1964

Motley's Concept of Freedom as a Schillerian Ideal.

Gary Grayson Mccann

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation


This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.
This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

McCANN, Gary Grayson, 1932-
MOTLEY'S CONCEPT OF FREEDOM AS A SCHILLERIAN IDEAL.

Louisiana State University, Ph.D., 1964
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan
MOTLEY'S CONCEPT OF FREEDOM AS A
SCHILLERIAN IDEAL

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Foreign Languages

by

Gary Grayson McCann
B.A., Louisiana State University, 1955
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1963
May, 1964
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer is indebted to Dr. Carl Hammer, Jr. for his generous interest and guidance which made this endeavor possible; to Dr. Charles E. Weber for his assistance and constructive criticism; to members of the committee Dr. Earl N. Lewis, Dr. Elliot D. Healy, and Dr. Calvin Evans, and to Dr. John T. Krumpelmann, who awakened my interest in this subject. Special thanks is given to the National Defense Education Act for its financial support and vote of confidence.

I wish to thank my wife for her consideration and understanding in this undertaking.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. SCHILLER - THE HISTORIAN AND POET OF FREEDOM</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY - SCHOLAR OF GERMAN LETTERS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. MOTLEY - THE HISTORIAN OF LIBERTY</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. THE RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC AND DER ABFALL DER NIEDERLANDE - INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. CHARLES V</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. PHILIP II</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. PRINCE WILLIAM OF ORANGE</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. EGMONT</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. CONCLUSION</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to show that Schiller's ideal of freedom, the recurrent leitmotiv throughout all of his works stirred the impressionable mind of John Lothrop Motley, a notable scholar of German letters in America. As a result, Schiller's crusade for the rights and freedom of the individual was perpetuated by the persuasive pen of this famous nineteenth century historian and champion of liberty.

This study considers primarily Schiller's Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande and selected volumes of Motley's The Rise of the Dutch Republic and the History of the United Netherlands.

Schiller and Motley grew up to witness much in the history of man in his search for freedom. Each paid allegiance to the high conceptions of freedom which came down from the great thinkers of the eighteenth century. Schiller and Motley had as their theme the value of freedom to mankind, and almost from the beginning to the end of their literary careers the idea of freedom engaged their thoughts, inspiring a large part of their best works.

As historians of liberty, Schiller and Motley considered the struggle between liberty and authority the most conspicuous feat of the Dutch history. Each work is characterized by the same genuine sympathy with liberty and the spirit of humanity which pervades it.

iv
Neither author can be called an objective historian. Dutch history offered them an opportunity to teach moral and political lessons. Each joins with the cause of the Dutch rebels and denounces Spanish tyranny. One must also consider them as picturesque historians. They believed that it was their duty to make history come alive, not merely to act as prosaic recorders of events. History was for them a genre of literature - the drama. They delighted in depicting diametrically opposite characters and in each case, they treat the leading figures in question with the same bias.

Thus we can conclude that Schiller and Motley were outstanding apostles of freedom. One may refer to the love of liberty as the guiding-star of their intellectual lives. Freedom, political, civil and religious remained for them the holiest of all possessions and the worthiest goal of all striving.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Alexis de Tocqueville once said, "...I love passionately liberty, law and respect for rights - liberty is my first passion." One imagines that Motley and Schiller made almost the same statement, for they too, were outstanding apostles of freedom. Almost from the beginning to the end of their literary careers the idea of freedom engaged their thoughts, inspiring a large part of their best works. One may refer to the love of liberty as the guiding-star of their intellectual lives. Each was keenly sensitive to the values of the individual, the unique, the lofty in man, and were oppressed by the greed and tyranny of despotism. No nation should ever deny man his basic liberties. Freedom, political, civil and religious remained for them the holiest of all possessions and the worthiest goal of all striving. It was, indeed, the rallying point of all culture. The Dutch rebellion of the sixteenth century was a natural choice for the two graphic historians.
Schiller and Motley were idealists. This word is sometimes used too glibly in our modern world. Ideals are often confused with desires that range from getting a good meal to earning a fortune. But to Schiller and Motley, ideals had to endure. One of the ideals by which mankind has been raised out of savagery is love of liberty, which began to manifest itself as a philosophical principle during the third quarter of the eighteenth century. It gained strength rapidly and passed from the philosophical to the active stage, resulting in the break up of l'ancienne Régime in Europe.

The Rousseauian doctrines, "Man is born free" and "Back to nature," became the watchwords of the new time in which Schiller grew up. The "despotism of the majority," as preached by Rousseau in the Contrat Social, the message of La Nouvelle Héloïse and the nature gospel of Emile were all in the air. Indeed, the eighteenth century was predominantly an epoch of ideas and ideals, the era of enlightenment, of political, moral and literary awakening, and the brooding time of revolutions. Much of this spirit was still in the air a few years later when John Lothrop Motley, a notable admirer of Goethe, Schiller, and German idealism, was born. He was destined to embrace Schiller's ideal of freedom.

