skin of the lad. You do not perceive it in a room. You must take the young man's hands and bury your face in them, or be covered with him under the same blanket in one bed, to feel this aroma. No sensual impression on the nerves of smell is more poignantly impregnated with spiritual poetry—the poetry of adolescence, and early hours upon the hills, and labor cheerfully accomplished, and the harvest of God's gifts to man brought home by human industry."

The point of quoting the above is to illustrate that it is every bit as possible for a woman to wax as poetically ecstatic over the smell of a man, as it is for a man to wallow in lyrical transports over a woman's more conventional allurements, as her fair hair, blue eyes, or tiny foot.

Often the most enlightening and convincing proofs of the validity of sexual truths are to be found in their contraries, and to this smell is no exception. However real may be the influence of smell in the normal man's sex life, it is of even more importance with inverts or homosexuals, male and female. However, as might logically be expected, the male invert as a rule finds the normal female odor either unattractive or downright repulsive, whereas the normal male odor will move him strongly. The authority Raffalovich cites many instances of this, and he also advances the theory that as the body odor of a man undergoes a marked increase under sexual excitement, which is an established fact borne out by the experience of many, this heightened odor may work upon the man himself further to stimulate him and thus establish a cycle of self-augmenting desire. Also, male inverts find the odor of peasants and open air workers especially attractive to an equal or even greater degree than normal women.

This is all equally true of female inverts, though naturally in their case it is the odor of other women rather than of men that is alluring. The effect of smells on these persons is probably multiplied because not only are they as a rule less inhibited in their reactions than the average "normal" person, but in addition they not infrequently possess a hypersensitive olfactory sense. It seems safe to assert that there are few if any inverted women who are not influenced to a discernible extent by the fragrance of their beloved, and in many cases it is quite exaggerated, as for example the invert who is recorded as having requested of her "sweetheart" some of her hair so that she might in solitude intoxicate herself with its perfume.

In studying the place of smell in the sexual functions, it may be well to examine a bit into the relationship between the organ of smell, the nose, and the organs of sex, and their physiological connections.

The nose, that is its outward characteristics and in particular its size and to a somewhat lesser degree its shape and placement, has from remote antiquity been taken by a great many peoples as rather a direct and dependable index of either the size of the sexual organ or of sexual vigor, or of both. Particularly in men a large nose has long been popularly presumed to be indicative of a large virile member. The ancient Romans were well convinced of this, and it is an odd coincidence that the old Roman poet who is undoubtedly the outstanding singer of the

beauties, problems, and techniques of love, Ovid, had as part of his name the word *Naso,* which is the Latin for *nose* and which was accorded his family by reason of the dominant olfactory organ that adorned the males of the line. To this day the average Italian believes in the correspondence of size of the two organs, and there are even several proverbs current in the country, especially around Venice, which are based upon this theory.

In women, a large nose is frequently taken as an indication of extreme sexual ardor, as it also is to some extent in men, since it is usually taken for granted that a large member signifies strong sexual vigor and appetite. This belief obtained even amongst so staid a people as the English, as is evidenced by a reference in a 16th century play by Massinger, "Emperor of the East":

> Her nose, which by its length assures me
> Of storms at midnight if I fail to pay her
> The tribute she expects.

Nor are more recent times, including even the present, free from this belief. The satiric and skeptical Schopenhauer states quite definitely: "The fate of innumerable girls has been decided by a slight upward or downward curve of the nose." And one of the famous wisecracks of history was made on this basis by Pascal when he observed that had Cleopatra's nose been but a trifle larger, the whole political geography of our globe might have taken a different course. To this day most phrenologists, fortune-tellers, and seers of all sorts utilize the external characteristics of their clients' noses in prognosticating in connection with their sex lives.

While many of the beliefs centering about this nose-sex relationship contain a goodly portion of outright superstition, there nevertheless appears to be some basis for them in physical and physiological fact. In most persons there actually is a notable increase in the size of the nasal septum during puberty, the time when the sex organs are developing into readiness to function. And there are other close connections between the olfactory and sexual regions which doctors have studied and the observation of which long ago by the common folk must have given rise to these various beliefs. Marro, who made detailed studies of a great number of criminals, found that there was no class of criminal in which there was so large a percentage of anomalies of both nasal and genital organs as in the sex criminal.

In all probability the physiological relationship between the nose and the sexual function is even closer than the physical, and this is true of both men and women. The main reactions from the sex processes seem to be upon the mucous membrane of the nose. Often this shows a remarkable sympathetic response to various sexual activities, and at other times the genital organs will appear to respond to olfactory functions or disorders. So well established is this correlation that it has been given a special name, the naso-genital reflex. Though operating in both sexes, it gives evidence of greater prevalence among women.

The symptoms often start early, usually with puberty when the sex glands are maturing. In addition to the increase in the nasal septum mentioned previously there is many times recurrent bleeding of the nose, not infrequently to a troublesome degree. In women this nose-bleeding is often noted at the time of menstruation, and in certain cases it may entirely replace menstruation, bleeding taking place from the nose only and not from the vulva, in which event it is termed "vicarious menstruation." Also, nose-bleed is far from uncommon during periods of sexual excitement, as during or after coition or masturbation. Indeed, there have been cases in which severe nose-bleed has been stopped or considerably lessened by applying ice to the genital region. Conversely, there have even been gynecologists who have attempted to treat pelvic disorders, and especially menstrual disfunctions, by cauterizing the

nasal mucous membrane, theorizing that a beneficial reflex could thus be induced in the pelvic organs. Congestion of the nasal mucosa is quite common during sexual tension, often accompanied by sneezing and more or less profuse mucous secretion, and the term "bride's cold" is popularly used to refer to this condition in a woman on her honeymoon, when naturally sexual excitement is usually maintained at rather a high pitch for some time. Dr. E. S. Talbot gives an interesting case that illustrates the close inter-relationship of nasal and genital areas. A 56-year-old man was operated on for the removal of the cartilage on the left side of the septum of the nose in order to correct a condition remaining from an accident to his nose in early life. The operation was done under a local anesthetic and no pain was felt save at one point of the lower rear portion near the floor of the nose, and as a result the patient underwent a severe shock of the general system. The reflex from this pain so influenced the sexual organs as to bring about a continuous flow of semen for three weeks. Treatment succeeded in checking this flow, but the patient suffered neurasthenia and general malaise and lassitude for months after. And we may find a final evidence of the bonds existing between the nose and the genitals in the fact that, just as in the young the maturing of the sexual organs is commonly accompanied by an increase in the acuity of the sense of smell, as if to augment this budding function; so in the old as the sexual powers fade out there is frequently a relatively sudden upsurge in the keenness of smell, as if nature wished to compensate for the waning of a function with a corresponding enhancing of an allied one. This same condition is often encountered in younger men who for one reason or another become impotent, and in them this exaggerated sharpness of smell may come to replace its correlated function, sex, and the result is olfactory fetishism, of which more later.

A closer and more careful study of the exact relation between the olfactory and sexual functions and their organs would doubtless be productive of a much deeper understanding of the fundamental nature of sex, the libido, and its points of contact with the other bodily functions and organs, but as yet such study has on the whole been rather superficial and poorly organized with all too little attempt properly to distinguish between the physiological and pathological relations between the nose and the sex organs.

SEX-STIMULATING ODORS

It goes almost without saying that in the matter of smells capable of arousing sexual reactions some aspect of the body odor of the opposite sex is fundamental. It follows with equal logic that where there is some sex-inciting scent of non-body origin it will as a rule obtain its validity through resemblance to or association with actual body odor. In other words, an artificial or extrinsic scent may prove stimulating simply because it happens to smell much like some element of the human body (as the odor of Spanish leather resembles that of a warm, moist human body, or the odor of moderately sauted mushrooms closely suggests that of fresh semen) or is made to smell like the human body, as in the case of carefully prepared perfumes. In addition there are smells which by all outward evidences bear no similarity to that of the body, and these are of two general sorts. There are certain perfumes and natural scents which, while bearing no obvious relation to body odor, yet appear to work as sex-excitants upon a goodly portion of normal people—and these we shall consider in more detail in a later chapter on perfumes. But when we come to abnormal persons, all rules are off and it is possible for almost any smell in the world, however far re-

moved from sex or body odors, to become associated for one reason or another in the mind of a particular individual with sexual reactions and thus become a potent stimulus toward those reactions—and this we shall consider in a chapter on smell fetishism. But in the present chapter we shall concern ourselves with those odors effecting a direct sexual stimulation, and in particular with the nature of the most basic of these: body odor.

Let us pause here to correct a widespread misconception under which the reader may also be laboring. The popular view of odor is that it is some wholly intangible and immaterial influence which in some manner affects the olfactory nerves, but that there is no real substance involved as there is, say, in tasting a delicious fruit or a spoiled meat; and in consequence there is a tendency to scoff at the possibility of smells effecting any physiological reaction, good or bad. The truth is that in many respects the sense of smell is pretty much an elaboration of the sense of taste and like it in general requires for its stimulation some material agent. Now scents, whether arising from a perfume, a dung-heap, or a human body, are material and consist of any of a great variety of real substances; only since they are as a rule in the form of a vapor (gaseous) or of infinitely finely divided particles of a solid or liquid, they cannot be perceived by the eye and are in consequence instinctively taken to be some sort of intangible force comparable to a radio wave. But smells are transmitted on a substantial basis, and these substances are absorbed through the nasal mucosa, enter into the physiology of the system, and there bring about certain reactions, the most obvious of which is olfaction. Sex stimulation is another of these reactions from certain of these scents, and it is no more remarkable than would be the reaction obtained from an aphrodisiac agent administered by mouth or through injection. Some authorities believe that we may even absorb the exhalations of other persons directly through the skin—indeed, this is one of the best explanations of that remarkable childbirth phenomenon known as the *couvade*. It is further quite conceivable that there are exhalations which stimulate no olfaction, but which nevertheless are absorbed into the body as are the odorous ones and there produce reactions whose causes are puzzling to deduce.

One of the most ancient employments of the beneficial effects of bodily exhalations is to be found in the biblical practice known as *Shunammitism*. The reference to this is to be found at I Kings, 1, v. 1-4, and reads as follows: "Now King David was old *and* stricken in years; and they covered him with clothes, but he gat no heat. Wherefore his servants said unto him, Let there be brought for my lord the king a young virgin; and let her stand before the king, and let her cherish him, and let her lie in thy bosom, that my lord the king may get heat. So they sought for a fair damsel throughout all the coasts of Israel, and found Abishag a Shunammite, and brought her to the king. And the damsel *was* very fair, and cherihed the king, and ministered to him: but the king knew her not." The idea behind having this beautiful young virgin constantly around the old king, tending him and even sleeping in the same bed with him, was that the bodily emanations given off by the girl would be absorbed by the old fellow and work some degree of rejuvenation. There was no scarcity of women around David's household (he had at least seven wives that we know about), but a young virgin was chosen because it was believed that such a person abounded in the therapeutic exhalations they were after, and a beautiful virgin was picked because it was taken for granted that beauty denoted that state of perfect health necessary for the wholesomeness of her exhalations. It is also possible that aged David "gat some heat" through visual and tactual contacts with the fair young maid, as old Venette rather slyly hints.

But there is every reason to think that the belief in the therapeutic value of the bodily emanations of chaste, young, healthy persons long

antedated this biblical instance. There are certain magic formulae in ancient Egyptian manuscripts that seem to refer to it, and over 500 years ago an antiquarian by the name of Gommarus dug up a long-buried marble votive tablet bearing an inscription which freely translated read: "To Æsculapius and Sanitas, this table is erected by L. Clodius Hermippus, who lived 115 years and five days with the aid of exhalations of young girls; which circumstance caused physicians no little wonder even after his death. You, descendants, lead your life in the same way." Some have asserted this tablet to be an ancient hoax, but hoax or not it at least demonstrates the prevalency of the belief at the time. An old Italian physician of the Renaissance, one Marsilius Ficinus, adhered strongly to the theory and saw no reason that if the soulless emanations from plants could be productive of so much pleasure, why should not those from an animate young girl be even more beneficial. The sage Francis Bacon shared this opinion and believed in the existence of *vital spirits* which could pass from one body to another. In his "Silva Silvarum" he says: "The spirits of young people can, when they enter an older body, restore life to it, or at least keep it in good health for a long time thereafter. It has been observed that old men who spend much time in the company of youths live long, for their spirits emerge strengthened from such contacts. Thus the ancient rhetoricians and sophists were always to be found among youthful bearers, as witness, Georgias, Pythagoras and Isocrates, and grammarians like Orbilius, among others, who reached the century mark." Bacon even had a plan for increasing the rejuvenating effect of a "Shunammite" girl by anointing her with myrrh and other aromatic agents, not so as to enhance the pleasantness of her odor but to augment the warmth emanating from her body.

As for more recent times, in 18th century France, where men worked quite earnestly at exhausting themselves with all the pleasures of the flesh, Shunammitism was not infrequently resorted to in an attempt to restore vigor. An outstanding case in point was that of Claude Henri Fusee, Abbe de Voisenon, who was not only a prominent churchman but the author of some risque "Erotic Fairy Tales" as well, and in his spare moments he found time to be the lover of, among others, the actress Favart, Mlle. Quinault, and the renowned Madame du Chatelet. Growing old and a trifle frayed around the edges, he retired from active participation in the world and took into his home a Miss Huchon to act as a "Shunammite" toward him. According to reports, he refrained from all carnal contact with her, a circumstance which moved Querlon to conclude his account of this matter (in his book about Voisenon, "Exercises de Devotion") with the delightfully Gallic observation: "She was a girl of great beauty; she slept always beside him, and he left her always virgin. Ah!" Indeed, so common was this practice in the Paris of that period that there were procuresses who made a good business simply out of supplying girls for the purposes of Shunammitism.

But to get back to body odor itself and its more direct sex stimulation. An indication of the sex significance of body odor is the fact, which was even noted by Hippocrates, that it does not attain its characteristic quality and strength until puberty, when a person's sex life is beginning. The odor of an infant's body is quite different from that of an adult, and it has been claimed that there have been certain persons who could tell an individual's age by his odor.

At the onset of puberty a person's body odor begins to take on its adult quality, but it is not a constant thing from then on, but continues to undergo changes throughout life which are governed by age, health, manner of life, emotional states, and a number of lesser factors. Variation in body odor is easier to comprehend when it is seen that it is not, as might be thought, a single, general emanation from the body as a whole, but rather is a complex made up of a number of components each

of which is variable and consequently capable of affecting the nature of the whole. It is commonly considered that the general body odor is a combination from seven important contributing individual odors:

1. The general odor of the skin. (This is usually agreeable in a healthy person and is not, as is often presumed, the result of uncleanliness—it is often discernible even immediately after washing.)

2. The odor of the hair and scalp. (Hair, not only of the scalp, but of the pubis, axillae, and elsewhere as well, is an efficient retainer and accumulator of smells.)

3. The odor of the breath.

4. The odor of the armpits.

5. The odor of the feet.

6. The odor of the perineum.

7. The odor of the genitals. (In men this is largely the result of preputial smegma, a cheesy secretion which gathers under the foreskin near the base of the glans; and in women it is a composite arising from the mons veneris, a smegma secreted by the vulva, mucus from the vagina, products of menstruation, etc.)

There are, of course, other individual smells contributory to the body odor, but in a normal person none of them can compare in importance to the above.

In addition to the alteration of body odor through variation in any of the above factors making it up, there are a number of influences which tend to determine or modify it, and these we shall now consider briefly.