Liberty and authority have been at odds since the beginning of history. In the days of Greece and Rome the
contest was between subjects, or classes of subjects, and the government. One meant by liberty the protection against the tyranny of political rulers. John Stuart Mill points out in his famous treatise on Liberty that rulers were considered, with the exception of some popular governments in Greece, as necessarily antagonistic to the people whom they ruled. They acted as a governing tribe, who derived their authority from inheritance or conquest, and who did not hold it at the pleasure of the governed. This was exactly the situation that existed in the Netherlands centuries later, but with one exception. Men in the early days were not anxious to oppose their sovereigns.

The Reformation set an important state in the evolution of modern liberty. It was through such movements that the aspiration for intellectual and religious liberty became a mighty factor in modern history. The revolt against the dominant system of thought, culture, Church, and theology, ushered in the great conflict of man against master, which convulsed the greater part of Europe, and which was finally fought on the battlefields in France, Holland, Germany, and Scotland. The Reformation was a social as well as a religious movement. At every turn there was a cry for the poor man, based on the Bible and natural rights - justice against an oppressive caste in Church and State. This is the era
from which Motley and Schiller chose to pick up their pens and declare war on the Church and Papacy. They believed that the Papacy constituted the greatest obstacle to the development of free and efficient secular government at that time. They asserted that the clergy had no right to speak in the name of the Church. They believed as Luther had taught; that members of the clergy were only men and entitled to no special privileges. The temporal power was to protect the good and punish the wicked. They recognized that Charles V would not go along with Luther's hope for establishing a national Church, freed from the Pope and united under the Emperor and the Bible.

The influence of this conflict on political liberty was of primary importance. As the struggle progressed, the champions of the Pope were appealed to on the basis of the right of the subject to resist oppression on political as well as religious grounds.

From the conflicts and theories of the sixteenth century, liberty thus received an impulse which came to full maturity in the French Revolution.

Rousseau's notion of the natural man with his natural rights became, first, a standard by which to measure the social order, then a protest against it and a program
to change it. But other events in European history were developing. Toward the middle of the eighteenth century, the "tool" began to take on more importance. It became more and more mechanical and in some cases, rendered man almost obsolete. Liberty was suppressed by the men who exploited and installed the mechanization. They challenged the established order of the communities, violated traditions and shattered human aspirations. The communities responded in the same manner as the young Dutch rebels did years earlier with force and violence. Thus the "economic man" supplanted Rousseau's "natural man" in the struggle against tyranny and exploitation. This resulted in a revision of the concept of government in terms of the revolutionary program of "liberty, equality, fraternity."

Schiller and Motley both grew up to witness much in the history of man in his search for freedom. In the days of Schiller's youth, it struck fire in his brain and blazed up in the revolutionary frenzy of Karl Moor. One encounters it again in the enthusiasm of Fiesco. It resounds in the words of the impassioned dreamer Posa as he pleads with King Philip for the Netherlands.

The purpose of this study is to show that Motley espoused the cause of liberty, having first recognized it as a Schillerian ideal. It will be shown that Motley
came to the aid of the oppressed, battled for the rights of mankind, and opposed despots in the truly Schillerian manner. A chapter will be devoted to Schiller's historical period and his preoccupation with freedom for mankind.

It will be within the scope of this study to consider Schiller's *Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande* and selected volumes of Motley's *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* and *History of the United Netherlands*.

Both Schiller and Motley paid allegiance to the high conceptions of freedom which came down to them from the great thinkers of the early eighteenth century. They saw them as a reminder that what counts in the long run is the ideal. They did not see the glory of a nation in the statistics of its wealth, but in the freedom of its subjects.

A brief historical sketch of the sixteenth century revolt in the Netherlands that both Schiller and Motley described seems necessary for a clear understanding of this study.

Upon the abdication of Charles V in 1555, Spain and the Netherlands passed to Philip II, his son, while the Austrian and German possessions went to Charles's brother, Ferdinand. Philip was cruel and remorseless and imbued with the conviction that he was the designated agent of
Providence to rid the world of Protestantism. Unrest flared up in the Netherlands almost immediately upon his accession. The Spanish Inquisition was introduced, and its efforts to crush Calvinism were actively carried out by the very unpopular Cardinal Granvelle. Excessive taxation curtailed the prosperity of urban centers like Ghent, Antwerp, and Bruges which had been flourishing since the Middle Ages. Mercenaries were quartered on the citizenry, with Protestants forced to assume the major share of the burden. Remonstrances to the Regent Margaret of Parma, were futile. She failed to understand the degree to which Spanish policies were causing resentment.

In 1566 a group of Dutch nobles rebelled. The authorities refused to heed the protests of these 'beggars' as they derisively called them. The rebels later adopted this epithet as their party name. A number of the leaders of this uprising, including the popular Count Egmont, were hanged. But they were regarded as martyrs, and their deaths did much to unite all elements in opposition to the Spaniards.

Philip's decision was to suppress the uprising by a campaign of terrorization, and he selected the Duke of Alba to carry out this mission. He was more than successful. Massacre and pillage were initiated upon the arrival of his army. The 'Council of Death'sentenced
thousands to execution.

When William of Orange consented in 1568 to lead the rebel armies, the Spaniards were forced on to the defensive. All the northern provinces joined the rebel cause, and most of the southern ones were enticed with economic inducements to do the same. After a series of reversals, Alba was recalled (1573), but the new commander, Alexander of Parma, did little to mitigate the cruelties of the time.

By 1579 the southern states, which were predominantly Catholic, were again under Spanish control, but Alexander's efforts to reconquer the north failed. William of Orange had continually urged the creation of a federation, and in 1579 the Union of Utrecht was formed in accordance with this policy. The Protestant northern states were then organized into a league of independent republics, but years of war were necessary before the independence of these states was recognized.

This struggle was the source of Schiller's and Motley's histories. Schiller completed the whole picture of the rebellion by reporting the Thirty Years' War. Motley, too, intended a history of this war, but ill health and, finally, death prevented it.

Schiller and Motley had as their theme the value of freedom to mankind. This was indeed sacred to the Dutch
for these citizens would not stand for oppression and resisted it to the extent "as it ever aroused in Grecian or Italian breasts."¹ Schiller was encouraged in the reflection that, "gegen die trotzigen Anmassungen der Fürstengewalt endlich noch eine Hülfe vorhanden ist, dass ihre berechneten Pläne an der menschlichen Freiheit zuschanden werden, dass ein herzhafter Widerstand auch den gestreckten Arm eines Despoten beugen..."² Even in the beginning of the Spanish rule, the citizens of the Netherlands attempted to limit the power of both Charles V and Philip II. This limitation was what they originally meant by liberty. They attempted to obtain a recognition of certain immunities, called political liberties or rights. The fact that Philip refused to consider these rights, and his infringement upon them, resulted in the revolt.

Schiller and Motley believed that a sovereign was bound to allow his subjects to believe what they wanted, and live and worship accordingly, just as far as was consistent with the maintenance of the social order.


Schiller and Motley coveted the cause of freedom. Those who sought to suppress its resounding cry fell before their attacking pens. Thus the battleground was provided, and they wielded a mighty pen in the name of liberty. One can feel Motley's dedication in the words, "Liberty, often crushed, rises again and again from her native earth with redoubled energy...In the little Netherlands territory, Humanity, bleeding but not killed, still stands at bay and defies the hunters..."3

---

CHAPTER II

SCHILLER - THE HISTORIAN AND POET OF FREEDOM

In eighteenth-century Germany there was a notable absence of true historians. Lessing attributed this to the fact that German men of letters would not study, while scholars could not write. Others have attributed this fact to the absence of political life in Germany which prevented even intelligent men from taking much interest in the progress of events, either in their own or past eras. As Motley was to do fifty-odd years later, Schiller was among the earliest German writers of history who attempted to make the average reader feel the charm and drama of history.

Schiller's historical works are crowded into a period of a few years. With the exception of two smaller works which appeared later, his historical period can be designated as 1786-1792. His drama Don Carlos motivated his interest in history and led him to undertake a translation of Louis Sébastien Mercier's Philip II which he completed in 1785. As a result of this early dramatic effort, the plan for the Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande took form and was finally published in 1788.
The public enthusiastically greeted the appearance of Schiller's first historical work. The Göttingen professor Spittler stated in one of his lectures that Schiller was well on his way to becoming one of Germany's finest historical writers.¹ Johannes von Muller later praised Die Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges for its "nationalen Gehalt" as well as "kritische Zuverlässigkeit."²

Partly due to the overwhelming success of his first effort, Schiller was appointed professor of philosophy at Jena where he remained from the summer of 1789 to the winter of 1791.

In 1790 the first of his Historischen Memoires appeared. In the same year, the first part of Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges was published, with the final volume appearing in 1792.

Schiller regarded his Abfall der Niederlande as an experiment. He wrote to Körner that it would depend upon the reception of this work whether he would continue to pursue this field of writing. Later he even declared himself suited to the reporting of history and even contended that the fame of an historian was, on the whole, preferable to that of a

¹Schiller, *Sämtliche Werke* (Sakular-Ausgabe), XIV, 7.
²Ibid., p. vii.
poet. He expressed the opinion that his own nature was more akin to that of Montesquieu than to Sophocles. But Körner would not agree. "Nicht zum Gelehrten, zum Künstler ist er geboren." Benno von Wiese concludes, "Schillers Einstellung zur Geschichte sei nicht historisch, sondern poetisch. Geschichte habe für ihn nur ein psychologisches und moralisches Interesse." We shall see that this statement could be true, to some extent, for John Motley.

But once the "wissenschaftliche Sinn" was aroused in Schiller, it completely consumed him. He worked day and night and in no way considered his interest in history a hobby or pastime. Fehler called it "genau so organisch wie seine Philosophie erwächst sie aus den Postulaten seines Genius."