The elements of age, sex, one's manner of living, the climate in which one lives, even his occupation, have already been mentioned, but they must not be forgotten as important modifying influences on body odor. But what is possibly the most fundamental factor in the whole situation is race. While there are certain individual variations, there is on the whole a distinctive type of smell attaching to the majority of the members of any racial strain. Some of these have been rather carefully studied and analyzed. The average Negro normally has quite a decided ammoniacal odor which is not, as most white persons choose to believe, the result of personal dirtiness but rather, according to the investigations of Pruner-Bey, of a volatile oil liberated by the sebaceous glands in a Negro's skin. The Eskimos and Greenlanders are characterized by their oil scent, the product probably of their highly fatty diet. The average Chinese gives off a readily discernible musty odor; and the Cossacks are said to emanate such a pronounced horsey smell (possibly the consequences of their almost constant association with the animals) that it may be noted for some hours after a considerable number of them have passed through a locality. Care must always be exercised, however, to distinguish between true racial odor and that of the filth in which some peoples habitually live, as for example certain low-grade Indians.

There is some evidence that even complexion and general physical type may influence body odor. As far back as the 16th century Ambroise Pare noted that persons with red hair and a freckled complexion gave off an offensive emanation. Dark complexioned people are considered to exude a scent similar to that of prussic acid, whereas blond persons frequently smell like musk. It is not uncommon for fat people to disperse an oily scent.

Body odor is often notably altered by sexual intercourse, and in particular that portion of it residing in the breath. Back in 1877, Preismann made rather a careful study of this phenomenon and found that for six hours after coition a peculiar odor was discernible on the breath, which he attributed to a special secretion of the buccal glands. He found this odor to be most noticeable in men of about 35, and that it could be

detected at a distance even of from four to six feet. So convinced was he of the validity of this that he suggested it as a legal test for men accused of rape who had been arrested shortly after the alleged act. The post coitum odor of the breath frequently much resembles that of chloroform, and is often strong enough to render a naturally offensive breath pleasant for a time.

Emotional states and excitations exert considerable power over a person's odor. Elation, depression, sexual desire, jealousy, and the like will in many cases notably alter or augment body scent. Monin, in his "Sur les Odeurs du Corps Humain," cites a young man who had been badly disappointed in love and became inordinately jealous, whereupon his whole body gave off a disgustingly fetid odor. Orteschi refers to a young lady who emitted a distinct smell of vanilla from the spaces between the bases of her fingers.

Closely allied to this is the perversion of body odors frequently accompanying nervous disorders. It has long been noted that insane persons ordinarily give off a characteristic smell which some assert to be like that of yellow deer or mice; indeed, so distinctive and pronounced is this odor that certain specialists have declared that without it, all other dependable symptoms failing, they would be at a loss whether to declare a patient's suspected insanity feigned or real. Mitchell has noted that where there are nervous lesions that area of the skin served by those nerves many times exhales the smell of stagnant water. And there was a young woman given to hysteria who during her spells would give off a scent of violets so pronounced as to fill the room she was in; and what was more remarkable was that it was emitted from the left half of her chest only. A violet odor was also diffused by a man subject to hypochondria. A young woman afflicted with St. Vitus' dance is mentioned by Hammond as smelling like pineapples, and he speaks of another who when suffering from severe sick headache gave off an odor like that of Limburger cheese. Persons stricken with lethargy or catalepsy not uncommonly exhale a smell like that of dead bodies.

Not only nervous ills, but also body diseases and disorders may be productive of their distinguishing scents. Certain physicians have asserted that they could detect the presence of syphilis in a patient by his smell, and many experienced nurses have declared that they can tell whether or no a person has cancer by the odor he diffuses before ever his biopsies come back from the laboratory. Rayer reports a woman patient of his who was afflicted with chronic peritonitis who for some time before her death exhaled a strong odor of musk which grew fainter as she approached death and had just about disappeared at the time she died. It is often thought that the well-known "hospital odor" of those institutions is a composite of not only the many medicaments there employed, but also of the multitude of odors characteristic of one or another of the numerous diseases being treated there. In general, the wards devoted to women and children have a predominantly butyric acid-like odor, whilst those for men are marked by more alkaline scents, such as that of ammonia. But more particularly, individual disorders have their distinctive smells. It has been asserted that sufferers from the plague in the old days when it was epidemic gave off an odor of honey. The sweats of dysentery patients have been noted to smell like excrement and to be discernible at some distance. Some of the other more striking disease scents are: typhus, a mouse-like odor; typhoid, one resembling blood; scarlatina, the fragrance of hot bread; measles, reminiscent of recently pluckd feathers; eczema and impetigo, a moldy smell, etc.

Finally, things taken into the system, as food, drink, or medicines, may profoundly influence body odor. Condiments and spices are particularly powerful in this effect, and an excess of butter or other fats in the diet will impart an oily smell to the person. In fluids, alcohol and

coffee hold leading places. Among medicaments, copaiba, cubebs, and sandalwood show marked effects on body odor. There was a case of a young woman who was taking Fowler's solution who became subject to periodic sweats of such offensiveness that she was forced to discontinue the agent, whereupon the odor disappeared.

As has been mentioned, one of the major contributing factors to body odor is perspiration, and with the possible exception of the direct genital odor, this seems to be the element with about the strongest general sex-stimulating effect. Prof. Most tells of a highly sexed young peasant man who boasted to him of having easily seduced many a previously chaste girl through the simple expedient of carrying his handkerchief in his armpit for a time while dancing with her and then wiping the perspiration from her face with it as occasion arose, the odor of his own perspiration in the handkerchief thus so exciting the young lady sexually as to greatly facilitate his designs.

An historic case of the erotic power of perspiration is that of Henry III, King of Navarre. It is said that at the feast celebrating his betrothal to Margaret de Valois (of "Heptameron" fame) he accidentally wiped his face with a garment belonging to Maria of Cleves, which was still moist with her perspiration, and though she was married to the Prince de Conde there was at once born in Henry as a consequence such irresistible passion for her that her subsequent life was rendered most unhappy by his actions. A similar occurrence is told of Henry IV whose intense infatuation for the lovely Gabrielle is said to have had its origin at a ball when he mopped his brow with her handkerchief.

So widely established has been this power of the odor of perspiration that there may be found many customs of primitive peoples based upon it. Ploss describes such a practice adhered to by engaged couples among the natives of the Philippine Islands: when for any reason the engaged persons are forced to separate for a time, as a safeguard of mutual fidelity they exchange articles of the clothing they have been wearing and these are carefully preserved by each and frequently kissed and smelled.

The smell of the hair and scalp has already been listed as one of the fundamental factors in body odor, and a few more details on it may not be amiss. It must be remembered that what is referred to here is the distinctive odor more or less inherent in these body attributes and not the stench arising from neglect and uncleanliness of them. To a large extent this hair odor may be racial, as for example with the Chinese whose hair will exhale a strong scent of musk even after having just been washed with powerful detergents. It is often thought that much of the characteristic odor of women takes its origin in the masses of hair adorning most of them. Sexual excitement and emotional tension may frequently heighten this smell, and various diseases and disorders may alter it. It has been noted that in the fits of hystero-epilepsy the hair will at times take on the odor of ozone, and that tinea favosa (a ringworm of the scalp) imparts to the head a smell like that of cat's urine. The odor of hair is greatly altered by death, and most of it is lost from hair that fall out—indeed, experienced wig-makers assert that they can tell whether certain hair they are using was cut from a living head or obtained from combings.

In addition to its intrinsic smell, hair, not only of the scalp but of the pubis and armpits as well and wherever else present on the body of certain individuals, functions importantly in compiling body odor by acting as an accumulator of various odoriferous body products (as perspiration, skin exudations, and many secretions peculiar to the locality at which it is situated) and then radiating them more effectively by means of its great exposed surface. In fact, there are authorities who believe that collecting and heightening sex-stimulating odors was the chief purpose of Nature in giving us hair

As has been said, in general it is the woman who has the more per-

sonal and directly erotogenic smell, whereas that of man is frequently less direct and is based more on associated than personal odors. The typical female scent is sometimes given the technical term of odor foeminoe and has the power of driving certain susceptible males to near-frenzy. Wealthy old men, and some not quite so old, have paid handsomely simply for the privilege of sniffing around on fresh young girls. Solomon's "Song of Songs" in the Bible is much concerned with extolling this odor of the female, and in that great delineator of the realities of physical love, Emile Zola, we encounter such reference as: "Everything exhaled an odor of woman;" "He smelled this woman's shoulders, the fragrance of which intoxicated him," etc. Poets and authors throughout the ages have sung the praises of woman's exciting scent. No least proof of the sexual power of the feminine odor is the fact that to practically all male homosexuals it is either distasteful or downright repulsive. It is not a uniform quality throughout life, but undergoes change from time to time. Some authorities divide these changes into three main periods or phases (after the sexless odor of normal childhood, of course): the period of puberty or sexual ripening; the period of marriage or sexual function; and the period of the menopause or sexual decay, or of old age. It is generally agreed that for the majority of normal males the first is the most keenly excitant, and the last the least so.

There are smells other than those originating from the body that exert an erotic influence, and of prime importance among these is the fragrance of certain flowers. One of the most prominent of the ancient Roman orgiastic festivals was the Floralia in which large quantities of flowers played a dominant part and served as a sexual stimulant. Mantegazza has advanced as evidence of this connection the similarity between facial expressions noted when inhaling the perfume of flowers and that when undergoing sexual pleasure. He observes that when a woman smells the flowers she loves best she will many times close her eyes, breathe deeply, and perhaps even tremble slightly, giving a general picture reminiscent of that she presents when with her lover. He quotes a certain lady as saying: "I sometimes feel such pleasure in smelling flowers that I seem to be committing a sin." Women seem to be more susceptible than men to sexual stimulation by the fragrance of flowers, and for some reason it appears that in the main it is the white flowers with heavy, penetrating scents that are most effective on this score, as in particular the gardenia, tuberose, lilies of the valley, frangipani flowers, and, by some strange paradox, the commonly accepted floral symbol of cold chastity, the lily. The pleasant perfumes of such widely admired flowers as the rose, violet, etc., appear to arouse no especial erotic reaction with the majority of women, though many confess that with the others they are excited to such a degree as to bring about a moistening of the vulvar region.

Though there are flowers which undoubtedly possess an aphrodisiac power in their own right, there are others which apparently operate through the more or less close resemblance of their fragrance to certain animal or sexual odors. A garden weed, the *Chenopodium vulvaria,* commonly known as the stinking goosefoot, exhales an odor like that of putrid fish which is suggestive of the female genitalia. Others of this same general nature are the Herb Robert and the Stinking St. John's worts (the *Geranium robertianum* and the *Hypericum hircinum*). Other plants give off a smell like that of semen, and the most noteworthy of these is probably the white-flowered Lawsonia, or *Lawsonia inermis,* ordinarily known simply as the henna plant. The flowers of this plant are held in great esteem by Mohammedan peoples, who take their sex quite seriously, and are employed by them for many purposes, as tinting their nails, hair, and other portions of the body, adorning their houses or persons, etc. That curious and observant old traveler, Sonnini, has to say on this head: "It is very remarkable that the perfume of the henna

flowers, when closely inhaled, is almost entirely lost in a very decided spermatic odor. If the flowers are crushed between the fingers this odor prevails, and is, indeed, the only one perceptible. It is not surprising that so delicious a flower has furnished Oriental poetry with many charming traits and amorous similes." Others have remarked upon the semen-like scent of the pollen of flowering grasses, and in this connection it may be well to quote what a female correspondent of Havelock Ellis has to say on the matter, not only in respect to these grasses but also for an interesting suggestion as to why plant smells may be erotogenic: "It seems very natural that flowers, etc., should have an exciting effect, as the original and by far the pleasantest way of love-making was in the open among flowers and fields; but a more purely physical reason may, I think, be found in the exact resemblance between the scent of semen and that of the pollen of flowering grasses. The first time I became aware of this resemblance it came on me with a rush that here was the explanation of the very exciting effect of a field of flowering grasses and, perhaps through them, of the scents of other flowers. If I am right, I suppose flower scents should affect women more powerfully than men in a sexual way. I do not think anyone would be likely to notice the odor of semen in this connection unless they had been greatly struck by the exciting effects of the pollen of grasses. I had often noticed it and puzzled over it." Havelock Ellis speculates from this that since pollen is the male sexual element of plants, this effect may be an evidence of a particular kind of unity running through the organic world. It is also possible to explain it more simply by the irritating effect pollens frequently exert on the nasal membranes, and the rather close relationship between the nasal and sexual organs, both physiologically and psychologically, has already been pointed out.

There are too many non-human odors capable, under certain circumstances and with certain individuals, of wielding an erotic power to consider them all here, but before leaving this subject we ought to consider briefly one further outstanding scent of this sort: that of leather. This differs from most smells in that it seems it may be about equally effective with either men or women. This may be due to the fact that this is an odor which appears to lie about halfway between the natural body odors and the artificial scents or perfumes; though leather is sometimes employed as a base in perfumery. Fundamentally, leather is an animal product, but its preparation and curing so alters its scent as to throw it toward the artificial side, which may help account for its middle position in the field of smells.

Some authorities feel fairly certain that the smell of leather is one of the most important elements in shoe fetishism, a condition of certain individuals in which they can be sexually aroused only when in visual or physical contact with shoes. Some shoe fetishists have declared outrightly that it is the scent of the leather that most moves them about shoes. There was a prostitute who had several patrons who insisted on the distinctive odor of new shoes in the room, and in order to satisfy them she resorted to the device of holding her shoes over a spirit lamp for a short time.

However, leather frequently has much olfactory erotic power in its own right, apart from any connection with footwear. Many women have been particularly addicted to the smell of old leather-bound books, and some have haunted old bookshops for no other reason than to revel in the scents abounding there. Certain of these women have declared that they find the fragrance of leather stimulating because it is suggestive of the odor of the sexual organs, and since leather is an altered animal substance there may be some truth in the contention, particularly for those with an especially attuned olfactory sense. Naturally, conditioning and association may also be a factor with the scent of leather as with other smells.

SMELL FETISHISM

The term *fetishism* is a generic designation for a broad type of sexual perversion in which the person afflicted with it is partially or completely impotent, or may even be totally cold and indifferent to sex, except in the presence of a certain article, substance, or environmental factor (which is his individual "fetish"). It may be some article of clothing, as a silk stocking or (as we have just seen) a shoe; it may be a material or substance, as fur, linen, sand, grassy ground, etc.; or it may be some immaterial element, as light, darkness, music, or, of course, certain odors. When a person is sexually aroused or capable of the sex act only in the presence of a certain odor or type of odor, he is said to suffer from "smell fetishism." This does not mean that certain smells will lead him to overt sex acts, though in many cases it may. There are some persons whose libido has become so completely perverted that the act of smelling their fetish odor and the gratification obtained from it has come entirely to replace the sex act and its gratification. However, such complete smell fetishists seem to be in the minority, and in most instances the fetishism is to a greater or lesser degree only contributory to the excitation toward and the power to complete the sex act physically.

Smell fetishism, or olfactory fetishism, is not in its broader manifestations especially unusual. Just where the normal reaction to the erotic stimulation of smell ends and fetishism begins is a most difficult point to determine. It is probable that at present no better criterion can be set than this: that where there is no actual replacement of sexual response by olfaction, and where the part played by smell in sexual stimulation does not pass the always-tenuous bounds of "normality," there is no smell fetishism.

A common object of male smell fetishists is some item of feminine apparel that has been in contact with the woman's body sufficiently long to take on some of the woman's scent. As a rule, under-garments—slips, corsets, girdles, panties, etc.—which have been in direct contact with the body, often near the genital region, are most favored. The exchange that frequently takes place between lovers of intimate articles of clothing undoubtedly has its basis in smell fetishism. The fact that handkerchiefs are many times exchanged may be entered in objection as they seem hardly an "intimate" item of clothing, but when it is recalled how they are usually carried — in a trousers-pocket near the genitals by a man and in the bodice between the breasts or up a sleeve by a woman—it will be seen that they have ample opportunity to pick up body odor. It is more than likely that the "favors" given during the Middle Ages by ladies to their knights (a handkerchief, a ribbon, or some other article that had been on their person) as a token of remembrance and appreciation and as an inspiration to valorous deeds, really functioned more effectively through smell fetishism. When going away on a journey men not infrequently take along a piece of clothing from their wife or sweetheart to give them vicarious solace while out of reach of physical gratification. An outstanding instance of this was the famous poet Goethe who admitted that one time when he had to leave Weimar for two days on an official journey he took along a bodice that had been worn by Frau von Stein so as to have with him the scent of her body.