The writings of most university historians of the day were described as "schwunglos und trocken." But it was

---

4 Ibid.
6 Schiller, op. cit.,XIII, 18.
7 Ibid., p. 19.
Schiller who brought life and eloquence to German historical presentation. In Schiller's hands as well as those of Motley, the presentation became less objective and more subjective. History was for them romantic. Schiller knew he possessed the ability to make history graphic and wrote to Körner, "dass es nur von ihm selber abhänge, der grösste Historiker Deutschlands zu werden." It must be pointed out that Schiller suffered from severe financial insufficiencies during his historical period and saw the publication of a successful history as a means to some degree of financial security.

Even if Schiller had not been plagued by financial difficulties and illness, his historical undertakings were too numerous and extensive ever to be completed. He possessed the overpowering interest in history and the desire to present it in a vivid and stimulating manner, yet not "die mühsame, unermüdliche wissenschaftliche Durcharbeitung."

This statement leads to a discussion of Schiller's scholarly methods and documentation. After the first enthusiastic acceptance by the public, his historical works later met with sharp criticism because they did not adhere to the principles of scientific historiography. According to

8Schiller Briefwechsel, p. 106.

present day standards, one will find a minimum of documentation to support the deeds of personalities or the course of events. Unlike Motley, Schiller began his history of the Dutch rebellion without knowing Dutch or Spanish. He had little opportunity to consult primary sources. Libraries were almost non-existent and financial difficulties and poor health precluded much travel. Even more important, it was only after Schiller's death that the new school of scientific historiography, led and trained by Leopold von Ranke, developed. Schiller never had the opportunity to profit by the methods of this historical school. It is interesting to note, however, that two German historians, Erich Brandenburg and Richard Fester, still esteemed his historical accomplishments and recognized their historical spirit and significance. Fester even claimed that Schiller had consulted a great many more original sources than had first been supposed or even claimed by Schiller.\(^{10}\)

One must view Schiller's historical writings objectively and consider them as a part of the great classical period in German literature.

Schiller sought in history an understanding of the "Philosophie der Menschheit," and later as supporting evidence for Kant's *Idee einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher* 

\(^{10}\)Richard Fester, "Zu Schillers historischen Schriften," *Euphorion*, XII, (Mai 1905), 78 ff. and XV, (Jan. 1908), 456 f.
Absicht which he read and admired. This lead him as expressed in the first lectures at Jena, to the conception of history as a "Universalgeschichte." He never forgot, however, "die schriftstellerische Aufgabe." To succeed in this task, his primary interest was to make history and its personalities come to life.

Let us turn to Schiller's lectures at Jena and examine his idealistic concept of freedom. He had been originally stimulated by a series of Kant's essays to which he had been introduced by Karl Leonhard Reinhard, the Jena authority on critical philosophy. Kant's essay which set the goal toward which human history is striving made a great impression on Schiller.

"Man kann die Geschichte der Menschengattung im grossen als die Vollziehung eines verbor- genen Plans der Natur ansehen, um eine inner- lich - und, zu diesem Zweck, auch äusserlich - vollkommene Staatsverfassung zustande bringen, als den einzigen Zustand, in welchem sie all ihre Anlagen in der Menschheit völlig entwickeln kann." 11  

Kant saw this as the ideal state in which man could achieve the full freedom of and use for his capabilities. This essay established a philosophical program for Schiller and presented him with the challenge to take up the work of a historian in the philosophical sense.

Schiller's program of study was exactly this, a philosophical approach to universal history. He saw history as a purposeful evolution. Schiller believed that, "unser menschliches Jahrhundert, haben sich - ohne es zu wissen oder zu erzielen - alle vorhergehenden Zeitalter angestrengt."\textsuperscript{12} He believed that his generation would live to see the Kantian ideal of the universal community fulfilled. He was disappointed in his hopes for the French Revolution and the oppressed people of the day. But like Motley, he never turned away from the belief in human progress. The world where freedom reigned remained their ideal.

Schiller's inaugural lecture at Jena also offers much insight into Schiller's dialectics of history. He is primarily concerned with two major stages; the beginning of man's history as a free moral agent and the great change of the medieval world into the modern. Schiller calls the Reformation, "Die theologische Revolution" and regards it as the decisive event which initiated the modern era and man's quest for freedom. He characterizes the great and real achievement of the Reformation as "der Abfall von Kirchensatzungen und die Rückkehr zu den Quellen, Bibel, und Vernunft."\textsuperscript{13} Although the Reformation was for Schiller only a step which fell short of establishing

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12}Schiller, Sakularausgabe, vol. XII, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, VI, 200.
\end{flushright}
the free concept of man, nevertheless, his inaugural address firmly establishes his fellowship with Protestantism. As we shall see, it was already evident in his Abfall. Grossmann maintains that Schiller recognized in Protestantism "the roots of the modern concept of freedom."  

Another notable passage from the inaugural lecture points to man's freedom of conscience at the time of the Reformation:

"Die Hierarchie musste in einem Gregor und Innocenz alle ihre Greuel auf das Menachen-geschlecht ausleeren, damit das überhand-nehmende Sittenverderbnis und des geistlichen Despotismus schreiendes Skandal einen unerschrockenen Augustinermönch auffordern könne, das Zeichen zum Abfall zu geben und dem romi-schen Hierarchen eine Hälfte Europens zu entreissen - wenn wir uns als protestantische Christen hier versammeln sollten."  

Again Schiller points to another historical process:

"Städte mussten sich in Italien und Deutschland erheben, dem Fleiss ihre Tore öffnen, die Ketten der Leibeigenschaft zerbrechen, unwissenden Tyrannen den Richterstab aus den Händen ringen und durch eine kriegerische Hansa sich in Achtung setzen, wenn Gewerbe und Handel blühen und der Überfluss den Künststen der Freude rufen, wenn der Staat den nützlichen Landmann ehren und in dem wohl-tätigen Mittelstande, dem Schöpfer unserer ganzen Kultur, ein dauerhaftes Glück für die Menschheit heranreifen sollte."  

---

15Tbid., XIII, 15.

16Tbid.
Schiller delights in describing the battle of "Das gesittete Handelsvolk" for religious freedom and national independence. He acknowledges the middle class as a major factor in dissolving the feudal order. As a great dynamic force they guaranteed the progress of mankind.

It seems worthy to the purpose of this study to review briefly the life and certain works of Schiller. Freedom, his motivating ideal, was always present in some form.

As a boy, Schiller devoured the current literature of the day, but did not neglect his studies in ancient classics, philosophy, history, and natural science. He enthusiastically read the works of the "Sturm und Drang" - Gerstenberg's Uguino, Goethe's Götz von Berlichingen and Die Leiden des jungen Werthers and Leisewitz's Julius von Tarent, to name only a few. He admired the writings of Shakespeare and expressed a desire to master his thought and style.

In addition to the motivating impulses afforded by his studies in theology, philosophy, law, and medicine, Schiller's own personal experience brought him face to face with the question of freedom. The harsh and cruel despotism of the Duke of Württemberg forced Schiller into the restricted confines of the Karlsschule. In this limiting environment, the ideal of freedom began to grow. However, life in the military academy was in no way compatible with this ideal. He was
forced by the tyrannical wishes of the Duke to accept a profession which he detested. He realized more clearly than ever that all his ills were due to the suppression of his liberties. This kindled the sparks of revolution in his soul and led to the fiery expressions of revolt in his writings.

He believed, as Rousseau had advocated, that society was organized unjustly and that only wrong could result from it. We might say he attempted to reform society. He went to the utmost extremes, as may be seen in Die Rauber, where he regards freedom as a state in which one is free from all conventionalities and restricting laws. Lawlessness is an acceptable alternative to the established social order. Karl Moor is initially the unrestrained man of feeling, the true "Stürmer und Dränger" and an impulsive revolutionist.

"Nein, ich mag nicht daran denken. Ich soll meinen Leib pressen in eine Schnürbrust und meinen Willen schnüren in Gesetze. Das Gesetz hat zum Schneckengang verdorben, was Adlerflug geworden wäre. Das Gesetz hat noch keinen großen Mann gebildet; aber die Freiheit brutet Kolosse und Extremitäten aus..."17

Karl comes to realize at the end of the play that defiant and reckless forms of revolution are destructive and without purpose.

17 I b i d., III, 18.
"O, über mich Narren, der ich wählte, die Welt durch Greuel zu verschönern und die Gesetze durch Gesetzlosigkeit aufrecht zu halten! Ich nannte es Rache und Recht — Ich musste mich an, o Vorsicht die Scharten deines Schwerth auszuwetzen und deine Par-teilichkeiten gut zu machen..."18

In Die Räuber Karl Moor represents the struggle of the "Dichter" with the conflicting impulses of his nature, and expresses the first hopeful utterances of a philosophy of reconciliation, which Schiller developed in his later works.

After Die Räuber, Schiller's faculties for observation matured. This growth only strengthened his dedication and love for humanity and hatred for class distinction. Fiesco was the next subject that advanced Schiller's philosophy of freedom. We hear Fiesco's memorable words, "Ein Diadem er-kämpfen ist gross. Es wegwerfen ist göttlich. Geh unter Tyrann! Sei frei, Genua, und ich dein glücklichster Bürger!"19 The poet has found a clearer solution to the problem of re-publican freedom in the sacrifice of personal ambition to the greater interests of the people.

In the last of his early plays, Kabale und Liebe, we have perhaps the best tragedy of common life in the eight-eenth century. Again Schiller turns to the conditions of

18Tbid., p. 155.
19Tbid., p. 280.
the day - the tyrannical misrule of the Duke and his mistress, the inhuman traffic of selling mercenaries to Holland and England, and the prevailing immorality of the court. The degradation of the existing social and political conditions are pointed to again and again. He proclaims the fundamental principles of humanity and yearns for the day when class distinction will be eliminated and man will be respected as an individual.

In Don Carlos we have the inimitable scenes between Don Carlos and the Queen and between Marquis von Posa and Philip II which ring loudly, with Schiller's freedom ideal. The leading men in this play are also the prominent personages in the Netherlands' fight against Spanish autocracy. As a poet of freedom, it was natural that this period of history should intrigue him. Here he found the forces of tyranny in mortal combat with the hopes of freedom.