The vicarious gratification of the sex instinct through smell may in itself become perverted and instead of following from the odor of the

genitals or body may require for its stimulation the smell of the bodily excretions, in particular the feces or urine. This type of fetishism may be particularized in which the pervert is aroused only by the smell of the excretions of his beloved, or it may be general in which the odors of the feces and urine of anyone and everyone will serve to effect erotic gratification.

PERFUMES

It is impossible to find any period of recorded history in which the arts of making and using perfumes were not given careful and serious study. The ancients employed them freely as general adjuncts to pleasant living (in a time when sanitation, sewerage, and personal hygiene were not too perfected), as therapeutic or preventive agents for many disease conditions, and of course as erotic stimulants. In modern times this first usage remains, the second has practically disappeared, and the third has gone pretty much underground where without open acknowledgment it is practiced with about as much assiduity as ever but frequently with much less skill and understanding than in antiquity.

Some of the most ancient Egyptian papyri extant contain references to the use of perfumes. Mention has already been made of the prominence given to scents in the Bible's highly erotic "Song of Songs," but the rest of the Bible is also shot through with allusions to the employment of perfumes for sexual purposes. Wherever a bride is being prepared her scenting takes top importance. When Ruth is on the make for Boaz she takes care first to anoint herself with fragrant oils. When Judith was getting ready to captivate Holofernes, "She washed herself all over with water and anointed herself with precious ointment." And when Esther won the contest for who would be the next queen of King Ahasuerus it was only after she, along with the great number of other maiden contestants, had been carefully processed and purified for a full year (six months with oil of myrrh and six months with sweet odors and with other things for the purifying of women), as the king would not even allow them in his august presence without this indispensable preparation. Mohammed, who while keeping the eyes of his soul steadfastly fixed on Heaven denied his earthy body none of the pleasures of its temporary habitat, often observed to the faithful that, "What I best love in your world are women and perfumes," and in the same connection he admonished them that, "Nothing, nothing is better nor more salutary than perfumes after copulation."

Perfumes have two fundamental purposes: to hide and to augment natural body odor. In our present-day civilization, in which we have almost made a fine art of persistently taking a wrong or artificial attitude toward all things natural, our effete culture has decreed that a body odor of any sort is animal-like and is therefore unworthy of humankind. As a consequence, most women today desperately douse themselves with a great variety of odorous (and high-priced) preparations in an idiotic attempt to make themselves smell like most anything—a pine forest, a rose garden, a violet bed, sea spray, etc.—in the world but what they are: a woman. The ancients, and such primitive peoples as have reached the stage of perfumery, are not so foolish—they employed perfumes and odorous agents to heighten, add to, or more attractively set off the natural body and sexual odors. It is odd that most women of today go to great lengths and much trouble to enhance and better display their anatomical sexual features (as pointing up their buttocks and breasts by means of foundation garments and brassieres, etc.), while one of their most direct and potent sexual allurements, their natural personal odor, they not only neglect to give what artificial aid they may, but

strive endlessly to do away with or disguise. Our fine ladies who disdainfully turn up their noses at the "uncouth, ignorant savages" might be taken down a peg and taught a lesson if they had seen the Polynesian who, on a visit to Sydney in Australia, turned away in utter disgust from elegant ladies of that city with the remark: "They have no smell!"

Another contribution of dubious value that modern times has made to the art of perfumery is the delicate, subtle, composite perfume of entirely characterless odor. In former times women rarely employed any but the strong, simple odorous agents of definite sexual significance. Almost invariably the favorites were animal products and in most cases were obtained from the genital glands of the animal. Probably the four most widely used around the world were: musk, castoreum, civet, and ambergris. The modern practice of blending perfumes of a number of agents to get a composite scent that resembles none of the ingredients, formerly found little or no favor; the various primary agents were generally used directly. Further, our present-day custom of choosing a single one of these blended perfumes and then employing it indiscriminately at various places on the body for *all* personal scenting purposes, would have been regarded with horror by the women of olden times. They were by no means blind to the possibilities of getting better effects by the blending of several of the fundamental odors, but they would not have tolerated having this blending done for them in mass production in the kettles of a perfume manufactory, so that they would smell exactly like the thousands of other women who had been led to purchase the same brand, probably through the cute bottle it was packed in or the catchy advertising that had impressed the brand-name on their mind rather than the suitability of the scent to their individual person. When blending of odors was desired, ancient women carried it out on their own body, applying one basic odorous agent to their genital region, another to their breasts, another to the back of their neck, and so on, each scent being so chosen as to enhance the natural odor of the part to which it was applied and not antagonistic toward it, so that as a result the woman exhaled an indefinable but seductive fragrance in which all the elements of her natural odor had been carefully augmented so as to produce a more pronounced and possibly somewhat improved general body odor which still remained much her own and amply distinctive to set her off from other women. The ancient Greek writer Lucian makes reference to this refinement of perfuming when he describes that portion of the old Athenian ladies' toilet: "Egyptian essences for the hands and feet, Phoenician perfumes for the cheeks and bosom, marjoram for the hair, and the spirit of wild thyme for the thighs."

It goes without saying that since the proper perfumes and scents may be effectively employed to heighten a woman's natural attractive odors, they may also be put into service by those women who for one reason or another are lacking or deficient in any of the natural personal odors that enter into the sexual stimulation of the male. It is more than likely that many a wall-flower would soon be transformed into a rambling rose if only she exercised a little care to take on the proper fragrance.

It may be enlightening briefly to sketch the history of the erotic employment of perfumes. As has already been indicated, there is every reason to believe (through the evidence of ancient papyri and far more ancient rock inscriptions) that the art of perfumery, and rather a complex and polished art at that, was flourishing in Egypt as far back as we have any trace of the country's history, and in all probability even farther back. From the earliest times of which we have any record, the Egyptians had special perfumes for the hair, mouth, genital parts, and other portions of the body. They made great use of the white henna flower, as did the early Hebrews after them who got not only the henna

from them but most of what they knew of the art of perfumery as well. The main odorous ingredients utilized by the ancient Hebrews were, in addition to henna, myrrh, cinnamon, cassia, and calamis, and that they were most freely employed in erotic connections is amply borne out, as has already been indicated, by many passages in the Old Testament.

Along with many other elements of their culture, the ancient Greeks obtained from the Egyptians the fundamentals of erotic perfumes, and naturally the Romans later took it over from the Greeks, just as they adopted practically everything Grecian of value. So great and economically important did the traffic in perfumes become in ancient Rome that Julius Caesar and Licinius Crassus, consuls at the time, forbade the sale of foreign perfumes in the country. Most noteworthy was the invariably close connection of perfume with all aspects of love. Indeed, the great majority of the makers and merchants of perfumes were in some fashion affiliated with prostitution, as procurers, brothel-keepers, courtesans, and the like, and for some strange reason the more prized and sought after a perfume might be, the more scorned and looked down upon was the person who made or dispensed it, as if anyone acquainted with such subtleties of so erotic an art as perfumery must be equally facile in the more unusual refinements of love. When a "respectable" Roman entered the place of business of any of these perfumers it was as a rule only with his face masked. So despised did these dealers in the avidly sought after articles become that eventually the term *unguentaria* (dealers in unguents or perfume) came to be about equivalent to whore or procuress, and the more elegant of the wealthy Romans simply could not tolerate any contact with them but maintained their private perfumers instead.

When the grandeur that was Rome began to peter out a bit, perfumery as a fine art went into something of a decline, as did most of the other cultural niceties during medieval times. The Crusades served to bring Western Europeans of the latter part of the Middle Ages into contact with the arts and practices of the Arabian people, and before long this brought about a renewed interest in and knowledge of perfumery and the knights' ladies were soon busily employing scents for erotic purposes, as the literature of the times testifies.

The Renaissance, which adopted and elaborated all the cultural refinements of classical antiquity, certainly did not ignore the possibilities of erotic perfumery. Indeed, in many respects it developed and refined it more highly than did the Greeks and Romans, a thing made possible by the discovery of new aromatic substances in the New World and improved technological processes, and spurred on by the intense interest in all things sexual for which the period was known. Some of the most penetrating works on the subject were compiled by Renaissance Italian experts and are often consulted to this day. Renaissance Italy was a hot-bed of sexuality, and perfumes were intimately associated with all phases of it.

From Italy of this time the science of sensual perfumery moved to France. Catherine de Medici was a leading figure in this transplanting and she imported a number of renowned Italian perfumers to France, and by the time Henry III came into power they were badly over-worked in supplying the demands of the pleasure-loving court. France came to be, which it still to a large extent is, the most perfumed nation of the Occident, and many were the refinements of scenting evolved and practiced by them, not least of which was the *pet parfume* (perfumed breaking of wind) so amusingly and vividly described by Verville. It is tragically amusing that perfumes which then came into wide popularity largely through their amatory provocative powers, received in this period a great additional impetus as a counteractive against the consequences of love: when in the 16th century syphilis broke all bounds in Europe and achieved epidemic proportions, people went about practically bathed in perfume as a desperate prophylactic measure against

infection, reasoning possibly that to be spared from the smell of the diseased was to be spared from the disease. Also, as personal cleanliness appears not to have become fashionable until well into the 16th century, it is probable that perfumes did much to make elegant gatherings of the quality folk somewhat more tolerable for all concerned. The elaborate use of perfumes most likely reached its height in the gilded, and extremely sex-indulgent, courts of Louis XIV and XV. An alternate name for the court of Versailles was *la cour parfumee,* and Madame de Pompadour's yearly perfume bill ran well over half a million livres. The famous Duc de Richelieu constantly had his person and living quarters generously sprinkled with perfumes (and Richelieu is still remembered for his libertine habits), while there were "clubs" of young dandies who instead of a password or grip had a certain scent by which the members recognized each other. Before the war Paris remained the perfume center of the world and its trade in scents brought it in well over 100,000,000 francs yearly.

Sensual perfumery reached England during the time of Queen Elizabeth. It seems that its importation there was primarily directly from Italy rather than by way of France, and it appears that one of the main persons to introduce it there was the Count of Oxford who on his return from a trip to Italy brought with him a number of perfumed gloves and other articles of clothing, scented pillows, and similar odorous novelties, and it was not long before fashionable folk simply would not be seen out without their elaborately wrought scent vials, perfume boxes, and the like. Nor were the staid English unaware of the erotogenic possibilities of odors, as evidenced by the fact that their Parliament found it necessary in 1770 to issue this decree: "Any woman of whatever age, position, or calling, virgin, wife, or widow, who shall hereafter ensnare into marriage any subject of the king, by the aid of perfumes, false hair, Spanish cosmetics, corsets, crinolines, high heels, or false hips, shall be liable to all punishments prescribed for witchcraft and similar practices, and the wedding shall be pronounced null and void."

The methods of employing perfumes for sexual purposes have had as long and checkered a history as the perfumes themselves. One of the most obvious utilizations of this sort is the direct scenting of the genitals, and this practice seems to have originated in ancient Egypt and to have been resorted to by both males and females. It is likely that in such a hot country perfumes served the double purpose of not only rendering the genitalia more alluring but also of covering up the naturally repulsive odor that might there be present. That famous old odorous compound made of a number of ingredients, called *kyphi,* was originally intended to scent the female genitals, and an ancient papyrus over 3,100 years old contains a formula for this and instructions to use it either by smoking or fumigation or as a pellet to be inserted into the female vulva.

The applying of perfumes to the genitals was carried to other countries along with the art of perfumery itself. The affected Renaissance naturally added refinements to this and in addition to scenting the pudenda the elegant people of that time carefully combed, curled, and trimmed the pubic hair, a work to which the gallant young dandies gave especial attention. Genital fragrance also became an item in the *ars amandi* of France, and Madame du Barry made no bones about attributing her hold on Louis XV to her practice of regularly douching herself with amber. Many young ladies of our day take pains to lay seductive sachets among their panties in the dresser-drawer, and various powders are openly on sale in the five-and-ten for counteracting the offensive sexual odors during menstruation.

Almost equally important in erotic perfuming is the mouth as the breath may have just as repellent an effect upon a budding lover as ill-smelling genitals and is usually sooner brought under his notice in

the early stages of courtship. So true is this that ancient Greeks who were suspicious of their wives' fidelity would make them eat onions before they left them alone. Consequently, scenting the breath has been an objective of the perfumers for almost as long as have the genitals. The collection of ancient Egyptian documents known as the Ebers payri contains recipes for substances to be smoked or taken as pastilles for making the breath agreeable. The old Greek and Roman medical writers give a number of formulae for such compounds, as do the old Arabic and Turkish erotological treatises, while the literature of the Renaissance abounds in measures for oral scenting. Today billboards, placards, and magazine ads thunder warnings to all and sundry as to what might be the dire fate of their love life if they are so careless as to "offend" with the breath.

Along with these two, axillary scenting forms the ageless trilogy of fundamental objectives of sexual perfuming. The ancients resorted to rubbing various spices and bruised herbs under the arms to counteract offensive odors, the people of the 16th century seemed to favor a concoction of pulverized myrtle leaves in a solution of alum or lead acetate, while the eager young lady of the present-day is limited in her choice of under-arm deodorants only by the size of the stock in her local drug store.

Through the centuries methods and materia alter somewhat, sometimes people are a little more open in what they are trying and sometimes a bit more covert, and in this or that age a little more intelligence is brought to bear upon the problem, but today as in the earliest recorded time most persons know, either consciously or instinctively, that the attraction of the opposite sex is a work with three major aspects, the first two of which are quite generally recognized but the last is not usually realized or openly acknowledged, though every bit as important: to look one's best, to act one's best, and to smell one's best.

What is a Hermaphrodite?

A STUDY OF PERSONS OF EITHER SEX WHOSE GENITAL ORGANS, MENTAL INTEGRATION AND CHEMICAL (HORMONAL) CHARACTERISTICS EMBRACE THE CHARACTERS OR CHARACTERISTICS OF BOTH SEXES

By

D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1947, by
E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of America

MY FIRST EXPERIENCE WITH HERMAPHRODITISM

Interesting indeed are the folk tales about hermaphrodites. Almost every community in America has its folk tale about someone who lives in the community who is reputedly a hermaphrodite. Or, perhaps, the tale concerns someone who *has* lived in the community who *was* a hermaphrodite. More interesting than these folk tales are actual facts of hermaphroditism, told, not in the beclouded terminology of the college professor, but in the plainer words of the man in the street—your neighbor and mine.

Like the traditional folk tale of the community, almost every individual we meet has his or her personal idea as to what constitutes a hermaphrodite. In verity, most hermaphrodites themselves have but vague ideas of the actual facts concerning hermaphroditism. Moreover, scientists are not altogether in agreement. Some of the reasons why scientists do not wholly agree will become more and more apparent as you proceed through the pages of this book.

Because you who read have your own folk tales and your individual ideas of hermaphrodites, you will not object if I digress somewhat and tell you "my folk tale" dating from my now slightly remote childhood.

In the community in which I was born and reared there lived a family, honorable, respected. There were four sisters in the family, three of whom were said to be hermaphrodites. Quite frankly, in my early years, I did not believe this.

Three of the sisters were married. This included two who were believed to be hermaphrodites. The unmarried one among those said to be hermaphrodites was an "old maid" school teacher. She was, at one time, my teacher.

My father was a surgeon and anatomist. His vast scientific library was open for my inspection from the time I could "read" pictures. By the time I was 10 my father had read many passages from his medical books aloud to me. In this way I had gained a fairly clear idea of the pronunciation and meaning of many medical words. Beginning to read in earnest at that age it was but natural that I, like most other children and nearly all adults, was interested in the medical side of sex.