There can scarcely be a more noble and pathetic plea for the rights of humanity than in the words of Posa, beseeching Philip to consider the rights of his subjects as his sacred obligation.

"Sei wiederum, was er zuvor gewesen, Der Krone Zweck - ihn binde keine Pflicht Als seiner Brüder gleich ehrwürdige Rechte Wenn nun der Mensch sich selbst zurückgegeben Zu seines Werts Gefühl erwacht - der Freiheit Erhabne, stolze Tugenden gedeihen -"
It is often pointed out that one can see in this drama Schiller's turning toward Classicism, as he neglects more and more the personal woes of Don Carlos and shifts the emphasis of the drama to Marquis Posa and the much greater and finer problem of human freedom and dignity.

Turning to Schiller's lyrics, we see his concept of freedom also based on love and harmony. This is particularly true in his early lyric poems, "Amalia" (1780) and "Phantasie an Laura." The latter offers these beautiful words,

"Sonnenstäubchen paart mit Sonnenstäubchen,
Sich in trauter Harmonie,
Sphären in einander lenkt die Liebe,
Weltsysteme dauern nur durch sie."21

Schiller's revolutionary concepts went hand in hand with his doctrine of love and harmony as illustrated in the poem "Männerwürde."

"Tyrannen hasst mein Talisman,
Und schmettert sie zu Boden,
Und kann er's nicht, führt er die Bahn
Freiwillig zu den Toten."22

Schiller's early sentiments expressing a necessary relation between freedom and harmony led to his aesthetic philosophy.

---

20Ibid., IV, 161.
21Ibid., I, 222.
22Ibid., 233-234.
which was to modify his early views of freedom. Freedom must join with beauty. In the poem "Die Künstler" (1789), Schiller expounds this gospel:

"Wie unter heilige Gewalt gegeben
Empfangen sie das reine Geisterleben
Der Freiheit sueses Recht, zurück."\(^\text{23}\)

Again the same theme is echoed in the lines,

"Der freisten Mutter freie Söhne,
Schwingt euch mit festem Angesicht
Zum Strahlensitz der höchsten Schöne!
Um andre Kronen bühlet nicht!
Die Schwester, die euch hier verschwunden,
Holt ihr im Schoss der Mutter ein,
Was schöne Seelen schon empfunden
Muss trefflich und vollkommen sein."\(^\text{24}\)

Schiller held that beauty was only liberty made visible, and in his last dramas he either exalted liberty directly, by setting up shining examples, or indirectly, by revealing the ugliness of tyranny.\(^\text{25}\)

\(^{23}\)Ibid., 179.

\(^{24}\)Ibid., 191.

\(^{25}\)Compare Schiller's essay "Die Gesetzgebung des Lykurgus und Solon." This short work first appeared in 1790 in the eleventh volume of Thalia. This essay presents another "classroom example" of Schiller's historical method and a reamplification of his freedom ideal. In Der Abfall one recalls Schiller's delight in describing diametrically opposite characters. Again in this essay, one encounters a contrast of leading men, Lykurgus and Solon. The despotic, socialistic, almost marxist Lykurgus is contrasted with the benevolent Solon, the munificent Athenian sovereign who held that man should live and prosper in a state where freedom was guaranteed.
After Schiller's early dramas, his study of art and aesthetic problems, historical research and philosophic study, we can say that his ardor for the rights of man diminished somewhat, although they never ceased to be thoroughly imbedded in his nature and unconsciously continued to work within him. His principles now were taking another form. The next decade was one of great changes. The "Sturm und Drang" period had passed. It was a decade in which everything on earth seemed to be in revolution and evolution. Fundamental principles of the most firmly established states were being dissolved. We recall what a stirring effect the French Revolution had on the mind of the poet of liberty, and how the dashing of these hopes caused him to grieve over the setback to progress. But Schiller never lost his youthful desire to elevate humanity. In his later historical handling of the question of freedom, Schiller is still the great philosophic thinker and poet as he appears in his last historical dramas Wallenstein, Jungfrau von Orleans, Braut von Messina, and Maria Stuart and Wilhelm Tell.

Schiller's final plea for freedom and union was Wilhelm Tell. Here we have not only the freedom of mature minds and of idealistic thoughts, but also the freedom of actual accomplishment. Here Schiller proposes two fundamental doctrines:
death to tyrants and the union of citizens. Wilhelm Tell appears as a dedicated patriot, an apostle of individual and national freedom, reconciling true liberty with the highest forms of order and civilization. He realizes that liberty is the means by which man can attain his full stature.
CHAPTER III

JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY - SCHOLAR OF GERMAN LETTERS.

A spirit of internationalism which manifested itself in the field of letters began in this country around 1820. German literature and thought unquestionably made their impact on many American literati of the day. In the first part of the nineteenth century and continuing for a number of years, America produced some of its greatest literary names. Men like James Fenimore Cooper, Edgar Allen Poe, Washington Irving, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ralph Waldo Emerson are a few of the most prominent ones. All of them were acquainted with German literature and many of them had studied in Germany. The interest in German letters was partly due to the great migration of American scholars to German universities a few years earlier. John Lothrop Motley lived and wrote during this period and was an important link with German scholarship in this country.