In 1910, when I was 13 years old, it fell my lot to accompany my teacher, also an inspector of rural schools and some sort of census official, traveling via horse and buggy through many rural communities. My teacher was the old maid sister who was reputedly a hermaphrodite. We called her Miss Lucy. In accompanying her I was substituting for her nephew who was ill. This nephew, the son of the fourth sister, was the only offspring in that family of oddly strange girls.

By this time I had begun to believe the story that Miss Lucy and two of her sisters were hermaphrodites. All three sisters had an odd skin appearance—quite unlike that of the sister who had borne a child. We may conceive of such skin appearance as being intermediate between the pronounced masculine and the distinct feminine. Such a type of skin is often present in diseases of the endocrine glands, glands concerning which we shall learn something later.

One of the reputedly hermaphroditic sisters had a heavy black moustache. Just what she did to temporarily rid herself of this from time to time I never knew. I saw her on numerous occasions when the moustache was much in evidence. At that time, my own face being as fuzzy as a peach, I envied her.

The three reputedly hermaphroditic sisters were tall. Two of them

were slender. Miss Lucy was neither slender nor fat. Instead she had a giant type of frame which was well filled out. Dressed in man's clothes and viewed from the rear she might have been mistaken for a man. Oddly, however, she showed no sign of a beard. The one sister sans moustache had a darkly stubbled chin.

While on the trip with Miss Lucy I observed that she preferred to drive the mare. Like any boy of my age at that time, I wanted to drive. Now and then I was permitted the pleasure. While driving Miss Lucy explained that she knew the roads, and indeed she did. She knew the people, too. During the several days of our tour we did not pay for a single meal or lodging.

The lodging question brought me face to face with naked facts. We stopped one night with a family of old (they were old in years, too) friends of Miss Lucy. The home was a beautiful and inviting country place.

Being a boy and not at all interested in the conversation of these old friends I ate my supper, went to be sure that our buggy mare was all right for the night, and turned in.

My room was a large upstairs bed-chamber. As if I was afraid, Miss Lucy had assured me, "You don't need to be afraid, my dear boy. I'll be in the room right next to yours."

The moment I hit the bed I knew I had company. Milllions of IT. Bedbugs!

My skin is thin and sensitive to insects of any kind. I knew well that I could not sleep in that bed. I shrunk from embarrassing anyone by going down and complaining, and so, fighting and brushing the bugs off (no small job), I sat on a chair until I discovered that it, too, was infested. Finally I found refuge by sitting on a broad front window sill with my feet resting outside the window on the slightly sloping porch roof. I had dressed, and from time to time I tiptoed to the head of the stairs hoping that the folks had gone to bed, although I had not heard Miss Lucy mount the stairs. Disappointed in time, I sat on the window sill and dozed.

At midnight I awoke, chilled. It was then that I conceived the idea of climbing out over the roof and down a porch column to the refuge of the buggy and the blanket which was as much a part of a well-equipped buggy as is the spare tire of an automobile today.

Surely I must have moved like a thief in the night. Cautiously! It would have been disastrous to have fallen and humiliating to have been caught sneaking out of my room and away from my eager company.

Clinging against the weatherboarding, I stopped suddenly. My barely opened eyes were flooded with light. It was there that without warning or forethought I *saw!* I was directly outside Miss Lucy's window —unseen. Miss Lucy was taking a "bird-bath" preparatoryy to going to bed.

Miss Lucy was a hermaphrodite.

What an astounded boy I was! I had actually seen a much-talked of wonder—a hermaphrodite!

Sharing my surgeon father's respect for the "secrets" of people, I kept quite silent about Miss Lucy. Having seen well-authenticated pictures of hermaphrodites in medical books, there was no doubt in my mind about Miss Lucy.

Later on you will find the appearance of Miss Lucy described. And, to avoid leaving this story hanging in mid-air, I will add that I made it from the porch roof and down the column and to the buggy undetected and unshot. At day-break I performed my second-story act, and with hair wet and sleeked down, I marched down the stairway and into the big dining room like a regular little gentleman, just in time for breakfast.

I experienced no sense of guilt for having been unhospitable to my

bed partners, and I did not in the least feel that I had been a "Peeping Tom." Frankly, I took a good look, if not to satisfy my curiosity, for the sake, then, of the Aesculapian career I had determined even at that early age to follow when I grew up to be a man.

SOME BASIC FACTS

That there are many subjects not lending themselves to intelligent understanding, in the absence of certain basic knowledge, we must recognize. This is most certainly true if we are to gain an insight into the short but broad subject of what a hermaphrodite really is or is not. To the end that we may understand, let us examine some important basic facts.

The word, or term, hermaphrodite is, except through common usage, a misnomer. There is a thoroughly scientific basis for the beliefs of scientists that hermaphrodites existed on this planet perhaps millions of years ago. Indeed a serious school of thought contends that there was a time in the evolution of the human species when (a) but one sex was regarded as existing, or (b) that although there were two sexes, these were combined in each person living in that particular evolutionary era. Be that as it may. We are interested in the hermaphrodite as of now and the more recent past.

The term, hermaphrodite, came into usage as a heritage from ancient mythology. In order that we may understand, let us examine the meaning of mythology. Dictionaries give this definition: "The collected body or system of the traditions or legends of a people in which are embodied their beliefs concerning their origin, gods, heroes, etc.; a treatise on myths." The word myth means poetic fiction or a fabulous narrative. For our purposes let us attach a simpler meaning and call mythology what it actually is: A collection of fairy tales.

In Greek mythology Hermes was the herald and messenger of *the gods.* He corresponded to the Roman *god,* Mercury. The Greek Aphrodite was the goddess of love and beauty. She corresponded to the Roman Venus. Even today a woman regarded as being of great physical beauty or near-perfection is called a Venus.

Hermaphroditus was the son of Hermes and Aphrodite, and, according to the myth, was united into one body with the nymph (naturally a female) Salmacis. This thus incorporated two sexes into one body, and from the name Hermaphroditus the name or term hermaphrodite was derived.

There is another word used especially by various scientists with the same meaning as the word hermaphrodite. This other word is much more applicable and explanatory than the word inherited from a remote past and its fairy tales. The word is: *Androgyne.* It is derived from Greek words meaning "man-woman," or transposed, "woman-man."

We thus approach the meaning of the term, hermaphrodite. The word is pronounced, hur-maf-ro-dit. The medical definition is: "Androgyne. A person whose genital organs have the characters of both male and female in greater or less degree."

Hermaphroditism: The condition of being a hermaphrodite. The seeming occurrence of both male and female generative organs in the same individual. A female hermaphrodite is one in which the female characters predominate. The male characters are predominant in the male hermaphrodite. In the lateral hermaphrodite, the male organs appear to be present on one side and the female organs on the other. In what is called the transverse hermaphrodite, the male organs are external and the female organs internal, and vice-versa. In the unilateral (one-sided) hermaphrodite, the doubling of sex characteristics appears on but one side. The androgenous (hermaphroditic) person is

also defined as having the characteristics, *mental* and *physical,* of both sexes.

Returning for a moment to folk tales, it will at once be apparent that the common idea of the hermaphrodite embraces something akin to the monster or freak. In rare cases this idea is more or less correct, On the other hand, we have ceased to regard the phenomenon of Siamese twins as monsterish or freakish. Nor do we longer regard the unfortunate victims of hydrocephalus (the condition whereing the skull appears to be vastly enlarged and commonly known as water on the brain) as freaks or monsters.

In the lower forms of animal life, hermaphrodites abound. We are here considering man (which includes woman), and will refer but briefly to animals lower than man.

It may seem quite strange to regard a person with visible male generative organs, a beard, a deep voice and mere nipples instead of mammary glands or breasts as being a female hermaphrodite, but science has recorded such an entity in numerous cases. This is the phenomenon in which the gonads (sex glands) are ovaries. Numerous factors contribute to this state of being. We will study some of these factors as we proceed. For the nonce, we may well ask how or why Nature produces the type of hermaphrodite (androgyne) we have just described.

Through an almost endless chain of action, the endocrine glands so mix their secretions (juices) that, during development, the formation of the external generative organs is influenced. It is believed (and the belief is based upon dependable evidence) that the actual sex (which is distinguished by the gonads) is fixed at the time of conception. Possibly a preponderance of hormones opposite those of the actual predominant sex of the hermaphrodite has considerable responsibility in determining the development of the external appearance of the genital organs.

A preponderance of female hormones in the mature male who is not hermaphroditic (or at least not so regarded) may be responsible for the so-called effeminate man. Likewise such a preponderance of male hormones in the female may account for the non-hermaphroditic female's apparent masculinity.

It must be explained that because Nature often shifts the hormonal balance, effeminacy in man and masculinity in woman do not necessarily indicate hermaphroditism.

There is a common idea that the effeminate man is homosexual. This idea is not infrequently quite erroneous. A homosexual person is one who is attracted sexually to his (or her) own sex.

The person who is androgenous mentally (i.e., the apparent male whose mind is on the feminine plane and vice versa) may not be androgenous physically. Here, however, the mental hermaphrodite is such because he or she is chemically (because of hormonal imbalance) androgenous.

When considering the distinction of sex it must be borne in mind that the sexologist is the authority to whom we must turn for the final word. The chemical and mental sex may be accepted definitely.. The determination here falls within the field of the biologist (the student of, or the person skilled in, living organisms) who also determines sex by the physical appearance and the external generative organs. The sexologist determines sex according to the gonads (testicles and ovaries). He holds that regardless of all other signs a person who has testicles is a male and a person who has ovaries is a female. Claims have been made, and some of these are doubtless authentic, that numerous patients have been found to have both ovaries and testicles. There are many hard-boiled medical scientists who astutely deny the probability or the possibility of the gonads, paired, being present in the same body. It is impossible for me to agree with these particular scientists, for although I

have never witnessed the phenomenon, I have seen one ovary and one testicle in a single individual. Further, I have encountered the ovotestis (a gonadal gland part ovary and part testicle in structure) on several occasions. The person with an ovotestis may be regarded as falling well within the category of the true hermaphrodite.

It may be well for the professional person and the layman alike, in forming an opinion concerning the statements contained in the preceding paragraph to study some of the anomalies (under deformities) which will be presented herein. These anomalies are well known to, and not disputed by, medical men. Some of these will be referred to under Developmental Sex Defects—others under Deformities. Various deformities are well known to the laity. Developmental defects relating to sex are medically authenticated.

WHY WE BECOME MALES OR FEMALES (Sex Determination)

Many masterly treatises have been written upon the subject of why we become males or females. Little, by comparison, has been written as to why there are hermaphrodites. Certain it is that sexuality, regardless of distinction or degree, is not determined by the yardstick which did the measuring in the Fairyland of Hermaphroditus.

Scientists now accept the chromosome theory of sex determination. Incompatible with this acceptance is the fact that recently published medical dictionaries refer to sex chromosomes as being "so-called" *because the particular (accessory) chromosome is assumed to determine the sex of the individual.*

The theory generally accepted, reduced to a simple form of explanation is: The ovum (egg) is neutral. The spermatozoon (male fertilizing element) carries 48 chromosomes in its head. These heads are divided into 24 pairs and one of these is considered the sex-determining chromosome. There are two types of sex-determining chromosomes. These are male and female determinants. One is called the x-chromosome—the other y-chromosome. The x-chromosome produces a female child and the y-chromosome produces a male child.

Some years ago various doctors set about to learn whether sex could be pre-determined—that is—whether parents could have children of a sex chosen by the parents. Results seemed rather convincing. In experimenting one discovery led to another until eventually it was shown that the alkaline vaginal (female generative) tract favored fertilization of the ovum by the "y" or male producing chromosome, thus producing male children while the acid female generative tract favored fertilization by the x-chromosome and produced female children. It was naturally quite easy to artificially alkalize or acidify the vaginal tract. So far it is not actually known whether the chromosomes have anything to do with the production of hermaphrodites. Investigators in general have attributed hermaphroditism to "developmental defectiveness." That this is true is readily acceptable. On the other hand future investigators may find a still better explanation within the chromosome category.

Recent studies of an enzyme known as hyaluronidase will lead to further studies which may change many of our present conceptions and theories. (An enzyme is an organic substance secreted by the cells of the body. It acts as a ferment and induces changes in other substances.) Hyaluronidase appears to have an influence upon the corona (crown) of the ovum, thus facilitating penetration by sperm. The enzyme is normally present in sperm and studies have shown that if the sperm count is high the quantity of the enzyme (hyaluronidase) is high in comparison. If the sperm count is low there is a low seminal content of hyaluronidase.

The significance of the studies made and being made may be greater than it now appears to be and after further investigation it may be

found that by a simple process a similar synthetic substance can be readily produced. By injecting the synthetic substance into the female generative tract prior to copulation childless couples might find themselves on the way to parenthood. This would be because the synthetic substance would aid fertilization when the count of motile spermatozoa proved low. Further, an "anti-substance" preventing sperm penetration and consequent fertilization might be the answer to "controlled parenthood" or birth control. The significance of these facts with relation to hermaphroditism is simply that investigations like these may lead to a better understanding of the basic causes of the phenomenon.

Present knowledge of birth determination serves a useful purpose. Future investigation, experiment and observation may lead to some worthwhile conception of the causes of hermaphroditism—possibly prevention of the condition and an understanding of the reasons for the continuous birth of homosexuals of the congenital type.

HERMAPHRODITISM AND HOMOSEXUALITY

There seems to be a common belief (shared by various workers in the field of medical science) that homosexuality of the congenital type and hermaphroditism are somewhat closely linked. There are no definite figures based on which a positive conclusion might be drawn. We do not know, nor do we have any way of knowing, the number of persons in each 1,000 of population who are either homosexuals or hermaphrodites. It is often difficult for the expert to determine between congenital and acquired homosexuality.

It is significant that out of the millions physically examined during World War II, a fairly high percentage of frank homosexuals were found. Rarely was an even suspected hermaphrodite encountered. One reason for this latter fact is, of course, that hermaphrodites who had not previously disclosed their conditions to their family or personal physicians did so and these physicians tactfully, through their personal and professional integrity, made suitable representations to the draft boards, thus preventing the subjection of their patients to the embarrassment of lining up, nude, with hundreds of their more normal fellows.

The more or less known homosexuals, classified on a percentage per capita basis, seem to bear a higher relation by ratio to the accepted "normals" than to a total estimate of androgenous persons.

It has been admitted that we can play as many games with statistics as we can coax tunes from a few ivory keys. This is embodied in that trite statement: "You can prove anything by statistics and yet you can prove nothing by statistics." What I have in mind is this: I have and have had actual knowledge of a number of mature hermaphroditic persons. I know the percentage of homosexuals among these. According to groups and the number of persons in such groups I have been able to state the number of homosexuals who were group members and thereby establish a group percentage. Such percentage is much lower among androgenous persons than among the established "norms."

There is a common belief that the homosexual person is "marked." That is to say that, if one is familiar with certain characteristics, one can point out the homosexual—can recognize the homosexual. A not dissimilar belief obtains with regard to hermaphroditic persons. There is not a shred of absolute positivity in either belief.

The effeminate man may be not the nth part homosexual. By the same token he may not be one decimal androgenous physically. The same rule applies to the mannish woman. It would tend toward the erroneous, however, to say that there was not something of the androgenous (hermaphroditic) in the chemical or mental make-up of such persons, even though quite transitory.

Transitory (continuing but a short time) hermaphroditism has been neglected by students, scientists, investigators, writers and others. It offers a field for vast research and should result in valuable psychological finds. In the final analysis it might be found that all humans are, at one time or another, or at various times and for various periods, transitional androgynes on the mental and chemical planes.

The foregoing may appear to be mixing philosophy with science and it has often been said that the sad thing about old Aristotle was that he was both scientist and philosopher. I have but to say: "Look! See what he gave the world!"

To avoid detail which might prove more confusing than enlightening, let us regard transitional hermaphroditism as beling in that field of study embracing personality. When we accept the three portional divisions of personality as the hereditary, the physical (related to both heredity and environment), and the acquired (dependent largely upon environment), it may be more easy to understand that under certain circumstances the manufacture within the body of certain chemicals (hormones) can have a profound effect upon the personality. Thus, for intervals, the normal male may appear to have what we consider as being a "feminine outlook" and vice versa. With the physiological shift of hormonal balance, the personality factor shifts, likewise, to correspond to that of the sexuality normal to the person affected.

Although some of the data just presented seem to have no direct relation to hermaphroditism and homosexuality, a field of thought is opened bearing upon the intricacies pertinent to hermaphroditism and personality, homosexuality and personality, with personality and normality demanding its share of consideration and study.

The temporary insanity plea so often placed before the courts is, when true, transitional insanity. Scientists and jurists accept transitional insanity as an established entity. Transitory hermaphroditism, though seldom recognized by those in whom it occurs as such, is no more an impossible entity than is transitional insanity.

DEVELOPMENTAL SEX DEFECTS

In order to discuss and study developmental defects pertaining to sexuality it is absolutely necessary that various other defects be considered because of their relation to, and connection with, the anomalies of sexual development. Thus we may ask: What is a developmental defect?

A developmental defect of the human or animal body is a failure of an organ, gland or part to develop according to the normally accepted pattern. A striking example of a highly visible developmental defect is the harelip which so often coexists with the cleft palate. A defect is an imperfection. Thus a medically considered defectively developed person is: One who is lacking in some physical quality, as one who is blind or a deaf-mute. Also a mental or moral degenerate.

Medical men in general resort to the frequent use of a special term by which they describe a developmental defect. It is the word: *Anomaly.* Broadly, this word simply means a marked deviation from the accepted normal or accepted normality. Hermaphroditism can hardly be said to be an anomaly. It is, of course, an irregularity, although not nearly so much an irregularity as may be conceived upon first thought. That there are doubtless many more hermaphrodites, both pseudo and true, than is commonly believed, is not to be doubted.

It is not well to study the subject of developmental defects by the A-B-C method. Such a method of study might be tiring. It would mean starting at *scratch* and so far, that which constitutes actual *scratch* is not known. In our present study we may regard *scratch* in the develop-

ment of the human species as the union of sperm and ova. To attempt to go beyond this would require a study of the formation of sperm in the male and ova in the female. It would mean going further back in plant and animal life and tracing out the various elements furnishing the final nutrition essential to the maintenance of life and to the formation of spermatozoa and ova. It could take us into heredity and deeply into the field known as psycho-dynamics. Plainly it could become quite complicated.

The harelip and cleft palate, invariably correctible today by surgery, have been mentioned. Less familiar a sight today (surgery having stepped in, rolled up sleeves, donned a sterile gown and gone to work) than was true a few years ago, is the clubbed foot. The club foot is a developmental defect. Babies have been born with but one hand or one arm. In the case of a "missing" part, development simply stopped. It may be said that in the case of a clubbed foot development met with interference. In the cleft palate and harelip there was an impediment to development.

THE SO-CALLED MARKED CHILD

Where folk tales may be entirely true in numerous instances there are almost countless other instances in which they are entirely fallacious and not based upon one shred of actual fact. This is specifically true of the so-called *marked child.* It is admitted that heredity has something to do with various deformities. Maternal impressions can have nothing whatsoever to do with the occurrence of deformities and developmental defects. In other words it is impossible for a mother to *mark* her child.

Upon being apprised of the actual truth, the reasonably-minded, intelligent person will cease repeating the tales of the fishwives.

The foetus (unborn babe from the third month on) has no direct nerve or blood vessel connection with its mother. It develops within the chorion—an "envelope" formed by the outermost structures of the ovum—and this envelope adheres with a porosity of connections to the mother's womb. No nerves or blood vessels connect the surfaces of the chorionic membrane and the uterine walls. The mother-blood furnishing the elements for the development of the foetus passes into the chorionic structures by a process known as osmosis. In this function osmosis is defined as *the* phenomenon of the passage of certain fluids and solutions through a membrane or other porous substance.

The blood of the mother being the food of the developing foetus it can no more carry the maternal impressions and thus "mark" a child than can the food eaten by a living person cause such person to be marked—except as a gourmet.

On the basis of the foregoing it may seem to many readers that there should be *no* developmental defects provided the mother eats and metabolizes the requisite foods in sufficient quantities to sustain and build or develop the foetus. This is *reckoning* without *reasoning.* Neither blood nor nutriment directly starts the process of the development of a new body and a new life. Both, we know, begin when a spermatozoon unites with an ovum and the ovum thus impregnated attaches itself to the wall of the uterus. Through these parent elements hereditary transmission may occur.

Heredity is the transmission of characters from parents to offspring. Cross heredity is the occurrence of one disease in a parent and of a different, but allied disease in the child. Epilepsy in the one generation and migraine in the other are examples of cross heredity. One form of heredity takes its name from folklore. It is called "Knight's-move form of heredity." In this there is the inheritance of sex-limited diseases

which affect only one sex but are transmitted by the other sex. The disease, hemophilia, commonly known as bleeder's disease, is an example of this. It attacks only the sons but is inherited through the mothers.

One rather sweeping definition of heredity is found in "Medical Genetics and Eugenics," published by the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania in 1940. The definition appears on page 138 and reads: "Any disease which is not due to mechanical or chemical injury or to some external agent such as a parasite, a bacterium, or a virus, is likely to have an inherited basis."

Heredity may influence developmental defects. Mechanical action undoubtedly influences the materialization of developmental defects to a vast extent.

Were it possible for you to see portrayed on the screen rather than to read a meager word description, the various stages of development from the ovum stage (first and second weeks after fertilization) through the embryonic stage (end of second to eighth weeks) and the final foetal stage (eighth week to term), you would likely wonder that visible developmental defects are not far more common than they appear to be. As an example, at the end of the embryonic stage (eighth week) and the beginning of the foetal stage, the *embryo-foetus* has a facial appearance not unlike that of a short nosed, fat-jowled pig. Before the end of the first month of embryonic development the eyes are readily recognized. Mechanical injury at this stage might readily cause a serious defect and considering the delicacy of the tissues and organs in the process of formation, it is easy to conceive of congenital deformities of a broad variety.

Although the sex of numerous individuals cannot be determined either at birth or in the very early years of life, the sex of the embryo can be fairly accurately guessed at by the end of the seventh week. This status would be according to the biologist and not according to the sexologist who holds that sex cannot be positively determined in the absence of a knowledge of the nature and kind of gonads (sex glands) — the testicles and ovaries.

As we go more deeply into developmental defects it will be much easier to understand why there are hermaphrodites and indeed one may well wonder that there isn't even a greater number of hermaphroditic individuals than is suspected, even by the physician who has made a special and exhaustive study of hermaphroditism.

In his splendid book, "Why We Do It," by Dr. Edward C. Mason, and published by Mosby in 1937, Dr. Mason states on page 92:

> "Due to the similarity in the development of the male and female sex organs, it is not surprising that incomplete development or overdevelopment of the organs of either sex does occasionally occur. Such developmental abnormalities should not create intense curiosity and excitement with much newspaper publicity of the individual's malformation, but should be interpreted in terms of embryological development. It is not remarkable that an occasional case of malformation occurs, but it is remarkable that normal cases occur so frequently."

On the same page Dr. Mason, without perhaps realizing it, gave an important fact which is to be regarded seriously in any study of developmental defects leading to hermaphroditism, pseudo-hermaphroditism, or any difficulty of sex distinction. It was this: "The principal difference in the development of the male and female external genitalia is one of degree rather than kind."

The clitoris is spoken of as a miniature penis. In the embryo, at the uro-genital ridge, it is rare that the degree of development of the rudimentary organ is greater in the male than in the female. Both organs have a glans placed at the distal (outer extreme) end. Both have a body, spongiosum and both are erectile. As development proceeds the male

sans such a developmental defect as hyperspadias or hypospadias has the urethra embodied with the penis. In the female the urethra develops beneath the clitoris. The tissues forming either the vulva or the scrotum stand apart in the early stages of development. In an earlier stage of development there is what is known as the *cloaca*. This is a combined uro-genital and rectal openig. The genital "glans" lies just superior to the cloaca. When the cloaca reaches such a stage of development that it is readily distinguishable the hips, feet and legs (at this stage numerous anatomists call them the hind limbs) are just beginning to form. As these limbs grow and extend the cloaca takes on an appearance indicating developmental change, an elongated superior orifice becomes distinguishable and soon the uro-genital opening and the rectal opening have become separate entities. Between the uro-genital opening and the rectal opening the perineum takes form. The sex-trend will, by now, have been established. If the sex is male the male gonads have begun their descent. The orifice (opening) closes as the raphe (ra-fe), which is a line of union between two contiguous surfaces or structures, takes form and union is established. The external distinction of the scrotum is established. In the female there is no union such as that just described, and if there is no impediment to development the larger and lesser lips become normally formed with their cleft (the vaginal opening) between them.

From the explanation which has just been given it may appear that the various changes described are so normal that a developmental defect or the so-called *freak* sexual development could hardly occur. To draw such a conclusion would be quite erroneous. This will be readily understood presently.

If, for instance, as does actually occur, the raphe fails to take proper form and the cleft between the lips fails to close or only partially closes, and the clitoris keeps a close growth pace analogous to that of the penis, becoming vastly overdeveloped, an apparent female hermaphrodite is in the making. This does occur, yet with what frequency there is no way of knowing. Countless births are not attended by physicians.

Standard birth certificates provide space only for showing the sex as male or female. When there is a question as to the sex status and a physician is in attendance, the physician in most instances prefers to leave it to the family involved to state the family preference as to the legal sex. Even when the physician is called upon as arbiter he does not always find it easy to make a decision. And regardless of the decision, the birth never enters into statistics as having been hermaphroditic.

Now and then the uro-genital opening fails to ascend to its normal position in the body of the penis. Or, the urethral opening does not reach the end, passing through the glans. The opening thus appears on the under surface of the penis. It creates a condition known as hypospadias (previously mentioned).

In some cases the uro-genital opening appears on the dorsum (back or top—uppermost) of the penis and the condition is known as hyperspadias.

In hypospadias the urogenital opening may be so low as to fail to connect with the stalk or body of the penis. If the condition is exaggerated the case may be regarded as pseudo-hermaphroditism. If, in a case of this kind the penis is underdeveloped, the sex may be mistaken to be female, the penis being regarded as an overdeveloped clitoris and the uro-genital opening a vaginal orifice. With this faulty development and the undescended gonads being testes, the sex is unquestionably male. Such pseudo-hermaphroditic males have gone through life as women, fully believing themselves to be women. They have married and in numerous instances copulation has been entirely satisfactory.

Because none is immune to the necessity of surgery, cases of the kind just described have come to light because surgery became necessary and the nature of the gonads being thus discovered established the true sex of the individual.

In numerous cases of diagnosis of cryptorchidism (undescended testicle—one or both) the penis (perhaps in many cases merely an overdeveloped clitoris) is small. Surgery has revealed such diagnoses to be incorrect, the internal gonads being ovaries (instead of undescended testes), and has thus established the sex as female. This is regarded as pseudo-hermaphroditism.

Both surgery and autopsy have revealed numerous cases of one or two ovotestes. In certain instances of this kind the external genitalia gave the appearance of the female. The subjects were female hermaphrodites. When the external genitalia were of male appearance the subjects were male hermaphrodites.

Internal developmental sex defects include a broad range of anomalies. To understand many of these the reader would need much more than a simplified knowledge of the human anatomy. A few of these defects may be described in such a manner that the lay reader can understand them and I shall try to limit my descriptions to those anomalies lending themselves to comparatively easy understanding.

In the descriptions of the anomalies in the development of the external genitalia no reference has been made to such internally placed organs as the prostate gland and the uterus (womb). Many laymen and some physicians refer to the prostate gland as the prostate glands. This may be attributed to the fact that the prostate is composed of three lobes—two lateral and one central.

During intrauterine development the prostate takes form in the male and the uterus takes form in the female. In the development of the prostate gland one curious phenomenon occurs. Actually a vestigial uterus is embodied within the structures of the male prostate. If you are inclined to doubt consult any accepted medical dictionary. You will find data under such terms as: "Utriculus; sinus pocularis, uterus masculinus, etc." This miniature uterus is described briefly as a minute pouch in the prostate.

The *uterus masculinus* has greater significance than it would appear to have on first glance. It is not an abnormality—not any more than the clitoris (which we must remember is a miniature penis) is an abnormality and it may well be pointed out that Dr. Freud shocked staid colleagues by declaring that in early childhood the clitoris of the female served or serves as the chief organ of sexual interest in the same manner as the penis of the male child.

The visible male nipples, analogous to the female mammary glands, excite no peculiar interest in anyone and are by no means regarded as an abnormality. But a male uterus? It would astound you to actually know how firmly many men will label anatomists as outright liars on this subject.

The uterus masculinus is of interest to us here because of the fact that if, during development an abnormal trend occurs, the uterus masculinus may become overdeveloped and thus, upon casual examination, give the impression of an infantile female uterus. If, in such a case (as occurs with greater frequence than is suspected) the external genital organs are of faulty development, the sex of the male may be readily mistaken as being that of the female. Only an examination (requiring surgical exploration in most cases) to determine the nature of the gonads can establish the actual sex in such cases. In this category we have another example of hermaphroditism.

If examination is first performed during or after puberty an infantile uterus may be mistaken for a precociously developed male prostate if (and this not infrequently occurs) the external genital organs (an overdeveloped clitoris which often accompanies an infantile uterus) have a remarkable male-like appearance.

The more deeply we go into the study of developmental sex defects, the more we find ourselves agreeing that Dr. Mason stated it lightly when he said that the wonder is that there are not greater numbers

of actual and apparent abnormalities and deviations from the normal in the development of the sexual systems in the human species. (The animal species may well be added to such an analytical consideration.)

"A MAN BECOMES A WOMAN"

The literature concerning developmental sex defects is much richer than the person who has not encountered such literature suspects. A recently published article of mine entitled: "A Man Becomes a Woman," depicted in considerable detail the strange case of Einar Wegener, the Danish artist who, after about 40 years as a male, decided that he wanted to become a woman. The article was based upon a biography of the case which has been labeled the Wegener-Sparre-Elbe case.

For several years Wegener and his wife, also a Danish artist, lived apparently happily and Dr. Norman Haire of London, internationally known as a sexologist, gave verity to the claim that the sexual lives of these two people, physically and psychologically, was entirely satisfactory.

One may wonder whether satisfaction was complete. Wegener, named Sparre in the biographical book telling the story of the case, early dressed as a woman and from then on was a female impersonator par excellence. In fact he played the role of woman so frequently that he began, in time, to wonder whether he was man or woman. Approaching the forties he had some x-ray treatment. Doubtless this treatment caused atrophy of the testicles. After the effects of the x-ray treatment exerted their influence on both body and mind, Wegener found a doctor who proposed to transform him into woman by a series of surgical operations.

It was claimed that surgery revealed rudimentary ovaries situated in the abdomen. Hard-boiled physicians and other scientists have astutely expressed their doubts concerning not only this but the existence of both kinds of gonads (male and female) in the same person. I do not argue with the biography. After all it is but biography and who could expect either a biography or autobiography to be other than distorted here and underdone there. That which is of greatest interest to us here is that a developmental defect did exist in Wegener-Sparre-Elbe. One examination revealed a vast preponderance of female hormones. After testicular atrophy his manner and actions, even when he consciously strove to alter these, were such that he was, when walking on the streets, through the market places, etc., whispered about as "a female masquerading as a male."