Motley counted among his friends some of the wise and gifted men of many countries, enjoying their respect and confidence. He maintained a considerable correspondence with men like Bismarck. In Germany, he was kindly received.
by some of the leading writers, poets, and artists, among them Ludwig Tieck and Frau Ottilie von Goethe. While serving in various diplomatic posts in Europe, he was in demand by the prominent literati of the day.

John Lothrop Motley is remembered today for his three excellent works of history dealing with the formative period of the United Netherlands. One might refer to him as a historian with an unusual gift for literary expression. He had first tried his hand without great success at the novel and only later turned to the writing of history. By birth he was an American, a New Englander of the middle part of the nineteenth century. But by training and inheritance, he was heir to the European tradition. He belonged to the new society which had primarily been concerned with the conquest and building up of the new continent. But he kept in touch with the older society of Europe, with its more ancient and more highly developed culture and institutions. We shall see that his reading of literature and history, foreign travel, and contact with European culture played a part in his acceptance of the Schillerian ideal of liberty which he expressed again and again in his historical works.

In making a study of Motley's concept of liberty as a Schillerian ideal, it behooves us first to investigate
the beginnings of his interest in German literature and to
determine how his attention became directed to it.

Born April 15, 1814, nine years after Schiller's death,
in Dorchester, Massachusetts, a suburb of Boston, Motley was
descended from a long New England ancestry, mostly merchants
on his father's side, and clergymen on his mother's. From
birth he was surrounded by ease and typical Boston culture,
"born with a silver spoon of Boston metal in his mouth."¹

At Round Hill in Northampton, Massachusetts, he received
the finest prep school education New England had to offer.
Here he was under the tutelage of Joseph S. Cogswell and
George Bancroft, both of whom were early products of the
University of Göttingen. Motley studied Latin, Greek, Spanish,
French, and German. Writing and mathematics were not neglected,
and Motley soon attracted the attention of his masters. Cogswell
noticed his keen intellect and stimulated him further. He
gave him Hume's History of England, and talked to him about the
wonders of Europe, especially Germany. Motley began to realize
the intellectual possibilities which lay open for him.

Motley entered Harvard in 1827 and graduated in 1831.
He did not particularly distinguish himself as a student,

¹Higby, Chester Penn and Schantz, B.T. (eds.), John Motley
although he attained the rank of Phi Beta Kappa. But he did gain a reputation as a writer and was associated for a time with O. W. Holmes and John Osborne Sargeant in editing an undergraduate publication called the Harvard Register. Some years later Sargeant wrote to Holmes, "He brought me one day, in a very modest mood, a translation from Goethe, which I was most happy to oblige him by inserting. It was very prettily done, and will now be a curiosity."² However, Holmes, in his Memoir of Motley states, "After examining in the Harvard library a copy of the Collegian, of which only six numbers were published, I have been unable to identify any Goethe translations by Motley."³ We assume that the Harvard Register was popularly known as the Collegian. Higby and Schantz offer the erroneous information that Motley's interest in German language and literature carried over into his college days and, "resulted in a translation of Goethe's The Ghost Seer for the Harvard Collegian..."⁴ Holmes was correct from the standpoint that he realized that The Ghost Seer was written not by Goethe, but by


³Ibid., p. 337.

Schiller. This was the first written indication of Motley's interest and activity in the field of German letters. There is no doubt that Motley became infinitely more familiar with the works of Schiller.

Not only Schiller, but Goethe as well, elicited Motley's admiration. He chose to deliver an essay, "The Genius and Character of Goethe," at the Harvard exhibition in May 1831, his senior year. Long, in his book Literary Pioneers, reprints this essay in its entirety.5

Let us examine this youthful production for evidences of his enthusiasm and familiarity with Goethe and German literature:

"The history of German literature is short and interesting. It presents an appearance so rich and various - it has sprung forward so rapidly - and has about it so much of grotesqueness and originality, that it savors more of the rapid vegetation of Fairy Land, where golden palaces and princely gardens are reared in a night, than of the regular, but comparatively stinted growth of this "banknote world." Previously to the appearance of Goethe as a writer, the poetry of Germany had been divided into two orders - the works of the followers of Wieland and of Klopstock. The poetry of the one is romantic and national - the other consists in the efforts of an imagination ever reaching beyond its own sphere. Wieland's is an im-

passioned, stormy music; the other's is quiet, contemplative, sublime. Both have been followed as guiding stars by innumerable writers; and both are as splendid and influential on their followers as they are different from each other.  

Motley makes a summation of Goethe and the characteristics of the great poet:

"But Goethe like every other splendid genius, apprenticed himself to no particular artist. His efforts in every kind of literature have been equally successful; and there is hardly a path through which he has not freely wandered, not a strain of music which has not sounded in his shell; and thus with the delicate finger of genius and taste, he has gathered from all things the requisite aroma of beauty and fragrance and melody and has thus impregnated every work of his hand with the very essence of genius."