Wegener-Sparre-Elbe was first castrated. There must have been little to castrate for. Later the penis was surgically removed and still later an operative process in which a piece of small intestine is used was performed creating an artificial vagina. The original name was Wegener. Sparre was the name given in the biographical book and Elbe—Lili Elbe, was the name adopted for the final woman-phase and the final phase of Wegener's life. The Danish government annulled the Wegener marriage and issued the transformed Wegener a passport as Lili Elbe. "She" returned to the hospital for further surgery, presumably an attempt to create an artificial uterus and died after a fairly lengthy and doubtless disappointing stay in the hospital.

Before we proceed to consider other deformities as what we may call a comparative study, I want to give details of one case wherein the male generative organ can be pushed completely back into the body. Cases of this kind occur wherein the organ can be manipulated into an internal position so that the external appearance is something similar to the external female organs. I have permission to use the letter which

follows and from which I have of necessity deleted actual names. A portion of the letter is a bit outside the pale of our present subject. It would detract from the interest of the letter in general to omit it and it is therefore included:

A LETTER FROM A HERMAPHRODITE

Dear Doctor Cauldwell:

I am glad you were able to locate the books you asked me concerning. In them you will find a wealth of detail throwing considerable light upon some of the subjects about which you are writing. If you ever wish to write on the "Secret Sex Life of the Clergy," let me know and I'll supply you with plenty of copy. Some of it will probably be too hot for publication.

Just now I have in mind the case of an Episcopal rector. His church was a large one and his wife was pregnant. The child was not wanted and the rector asked a doctor whose son was a choir boy to perform an abortion. The organist and the choirmaster who had overheard the doctor's son telling another boy told the rector what they thought of him in plain words and of course he got fired (the organist got fired). The minister tried to keep him from getting another church, but he became organist of my former home church. At the time the little church I played for held a mission and the theme was "Health and Religion"—sort of a modified Christian Science affair which was not so strange as all of the ancient churches practiced healing by prayer and anointment. I once heard a bishop say that if we'd kept mental healing in the church where it belonged we wouldn't now be plagued by Christian Science. Anyway a Society for Mental and Spiritual Healing was formed and here is the pay-off: The founder, president and enthusiastic leader of the whole project was the rector who had wanted the abortion performed on his wife. I got a kick out of THAT mission. As I sat in the choir listening to the very earnest preacher expounding his theories I often chuckled at the thought of what he would say if he knew as much about the *patron* as I did. This little preacher was very serious but what he got was pin money compared to what the abortion-seeking rector got, for this rector had "RUBBER" barons in his congregation. One of these barons made one brand of tires world famous.

As Shakespeare said: What fools we mortals be.

I can give you plenty of data on hermaphrodites and it is as you say, there are plenty of people who are of that type and don't know it. I often think of how different my life would have been had I known I was some type of hermaphrodite. I would not have spent the best years of it doing things I was absolutely unfitted for, physically and mentally, and would have avoided a nervous breakdown and years of misery had I regarded myself as predominantly feminine and kept within the limitations Nature imposed on me.

I have always lived a feminine life—never was a boy—nor did I play with them, but I did not know my condition then. I merely knew that I was different. My father knew it, too, and was very impatient with what he regarded as my silly ideas. He never tried to understand me. I was just odd and had a lot of romantic ideas in my head and it was his mission to knock them out and make a grocer out of me. He finally gave it up as a bad job and he was always disappointed in me. He never dreamed that there might be physical or mental differences. NO. To him I was different simply because I wanted to be.

Strangely, Dr. (*a prominent and nationally known surgeon*) who examined me at (*outstanding institution*) two years ago had the same ideas. He said I had seminal vesicles which was not indicative of hermaphroditism—that no hermaphrodite had seminal vesicles. He said also that being able to shove the penis into the body was quite common, (I never knew but one boy who could and he was a homosexual), and to get over this crazy idea that I was a hermaphrodite, and to forget about sex. All this, but he insisted on taking a 24-hour supply of urine for a hormone test for which I paid $30 (he wanted $50 but I wouldn't agree) and he promised to send me the report but he never did, and when I wrote him to send it to me a year later he did not answer my letter. That, it seems to me, is significant. I never felt at ease with him and I was afraid he'd think I was unbalanced if I told him of my emotional life, so all he got was the physical side of it, and he *could* be wrong there.

On the other hand, the minute S (*a writer*) showed the photographs of my organs, face and figure to Dr. (*a nationally known and honored psychiatrist*) of the (*a clinic just now doing vast research and experimentation on subjects sexualis*) clinic, and Dr. —— of Leland Stanford University, they said at once: "Undoubtedly some form of hermaphrodite." So: "You pays your money and you takes your choice."

Dr. (*the psychiatrist*) used to be with Dr. (*the surgeon who got the thirty bucks*) but he has better sense than to consider one a freak of nature and look at you coldly as if you were some specimen under a microscope. It is his idea that it takes a person of like nature of a homosexual to get to the bottom of these cases, and he is right. Very few "normal" men can look at them without considering them (secretly) very queer fish. They try not to show it but we sense it and when they spring this: "You don't have to lead this kind of a life—you can be normal," song and dance, we just get disgusted and shut up like clams, for we know it's no use and we will get no help from them. S (*the writer*), on the other hand, is one of Dr. (*the psychiatrist*)'s pupils, and a transvestite (one who enjoys wearing the clothes of the opposite, or the supposedly opposite, sex), besides being a very strong character. Dr. ——— knows all that, of course, and takes full advantage of it in getting case histories. He is president of (*national professional society*), and he must know something. I'd say he knows a lot more than the thirty dollars urinary specimen doctor who is primarily a surgeon.

(The letter tapers off here on unrelated subjects.)

Sincerely, (Blank).

NOTE: This letter tells much and some of its data might well have been reserved for presentation under a more appropriate topic heading. The physical condition (presently to be analyzed) is a developmental sex defect, and deserves attention here. Some of the general effect of the letter would have been spoiled by breaking its continuity.

The status of this correspondent appears *clear* to me. Nevertheless, considering the ever-possible element of human error I *may* be wrong.

Babies are brought into the world with *loving care*. Even when delivered assemly line fashion with a shot of pituitary and torturous appearing forceps? Ahem! Obstetricians glance sex-wise and scribble male or female into the report. All too seldom no suitable examination is made even to determine whether the normal passages are open—the mouth and nostrils, perhaps—rarely more. If trouble develops the doctor will be advised or the resident will take care of it. Even when the child is born in the home and the attending physician is not a "production or

assembly line expert" far too little attention is paid to the genital organs and the genito-urinary system. I have known doctors to regard such examinations as something of an "indelicacy." The situation always reminds me that it takes more than a sheepskin and a goatee to make a doctor.

What my correspondent described indicates a condition known as atresia. This is the congenital absence or pathological closure of a normal opening or passage. There was probably a congenital absence of a vaginal orifice in this case with overdevelopment of the clitoris which was *perforate*. The clitoris normally lies within the folds of the "vaginal lips" and hence could be readily pushed back into what should have been its normal position. This condition occurs much more often than medical attendants discover at birth. In many, many cases the person so affected is regarded as a cryptorchid—it is believed that there simply has been no descent of the testicles. The condition is one of female hermaphroditism but the victim of Nature, of man's carelessness and inefficiency, goes through life with the role of a sex to which he is unsuited thrust upon him.

The *finding* of seminal vesicles by the Great Surgeon means nothing unless there was exploratory surgery which there plainly was not. What the surgeon mistook for seminal vesicles could just as easily have been lymph nodules, hard fatty lumps or what a layman might call simple kernels. If this patient's urine *was* examined there is no doubt in my mind but that a vast preponderance of female hormones was found.

There are numerous developmental sex defects which can not be described here for lack of space and because the reader who has not been trained in anatomy and indeed in medicine or the medical sciences would have to read with a medical dictionary in one hand and a standard illustrated anatomy in the other.

It is believed that when the reader has added the brief references to be given on deformities to his present idea of the various developmental defects considered, he will find it easy to understand why, in the first place, there are hermaphroditic persons and why some of the folk tales are true in principle. He may also have a better understanding as to why so little of actual truth is generally known of the subject of hermaphroditism and as to what constitutes or may constitute a hermaphrodite.

DEFORMITIES AND HERMAPHRODITISM

From time immemorial deformities have occurred. Some deformities relate to hermaphroditism—many do not. A few deformities—some common and others comparatively rare—are cited in order that hermaphroditism as a departure from the accepted normal may be more readily comprehended as an actual phenomenon.

Siamese twins represent a type of deformity. The original Siamese twins were truly Siamese. It is said that modern surgery could have separated them. In many cases Siamese twins cannot be separated. An example is a Pueblo, Colorado, case where Siamese twins had two skeletons—or separate skeletons—and but one set of abdominal organs. These twins died in birth but had they lived separation would have been impossible because of the common set of abdominal organs between them. Twins have been born joined together by a common frontal (forehead) bone. Even though all other organs were present it is doubtful whether any surgical procedure yet devised could have safely separated them. An odd but authentic case is that of twins with but one pelvis and one pair of legs. The idea of the "mermaid" has something in common with the deformity wherein the legs are either joined or are missing. Hernia of the brain in which the hernia appears outside the skull is not unknown.

Harelip has been mentioned. An old medical drawing made before photographs were invented depicts two heads and faces, one head being inverted and appearing to grow out of or attached to an apparently normal head. Historical data indicate that the second head had no intelligence. An apparently authentic case is that of a Chinese with a twin, sans head, growing out of his chest. In this case the knees were flexed and the feet were on a level with the umbilicus.

One type of congenital deformity is called a phocomelus. A phocomelus has nimble hands and feet, but no arms or legs.

Almost everyone has seen innumerable types of deformity. Page after page could be filled with descriptions of deformities. Suffice it to say that a broad variety of congenital deformities, plainly visible to everyone, can occur. That various deformities occur is common knowledge. By the same token an infinite variety of deformities of the sexual system can occur. Such deformities do occur.

Hermaphroditism on either the physical, mental or chemical planes is not as rare as it is believed to be. It should not be treated as a subject for curiosity but should be accepted as a fact and science would do well to direct efforts to the end that hermaphroditic and other congenital deviations from the perfect body and normal mental potential be eliminated.

ANALYTICAL CONSIDERATION OF ACTUAL CASES

We shall now proceed to examine some of the data which have been presented, to consider some special cases and to concern ourselves with some of the personality considerations in hermaphroditism and sociological aspects of this condition. In doing this we shall look in on the endocrine system for a brief, yet interesting inspection.

When I recorded the incident wherein I had my first sight of the genital appearance of a hermaphrodite, I stated that I would describe Miss Lucy's actual hermaphroditic appearance at a later time.

Seated on a chair with legs set off at different angles, one of the feet resting on a hassock and the other foot elevated from the floor, Miss Lucy displayed the genital area almost perfectly for visual inspection. There was what appeared to be a short stubby penis about as long as the distal phalanx of the thumb of the average man's hand. The organ was of about the same thickness and an area of glans slightly smaller than a dime showed clearly in contrast with the prepuce surrounding it. It was impossible to tell whether there was a perforation but I do not believe there was one. Just beneath the organ there was an opening such as I have since observed in hypospadias. Inferior to the opening (beneath it) the tissues appeared united, forming a perineum much longer than that of the normal male or female. The triangular area forming the genital area appeared long and narrow. Looking back over the years today it is my belief (and belief only) that Miss Lucy was an underdeveloped male with hypospadias. The very fact that she had been reared to regard herself as female, the feminine role she played in normal affairs, yet with a definite admixture of masculinity of personality and body configuration, aside from the external genital defective formation, plainly label her as at least a hermaphroditic person with a distinct hermaphroditic personality.

In the case of the person whose letter I have reproduced, or presented in part, I am convinced that this person (and in my opinion from several letters I have had from him) is not a male at all. It is my belief that what appears to be his penis is an overdeveloped clitoris and that he was born with an atresia which means that the passage which should have been the vaginal tract and the point which should have been the external vaginal orifice were closed. Judging from several letters

from this so-called man I know that his mental processes are at least 90 percent feminine. I can but believe that exploratory surgery would reveal the internal gonads as ovaries. There may be an infantile uterus. At this time of life I doubt seriously whether surgery could be of benefit but if my conclusions are anything like right surgery might readily establish a rather normal type of vaginal orifice. An environmental change would complete the transformation to what I believe the sex to be. In other words my opinion as of the present is that the sex is that of the female hermaphrodite. Through suitable attention and surgery in early life a correction might have been made and a serious error avoided.

Before leaving this case let us remember that the writer of the letter did not frankly state that he was homosexual but one or more passages implied that this condition might obtain. If, however, desire is directed toward the male sex and the subject is, as I think, female, then the idea of homosexuality is a mistaken one indeed.

Numerous cases of hermaphroditism occurred in my practice during the years in which I actively engaged in practice. The various degrees of hermaphroditism occurring were quite generally in accord with the conditions I have described under developmental sex defects and elsewhere. The personality angle in the matter of individuals and the sociological aspects of hermaphroditism in general are of greater interest than the mere factors seeming to mark individuals physically or mentally—not outwardly and to the world nor even to themselves in numerous instances—but with those indelible but not ineradicable features common to a disrupted sexuality.

It will be remembered that I explained that many hermaphrodites have but a vague idea as to their condition. They may believe that they are hermaphroditic—yet may be unable to point out the deviation which they believe to be existent. It will be seen that this is true in the case of the hermaphrodite whose letter we have read.

Hypogenitalism should not be confused with hermaphroditism although the open-minded physician may often find it difficult to differentiate the conditions. Hypogenitalism means underdevelopment of the genital system. This is seen often in certain diseases of an endocrine or gonadotrophic nature. Gonadotropism is an endocrine condition wherein the gonads, by their secretions, exercise a dominating influence. It is also spoken of as an endocrine constitution.

The endocrine glands were first called the ductless glands. The term originated in the fact that these glands pour their secretions directly into the bloodstream. Thus they have no ducts, as some other glands, by which secretions are conducted away from the glands for discharge and dispositon.

A duct is a tubular structure giving exit to the secretion of a gland, or conducting any fluid.

The secretions of the endocrine glands are chemical substances known as hormones. The endocrine glands have a rich blood supply. These glands remove substances from the blood, convert them to other substances and then return the substances so converted directly to the bloodstream.

It may seem strange that the substances returned by the endocrine glands to the bloodstream are of such vast significance. The significance can be more readily understood when one knows, for instance, that the difference between the androgenic (determining masculinity) hormone and the (feminine determinant) hormone, chemically considered appears to be almost infinitesimal.

These are the chemical formulas of male and female hormones:

Androsterone (Male) C19-H30-02.
Testosterone (Widely called *the* male hormone) C19-H28-02.
Estrogen (Female) C18-H24-02.
Estrone (Female) C18-H22-02.
Progesterone (Female) C21-H30-02.

Strangely testosterone, with a difference of but two atoms of hydrogen, is said to be from six to 10 times stronger than androsterone. Estradiol with but two atoms more of hydrogen than estrone is regarded as about 12 times stronger than the latter. The difference between testosterone (male) and estradiol (female) is a matter of but one atom of carbon and four atoms of hydrogen. The comparison staggers the imagination.

To the end that the endocrines may be better understood let us see how many there are and more about them.

As late as 1942, when the 24th Edition of Gray's Anatomy appeared, the endocrine glands were named as: the thyroid, the parathyroids, the pituitary and the adrenals. Other organs once regarded as endocrines, being as yet of uncertain function, are: the thymus, the pineal, the glumus coccygeum, and other organs regarded as of definite endocrine function are the gonads (testes and ovaries), the pancreas, liver, and mucous portions of the gastro-intestinal tract.

It cannot be said with certainty that the endocrine glands entirely determine sexuality (once this is established), but it can be said definitely that the endocrine glands (and those of definite endocrine function) dominate or exert the greatest of all known influence upon sexuality.

All of these facts are important when we consider the androgenous or hermaphroditic person. To use a common figure of speech, "it does something" to a man when his bloodstream becomes heavily laden with female hormones and it definitely does something to a woman when her blodstream becomes heavily laden with male hormones.

In the apparent male there may be a preponderance of female hormones. This chemical difference can influence his way of thinking so that mentally, he is androgenous on the female plane. A similar preponderance of male hormones in the female or apparent female, places her personality on the male androgenous plane. In view of these conditions it is not difficult to understand hermaphroditic persons seemingly of one sex may act much more as though they belonged to the opposite sex.

It will not be amiss for us to refresh our minds with a brief summary of a few well known facts. These are:

(a) Both males and females are begotten by males and borne by females.

(b) All males are *part* females and all females are *part* male.

(c) All males have vestigial markings of the female and all females have vestigial markings of the male.

(d) Being a son of his mother no man should be ashamed of the natural fact that certain of his thought patterns are feminine and likewise, being a daughter of her father, no woman should be ashamed that certain of her thought patterns are masculine.

(e) Being in no way responsible for his or her condition no human being should be ashamed because he or she is not fully sexed.

(f) Society should be made cognizant of the highly important truth contained in (e) above.

Personality constitutes the factors of distinction of persons. Personology is the study of persons. In hermaphroditism the personality traits are far more apparent to the individual himself or herself than to any other person. Many psychiatrists are today turning away from consideration once given to personality and are delving more deeply into personology. In this way personal (or individual) problems of personality will lend themselves to readier solution. The overall sociological effect will be greater and necessarily better.

It seems entirely apropos to mention that in my work as a sexological editor I count my correspondents by the hundreds annually. In their letters, most of them quite frankly written, my correspondents disclose so many angles valuable to any student of personology that I

often think we might afford to forget much that we have learned about psychiatry if we had enough medical specialists with a thorough knowledge of personology.

Letter after letter discloses the personological and therefore the sociological aspects of the sex complexes both on the physical and mental planes and I do not feel that it is inappropos to add the chemical plane. There are traits of personology common to all, it appears, disclosed in these letters. On the other hand the clearest of pictures indicate what many of our best and most successful doctors have contended for years and that is: "In the practice of medicine the doctor who seeks to cure his patient's ills pours water through a tin horn open on both ends. The doctor who seeks to cure his patient follows a wise course and has a greater chance to succeed in his undertaking."

A WOMAN WHO THOUGHT SHE WAS A LESBIAN

Not so long ago I received a letter from a young woman who believed herself to be homosexual. She had *never* met *another* homosexual person. She had read numerous well-qualified writers on sexological subjects, and yet, no key to her own problem had been found. Like the hermaphrodite whose letter has been quoted, she railed at being told to just be "normal." She stated in part: "It seems the only people I ever come in contact with are 'normal.' Carpenter explains quite well when he points out how hard it is for the young among the 'sex questionables' to suffer that complete veil of silence which is drawn over the suject and which leads to painful confusions and perversions of the mind. It is hard that there should be no hint of guidance and no recognition of the solitary and really serious inner struggles they may have to face."

She went on to explain: "Those in a position to offer guidance turn away in cold ruthlessness. They are heartless when they demand that we adjust ourselves to what they call normal living, for what is normal to them, or that which they call normal, is abnormal to us."

In my reply I stated in part: "You state: 'Those in a position to offer guidance turn away in cold ruthlessness.' Let me remind you that those who thus turn away are incapable of giving counsel and guidance. Relative to that which constitutes normality and abnormality this depends upon individual belief rather than upon actuality. Abnormalities exist in our minds. . . . There is nothing wrong with you that psychiatry and endocrine therapy cannot correct. That there is an endocrine imbalance I do not doubt. You may be hermaphroditic if we recognize the chemical (hormonal) trend. Definitely I find nothing indicative of homosexuality in your letter.

"I thoroughly agree that the position of the invert in society is rarely a pleasant one. Not at all pleasant is the lot of the invert who falls into the hands of the penologists instead of the hands of the psychologists. Except when an innocent person is injured or an unnecessarily anti-social crime (and I mean actual crime) is committed the cases of the homosexuals and certain hermaphrodites fall within the field of medical rather than criminal jurisprudence.

"Psychologists point to the fact that many of the Great, near-Great, and others so considered were of sexual natures regarded by the yard sticks of the criminologists and penologists as *abnormal.*

HOMOSEXUALITY AMONG THE GREAT

"Some of these Great and near-Great were believed to be homosexuals and others were regarded as of homosexual natures. Among these we may count Leonardo da Vinci, Michaelangelo and Shakespeare. And there were Wilde, Whitman, Tennyson, Cardinal Newman, and

Frederick the Great of Prussia. There was Queen Elizabeth of England. Also to be mentioned are numerous outstanding men and women not altogether figures of a dead past. In our own country aspersions were cast upon Washington and Hamilton. Washington, regarded as an austere man and highly dignified, was said to be far from either. His stern and dignified appearance, it has been revealed, was attributable to the fact that he wore false teeth which fit poorly. He was reputed to have never laughed yet the reason has been revealed. He was afraid to laugh for fear of losing his false teeth.

WAS QUEEN ELIZABETH A HERMAPHRODITE?

"Except for the odd sexuality of Queen Elizabeth of England, Washington would have remained, it has been claimed, an obscure farmer. Queen Elizabeth was believed by many to have been a hermaphrodite—referred to as double sexed. History certainly shows that her nature was of such duality that she could carry out the part of a woman with finesse and in the handling of affairs of State could out-man any man who approached her kingdom from within or without. Queen Elizabeth's surgeon denied that she was hermaphroditic but we must remember that heads weren't worth much in those days and perhaps the surgeon did not care to have unlicensed (except by the Queen's word and the word of her successors) surgery committed upon him from the neck up—or down. His statement can hardly be regarded as dependable and a personology study would indicate hermaphroditism on the part of the Queen—for which she was in no way responsible.

"Just what your condition is I can but guess. I do not have to guess that you need the services of an interested psychiatrist and I feel certain that you need the ministrations of an endocrinologist."

I have given as much of the above as I have in order to show that not all professional men and women in the several fields of medicine, social science, psychology, etc., are disinterested in persons who call themselves abnormal because they do not recognize the fact they are merely different.

Many fine people write me explaining their difficulties in adjusting to a society which has not advanced sufficiently even today to recognize the fact that mental illness is just as natural (if not more so) as physical illness. Our "highly developed civilization" still trusses the mentally ill in handcuffs and hauls them away to jail in a "Black Mariah." An ambulance with respectful attendants calls at the bedside of the physically ill and with gentleness (sometimes) wafts them away to a well organized and immaculate hospital where excellent care and flowers await them.

Small children draw no distinctive line between sexual differences. Neither the little girl nor the little boy learns to hide his or her body until taught to do so. Certain it is that the positively hermaphroditic child knows nothing of his condition until the dictates of a benevolent society cause him or her to be taught the difference. This same benevolent society labeled or mislabeled civilization teaches also that curse of mankind, the complexes, and doubtless the most abominable of all so-called complexes taught are those known as the *inferiority complexes.*

The whole social structure would benefit were the inferiority complexes forgotten and never brought to mind. Society would be infinitely richer if parents of children who are born into a status diametrically different from the so-called normals would seek to teach these children from early childhood that their place in humanity and the social scale is just as important as that of their so-called normal brothers, sisters, cousins and friends.

The androgyne (hermaphrodite) or other person born differing from the accepted normal should be impressed that his or her condi-

tion is as normal to others in a similar condition as anyone is to persons of their own status.

It is fortunate that so many persons who, if their condition were known, would be regarded as abnormal, grow up with understanding and rise above their *self-styled superiors.* Hermaphroditism cannot be a stigma unless the hermaphroditic person permits society to teach him (or her) to *will it so.*

Hermaphrodites among humans (hermphrodite species in lower life beget, conceive and produce young) do not bear or beget children. It seems strange therefore that hermaphroditism does "run" in families. There must me some hereditary factor but if that factor is as yet suspected I am not apprised of the fact.

HERMAPHRODITIC ANIMALS

Under suitable procedure it has been shown that we could breed out numerous hereditary diseases and socially defective persons within the space of a single generation. Animal husbandrymen follow methods which are continually improving their breeds, and yet human breeding must be left to blind chance. Hermaphroditic animals appear from time to time among our domesticated animals. As yet the intelligent husbandrymen have not learned a method of breeding the condition out.

Cattlemen are thoroughly familiar with an anomaly, the hermaphroditic twin to a bull calf with internal male gonads and external female genitalia. The anomaly has been known since antiquity. It still appears with frequence on the western ranges. The product, this animal hermaphrodite, is known as a freemartin.

Hens have been known to cease laying, to undergo changes in appearance and to become cocks—cocks capable of copulating with hens and fertilizing their ova. Eggs from such matings have been incubated and hatched—producing normal chicks. Likewise, cocks have undergone sex transmutation and become hens and thus have actually laid eggs.

Notwithstanding these so-called freakish occurrences, fowl and animal breeds have been continually improved for the past few decades until "scrub" stock has almost disappeared from the face of the earth in advanced countries.

Our "civilization" places a stigma upon persons born sexually different from the accepted normal .It stigmatizes in a like manner the child born out of *"holy* wedlock." For the child born in what civilization is pleased to call illegitimacy, civilization has invented and conferred that most despicable word, "bastard." Law does not legalize unfortunate children born "outside" the law—children born without their knowledge or consent. Law refuses to legalize these children except by sanctioning the *"holy morriage"* of two persons who should, in many instances, never see each other again. Yet *law* has legalized that despicable word, has made the word, bastard, legal tender in court.

Is it any wonder the poor bewildered girl who believed herself to be homosexual (yet could not know because she had never met another homosexual) believed that those in a position to offer advice and counsel turned away in cold ruthlessness?

Is it any wonder that the hermaphrodite who knew more than one of our country's well known surgeons expresses bitterness because his father refused to understand him and tried to "knock the silly, foolish and romantic ideas" out of his head. It is any wonder in this case that much of a very fine life was possibly wasted—at no one knows what cost to the betterment of civilization?

To throw an additional sidelight upon the hermaphrodite whose letter has been shown herein, let me explain that several days ago he wrote me a letter in which he gave some interesting information. I

learned that he is a connoisseur of music and fine art. He sent me, as a token of appreciation for the interest I have shown, a fine and rare print of a botanical specimen, dating back to an early and turbulent age in English history. Naturally I use the terms "he" and "him" advisedly as will be understood. I regard the sex of this individual as female and I firmly believe that a rather simple operation early in life would have opened what I feel certain was a closed vaginal orifice, thus establishing the individual's true sex and giving "him"—shall I say "her"?—a rightful place in the world and its social structure.

THE HABIT OF "SELF-GRATIFICATION"

Not so long ago I received a letter from a much perturbed young man. At an early age he had fallen into the practice of what is known by an established term: Masturbation. This practice is fast becoming known by a better term: "Self-gratification." This young man had been taught that all things worldly, such as *amusements,* erotic attraction to the opposite sex (I use his way of expressing), swimming, athletics and sports, were sinful. He had been taught nothing whatsoever concerning sex.

From time to time he worried about his "secret" practice. He was not attracted to girls. His sexual organs were underdeveloped. He attempted to conceal the fact that he believed he "thought" like girls. He liked all of the things girls were supposed to like including dolls and soft clothing next to his skin.

For a while after he went to the army he found that he was able to control his indulgence in the "secret practice." Then he fell into the habit again. He solemnly vowed (and I believed him) that he had never committed a homosexual act although he had found himself greatly admiring the physique of "handsome" males when in line nude for physical examination, for baths, etc. Worried, he went to a chaplain to talk about his secret practice.

Unfortunately, the chaplain was not a sexologist and had not learned what science has demonstrated concerning masturbation, i.e., that masturbation per se is not injurious as it was formerly believed to be, that injury occurs through misinformation, ignorance and a sense of guilt, that it is reliably estimated that 90 percent of all males and females indulge in some form of masturbation at some time and for varying periods and that the practice has not caused an insane world.

The chaplain told him all of the scary tales dictated by the ignorance of a few years ago. Frightened, the lad refrained from the habit for a short time.

Discharged in time and returned home, he plunged into "church work" in an effort to "expiate his sins." He met a girl who was likewise engaged in church work. *She* wanted to marry *him.* He was afraid the marriage would not turn out well. What was wrong with him and what should he do? Since the girl had entered his life he had grown to hate the church which had failed him. He had grown to hate his parents who "had failed to teach him correctly about the most important thing in life." He had no further belief in any God, heaven or hell. To his letter he added a postscript: "Please answer this through the magazine." (*Sexology*). (Parentheses are mine.) "Please do not send any mail to me here at my home address. Should my folks find out about anything I have written you it would cause me serious embarrassment."

Here was a definite androgenous trend (hermaphroditic) with defective functioning of the endocrine glands and consequent hormone imbalance. The expressions indicating perhaps a homosexual trend were not actually indicative of homosexuality. This subject was, mentally and physically, still at the age of puberty. The admiration he expressed

of "handsome" nude males is regarded as normal to boys at the age of puberty who, in fact, envy the superior development of somewhat older boys who have passed through the stage of devolpment of secondary sex characteristics.

Intelligent endocrine therapy and earnest psychiatric counsel with encouragement to indulge in normal physical activities are indicated for the establishment of positive normality in this case. Many analogous cases have been so treated with excellent results. In the absence of treatment if this young man does not become frankly psychopathic at an early age (he had felt a tendency toward suicide—a stage of melancholia) he will develop into that type of androgyne wherein the physical sex will be that of an underdeveloped male, while the mental status will be distinctly feminine. A condition of absolute *psychopathia* might be preferable.

WHAT IS A HERMAPHRODITE?

With reference to homo sapiens the majority of medical men have given but little thought to the subject of hermaphroditism notwithstanding the fact that many members of the honorable profession have been of doubtful sex. Canvass a cross section of doctors throughout the country and ask their conception of the hermaphrodite and those who have time away from testing cigarettes and endorsing products they know little or nothing about and never prescribe will answer: "An unsexed freak." This is the version given in whatever medical literature there was on the subject not so long ago.

Many doctors admit that "pseudo-hermaphroditism" occurs rarely. More than you'd suspect would not recognize a hermaphroditic person should they examine one unless perchance the condition was written on the surface anatomy in box car letters. I have known innumerable doctors who would have gazed upon an actual hermaphrodite (when informed of facts) with the same degree of awe and amazement I experienced when I saw the first one as an early teen-aged boy.

The fault is not that of doctors. Practically nothing is taught of the condition known as hermaphroditism in medical colleges. By the same token, little concerning sex science and sex hygiene is taught in our medical schools. No medical school is known to exist in the United States that actually teaches the science of Sexology, which is medically defined as: The science of sex; study of the relations of the sexes.

Actual evidence which can be publicly presented showing that there is any appreciable number of *true hermaphrodites* is, of necessity, lacking. Under present social standards families regard "sexual deviates" (when they recognize them) as skeletons in the family closet. Everyone knows with what zeal these skeletons are believed to be guarded from not merely the eyes of the curious, but from the eyes of the public as well.

Herein we have studied and analyzed various degrees and states of hermaphroditism. No attempt has been made to present a *scholarly treatise.* On the other hand I have attempted to present the subject clearly and definitively and, as I stated in the beginning, in the words of the man in the street—your neighbor and mine. I have gone a step or two farther because I have felt that this book might fall into the hands of persons who are in some degree androgenous or hermaphroditic. I have earnestly endeavored to present each topic in such a manner as to give an insight into his or her condition to the actual hermaphroditic person. Further, I have tried to show the reasoning person that society should take a sane and therefore human view of known deviates. All data have been carefully checked in an effort to make certain that the manner of presentation was in agreement with basic scientific principles.

Various degrees of hermaphroditism exist within the human family.

Any person of either sex whose genital organs, mental integration and chemical (hormonal) characteristics embrace the characters or characteristics of both sexes may be regarded as a hermaphrodite.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

Reprinted from The American Freeman, Published at Girard, Kansas.

ARE WE GROWING CHILDISH?

For the last year or so learned or snappy or selfconfident writers who have in our time taken the place of the gospel-writers have been assuring us that we have allowed our intellectual to outstrip our moral development. On any particular evening you will find two-thirds of grown-up America in cinemas, theaters, or dance-halls. What would be their reaction, if you could secure it, to this statement? To judge by the daily and weekly press they have allowed their mental development to have a spell of rest, whatever their moral condition is. "Do you believe in fantastic stories?" an editor asks in large type; and he then tells this, which he heard from a friend who "knew well" the characters in the fairy tale. A group of young folk, one of whom had a camera, were playing about when one of the group, a girl who, conveniently for the purpose of the story, was beautiful but an avowed Atheist, pointed the camera at the sky and said: "Let's see what this Lord of yours looks like." When the plate was developed there was on it "a remarkably clear image in the heavens of Our Lord"; and the young Atheist is a patient for life in a mental hospital. Another paper has a photograph, colored, of the actual rock from which Moses drew water. Others announce that Noah's ark has been found. Not long ago practically every paper in our country announced appearances of the Virgin in the pious and virtuous Bronx, and later we had whole pages of even highbrow dailies on Mother Cabrini's miracles. Of a score of leading countries today we have a press that reflects the worst degree of readers. But perhaps there are other explanations why the American credulity or the lowest editorial estimate of the intelligence of the press has of late years been so rich in fairy tales.

✤ ✤ ✤

THE NEW HOLY ALLIANCE

When the European monarchs, including such stout champions of virtue as George IV., finally defeated Napoleon they founded what they called The Holy Alliance to restore peace and freedom to Europe. They shed blood enough in the next 50 years to fill the basin of Lake Michigan, yet here we are having to fight the great war over again. *Life,* which of course now abhors bloodshed, had a prominent article, written by no less a person than the managing editor of the *Christian Century,* with the title "Does Europe Face a Holy War?" The writer believes at all events that "Western Europe is moving fast toward a showdown with Communism," and that the Catholic Church is its great antagonist. The showdown, we take it, will not be with 4-ounce gloves, or a marathon race. On the British side we get an article in the *Economist,* a weekly which is as sober and conscientious as *Life* is—shall we say highly-

colored? "This year," the editor says in an article on "A New War of Religion" has seen "a sudden and startling extension of Catholic political activity in preparing for a war on Leftism." And since the Catholics do not intend to take the field with crosses, candlesticks, and holy water, writers on the subject might as well use plain English. By showdown the Catholics mean that they are going to induce Washington to pour its atom bombs and poison gas on Russia and then, with the aid of those 200,000 Catholic Polish soldiers in Britain and doubtless valiant legions from Eire, Spain, Portugal, and Brazil, wipe the wicked Reds off the map. Whatever happens we now know what these people mean by freedom, the brotherhood of man, love your enemies, turn the other cheek, peace, etc.



REACHING OUT TO MARS

Various enterprising gentlemen in Europe have announced that they propose to take a trip to Mars in a rocket. Others suggest that in communicating with Europe from America we will best avoid atmospheric disturbances if we use the moon as a sort of reflector of our radio waves. Now somebody proposes that we use radar to probe the secrets of Mars and get in touch with those advanced Martians, if there are any. Perhaps they could tell us how to get, in the words of Loeb's recent book, "full production without war." It is good to see intellectual enterprise and vitality, but suppose we put off these trips abroad until we have brought this planet of ours into something like order. Seven years ago we concentrated a small body of our ablest men on the study of uranium as a means of murder. What they did in five or six years was probably the greatest feat—from the coldly intellectual angle—in history. Suppose we had invited a hundred-fold greater concentration of genius or high scientific ability from all countries on such matters as why we must march out to blow each other's guts out every few years, why the death rate is in poor districts or in India and China twice as great as in comfortable districts while we shriek at women to have more children, why we can't distribute the goods we can produce, whether religious education does in fact keep down crime, and so on. Some day the people will awaken to the fact that fighting for such things is really as interesting as pictures in technicolor and as satisfying as swing.



THE OPEN MIND

Two letters in the batch that lie before us tell us that the readers dislike Atheism but have an open mind and like to read how the Atheist proves his case. We like open minds, provided they are not too wide open. Millions of people unfortunately have such narrow doors to their minds that you can get nothing in once their teachers, pastors, or pet politicians have got their stuff in. Others have minds so wide open that everything they read slips out again. Our correspondents seem to be in the golden mean and we can offer suggestions. They say that neither the Theist nor the Atheist proves his case so they remain Agnostic. What we suggest is that the most authoritative dictionaries of the English language are better guides on the use of words than religious writers with an axe to grind. These say that an Atheist does not necessarily deny the existence of God: that a man who just has no such belief also is an Atheist. The only fault we find with that is that the former type occurs only once in a blue moon. All who call themselves Atheists with a few rare exceptions mean that they have examined the supposed evidence for the existence of God and found it invalid. We fancy that is also the position of our correspondents. The Atheist has no case to prove. It is the Agnostic who has. He has to prove a philosophy which holds

that the human mind is incapable of speculating on such a subject, and he is then himself incapable of saying whether the arguments are valid or not. Nowadays there ain't no such animal.

✤ ✤ ✤

WOMAN KISSES THE HAND

In recent elections in France and other countries as in the pre-Franco elections in Spain it is acknowledged that the extension of the franchise to women favored the reactionaries. The press, of course, had not a word of appreciation of the action of the Spanish Socialists in granting the vote to women although they knew that most of the women would vote against them; nor did any paper point out that the deGaullists knew that they would gain by doing the same in France. However, there it is. In most countries, particularly Latin, the majority of the women vote conservative. We understand it. You needn't go into subtleties of psychology or grossnesses of physiology. Mental environment, in this case created by the men, is the clue as usual. It is a good thing to open the eyes of women to the fact that they are kissing the hand that chastised them during more than 1,000 years. In the more ancient civilizations woman had few or no disabilities. With the introduction of the Bible as the code of life she was put on a lower level until, in the 19th century, the Bible was broadly challenged and the church told to raise its social ethic. The mail brings us a leaflet which will show her position in the Bible, published by Merrill R. Holste, 1903 Walnut St., St. Paul. But don't quote from it the old legend that a congress of bishops found that woman has no soul. It is a distortion. Mr. Holste surely knows that the church in all ages gave woman one equality: she could be damned just as well as man.

✤ ✤ ✤

WHAT WE MEAN BY PROGRESS

Still the cry is raised that we progressives used the word Progress as a slogan just as politicians use Freedom, Democracy, and Our Christian Civilization, and attach no definite meaning to it. Bunk. Our meaning is as positive and definite as any man could wish. Draw up a list of all that, according to all sensible men and women, is wrong in the world. The only difficulty about that is the shortage of paper. Put the evils under broad heads: Steep inequalities in the distribution of wealth, insecurity of the job and recurring depressions, dishonesty in trade, the press, and the administration, the constant danger of war, the ravages of preventible disease and accidents, sour and unsocial behavior and crime everywhere, the power of fanatics, the parasitism of the clergy, the stupefying influence of much of our entertainment, the libelling of other nations, the restrictions on trade and travel, the shackling of free discussion, the stupidity of censorships, hypocrisy in politics. . . . Well, that will do to go on with. Progress means getting rid of these things as far and as soon as we can. And the real progressive wants to get rid of them *all*. Experience is that if you knock over two crooks out of three, the one you spare helps the others to get on their feet again. The man who says that attacking evils is merely destructive must have a poor opinion of his doctor, and it is 100 to one that he defends some creed or institution that ought to be destroyed.

✤ ✤ ✤

THOSE "FILTHY" BOOKS

There is a new crusade on the way. Various Peter the Hermits have raised the cry and a large part of the rotten press has got out its brass instruments. Hearst's well-paid cartoonists have got out a picture of a

prosperous gentleman rubbing his hands over an open sewer which is labelled The Literary Gutter. We gather that this does not mean the Hearst Press. They publish articles in large type deploring that certain writers and publishers whose god is the dollar have studied "how filthy they can become without being thrown into prison" and are turning out stuff "that would have shocked Rabelais." Don't write in and ask us where you can get it. Possibly the men who write this sort of blah for Hearst and the Catholic press enjoy Rabelais of an evening but we doubt if they ever read a line of the amazing original, which would scorch modern paper, or are aware that Rabelais was a priest and monk whom the Pope genially excused from the burden of his vows. Really Rabelaisian books have not been published since the Ages of Faith closed. The modern world does not need the assistance of screeching preachers and hypocritical pournalists. What we have really to fear is that under the title of "obscenity" they are going to demand the suppression of every book or paper that indulges in a little joke at the expense of the creed. On one of the many clippings sent us as part of this new crusade a pious hand has written: "This includes you." Others connect the wicked literature with Communism, though Russian literature is the "cleanest" in Europe. Look out for another outrage on freedom in our country.

✤ ✤ ✤

OUR PROTESTANTS STEP OUT

Some time ago a big conference of the American Protestant churches was urged to condemn the atom-bomb, and after a long discussion it decided that this was one of those mundane matters with which the clergy need not concern themselves. But a number of them are not content to see the Roman church have a monopoly of the bomb, so they get at it by the backdoor. At a recent conference summoned by the World Council of Churches—Protestant and Greek Orthodox—in America a vigorous attempt was made to get the assembled clergy to denounce power politics. One clerical professor, Georgia—doesn't that mean a lady?—Harkness, told some story of a clergyman caught in a fire. "He had to act swiftly and so must the church," she (or he) said. Can this have been the story of the parson who had not time to put his pants on? Really, Georgia! However, the need of caution prevented a unanimous outspoken declaration. It was enough to bear witness—but strongly—to "the significance of the Christian faith for the life of the nations." Which of the many significances did they mean? From the 5th century to the 19th the Christian churches used power politics of a painful nature to defend or enrich themselves. Augustine proved the justice of this from the gospel. "Compel them to come in," it said. The Pope approves the use of power-politics in Spain and Portugal today and approved in Poland until the war. More than half of the members of Christian churches and their pastors in America howl for the application of power politics to Communist countries. And these people are supposed to be "constructive" and we "destructive."

✤ ✤ ✤

TO DRINK OR NOT TO DRINK

We receive a polished little gilt-edged card which at first sight is rather alarming. It does not promise us burning in the next world, which we would not mind, but in this. Observe the effect of alcohol in cleaning clothes, it says, and reflect that it does just the same in your inside. It "will burn out and remove the mental tissue of your brain and show up what a weakling and fool you are." Terrible. But how long does it take to do it? The late H. G. Wells was a most generous

wine-bibber all his life but he had quite a lot of brain tissue left. Joseph McCabe has been drinking alcohol since he entered the clerical world 65 years ago, but even a priest (on the Australian Catholic radio) described him a few months ago as "brilliantly intellectual." Churhill, who drinks heavily, is considered a great intellect by many. In fact, we should like to see an analysis into drinkers and non-drinkers of, say, 1,000 of the ablest men of the last 50 years. The Board of Temperance of the Methodist Church has got out a paper showing the appalling increase of drinking in America since 1932. We should hardly call that brilliantly intellectual. In the early 30's tens of millions could not afford or get more than coffee and a doughnut. The alcohol figure naturally rose when Roosveelt "primed the pump" and as to the big rise since war broke out. . .. Let us have decency and efficiency by all means but you won't get them that way.

THE MUDDLE IN FRANCE

America and Britain have taken an unpleasant advantage of the msifortunes of France to exclude it from its rightful position as one of the four leading powers of the world. To have put in its place the China of Chiang Kai-shek is almost enough to explain the futility of international statesmanship this year. France is recovering steadily and is more and more consulted on world-affairs, but there is something in itself that prevents it from rising to its old position. That something is that as long as its progressives—the Socialists, Communists, and Radicals—are at feud with each other the Anglo-Americans will successfully intrigue against their exerting the supreme power which, if they were in harmony, they would obviously possess. At the last election the anti-clerical progressives got 11½ million votes against 8 million for the anti-Socialist opposition. The cry that this was a moral victory for the Catholics is ludicrous. There was no Catholic party. The clergy advised Catholics to drop their name and call themselves Popular Republicans so as to attract all shades of anti-Socialists, including the large body of middle-class Liberals who are all anti-Catholic but discover a fervor for the faith whenever their bank-accounts are threatened. General de Gaulle was their figure-head and he plainly aspires to succeed Petain as dictator. Recently Professor Harry Elmer Barnes published an astounding defense of Petain with the title "Crucifying the Savior of France." Petain was a traitor to France and humanity, and de Gaulle, though he has none of Petain's fanaticism, has an ambition to succeed him. From the first we expressed distrust of the man. He is now France's Public Enemy No. 1 and the Hope of the Anglo-American.

THE POPE'S CASTRATED SINGERS

A reader tells us that Catholics to whom he quoted what we said about castrated singers in the Papal choir blushed with modesty and wrath. Another Atheistic lie, they said. It is another good illustration of the way in which their authorities get the truth suppressed and then say that we can produce no authorities for our statements. We could produce 50 authorities of the last century, and we have known elderly men who have dined with some of these "male sopranos," as the Italians call them, in order to get them to discuss their peculiar psychology. But 99 out of 100 Americans have no access to European literature of the last century, and the Catholics (doubtless by a threat of boycott) got permission to revise the last edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which told the facts. Any good library will have the 11th (or earlier) edition of this encyclopaedia. Compare the article "Enuchs" in it with the "revised" article in the last edition. Down to 1910 this most consulted of

all reference books said, "Driven long ago from the Italian stage by public opinion, they remained the musical glory and the modern sham of the papal choir until the accession of Pope Leo XIII, one of whos first acts was to get rid of them." Then the Catholics forced their wa in, and now you read only that Leo XIII made an end of the singin eunuchs. The reader naturally supposes, and some Catholic writers sa that it was in the opera-houses that they had survived so long. Bu Groves's *Dictionary of Music* and other standard works still tell the truth.

❖ ❖ ❖

THE RELIGIOUS PULP MARKET

When we say today that the churches are just economic corpora tions and survive by the same means as other economic corporations v mean a great deal more than counting the number of their bisho priests, pastors, etc. Those are the professionals in whose interest t corporations chiefly exists. But between them and the great body the faithful who support them there is a growing body of paid worke who have just as deep an interest as the clergy in persuading the pub that religion is the indispensable foundation of the Commonwealth a we shall all go down in a swamp of social disorder unless we support By no means with the intention of showing this, the *Writer's Digest* r cently had an article that reminds us of it. It was titled "Writing t Religious Pulp" and the writer hardly concealed her disdain of the ne profession of religious writers and the stuff they turn out. The religio pulp has become a market for literary tripe side by side with the lo pulp, the western pulp, the crime pulp, and so on. Amongst its rules, t author says, is that a writer must strictly avoid such words as evolutic social gospel, brotherhod of man, racial equality, tolerance, scienti words that suggest that the world is more than 5,000 years old, a so on. And that is only one section of the enormous numbers that ha to be admitted to the racket. Add the immense number of teachers religious schools, musicians, the clerical staffs, staffs of radio statio the professional journalists and journalistic staffs, college staffs, ho pital staffs, lawyers, recommended doctors, secretaries, organizers, e If the American people quit the churches, more than a million fo would be jobless. You may conclude that there is more than "the u dying religious instinct" to do with the vitality of religion. And now th some of the churches have bought the secular press by their lavish pa ments for space we wonder where it will end.

❖ ❖ ❖

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE 100468

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped.

दिनाँक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

GL 170
MCC

100468
LBSNAA

170
McC

100468
अवाप्ति संख्या
Acc No.

वर्ग संख्या
Class No.

पुस्तक संख्या
Book No.

लेखक
Author McCabe, J.

शीर्षक
Title The morals of th...

170
McC

LIBRARY
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 100468

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Refrence books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.