Motley points out Goethe's fairness and openness of mind. These Goethean qualities, no doubt, influenced Motley and his insistence on justice for the individual:

"In his examination of the efforts of others, there seems never to have been a thought of his own comparative excellence, nor the fear of the overthrow of his own literary sovereignty, however probable such an event might have appeared. His candor in expressing his private and printed opinions of other men's efforts is well known, and it is told of him, that when Byron was in the zenith of his popularity and taking with him the lion's share of the admiration of the world, that

6Tbid., p. 200.
7Tbid., p. 201.
that he asserted that Byron was not only the greatest living poet, but the only one.\textsuperscript{8}

Orie W. Long points out correctly that the work is juvenile, but still pleasing, particularly when one considers that it was produced by a seventeen-year-old.\textsuperscript{9} The essay serves as an excellent indication of Motley's knowledge and understanding of Goethe, who was Schiller's closest friend during his most productive days. Having made Goethe one of his masters, Motley was to play an important role in interpreting him to the American public.

O. W. Holmes states in his \textit{Memoirs} that Joseph Cogswell found the essay so good that he later sent a copy of it to Goethe's daughter-in-law, Ottilie, who stated, after reading it, "I wish to see the first book that young man will write."\textsuperscript{10}

After his graduation from Harvard, Motley decided to continue his studies abroad and sailed in April, 1832, to Europe where he remained for two years of study and travel.

There seems to be very little recorded material about the two years Motley traveled and studied in Europe, during which he divided his time between the Universities of Göttingen and Berlin. O. W. Holmes writes in his Motley bio-

\textsuperscript{8}Orie William Long, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 200.

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., p. 200.

\textsuperscript{10}Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 342.
graphy of this period, "...I have little to record. He cer-
tainly must have enjoyed pleasant social relations with his
fellow students based on the portraits he has drawn in Mor-
ton's Hope."11 Motley, probably more than any other of the
better known Americans who studied at Göttingen, threw him-
self into the German life and environment. It is only from
his correspondence and his autobiographical novel Morton's
Hope that one is able to draw a picture of his life in those
young days.

In the course of Motley's sea voyage to Europe he began
already to intensify his study of German. He wrote, "I con-
trived, in the course of the voyage to learn a good deal of
German by talking and reading and writing, and I have been
talking all day with the German pilot (who speaks very little
English) and have acted as some sort of interpreter between
him and the captain."12

After his arrival in Europe, Motley's journey from Ham-
burg to Göttingen was long and tiresome. He found himself
thrown on the mercy of the postillions. One of his drivers
seemed determined to walk his horses the entire distance to
Göttingen. Could the horses go no faster, Motley inquired.

11 Ibid., p. 334.

12 George William Curtiss (ed.), The Correspondence of
John Lothrop Motley (New York: Harper and Bros., 1889),
"Oh, ja," came the answer, yet the pace did not pick up. Motley became exceedingly annoyed and took it up again with the driver, whose only reply was to place his whip down beside him, take out his bugle and practice the overture to "Tancredi." Finally Motley took out a dollar, held it up to the driver and said, "Schwager, if you go no faster, you get no 'Trinkgeld.'" This approach was successful, and the horses took off in a gallop at the insistent prodding of the driver.

At Gottingen Motley concentrated on the study of German because his knowledge of the language was too sketchy to understand most of the lectures. He paid a certain Professor Benecke to come three times a week to his room from seven to eight in the morning to tutor him in German. In addition, he spent hours studying the language on his own, and took every opportunity to mix with the German students. He attended one course of lectures, given five times a week by Professor Hugo, the introduction to a course of Civil Law, and found he could understand the general drift of the lectures if he followed his text.

Motley's first semester afforded him much free time to indulge in his love of reading at the university Library.

---

13 Ibid., p. 16.
which contained for that day, an immense collection of four hundred thousand volumes. Motley was impressed with European libraries and deplored the cultural insufficiencies of the United States. The United States was superior in progressive accomplishments but could offer little to match European libraries and art galleries.¹⁴

At the close of the first semester in Göttingen, Motley wrote to his parents, "...I have studied German a great deal this term, and by mixing a good deal with the students on all occasions, I have made some progress in speaking and understanding the language. By reading a great deal of German every day, I have become able to read it almost as easily as English."¹⁵

Motley learned German so well as a result of his study and residence in Germany that Emperor Francis Joseph, at the time Motley presented his credentials to the Austrian court, asked him whether he was not a German or at least of German ancestry.

Orie W. Long reports that Motley, in company with three German students, journeyed, primarily on foot, to the Tyrol, Switzerland, and through the Rhine Valley during the vacation period.¹⁶ The next semester he attended a full schedule

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 29-30.
¹⁵Ibid., p. 24.
¹⁶Long, op. cit., p. 198.
of lectures at Göttingen.

One notes with interest that Motley formed close contacts with two of his fellow-countrymen, Amory Coffin and Mitchell King, both from Charleston, South Carolina, while at Göttingen. Long adds "Bismarck welcomed...Motley's interest in literary matters, and companionship with the three young Americans (Coffin, King, and Motley) whom he joined in celebrating the Fourth of July, 1833."17

By the beginning of the following semester, Motley felt that he had sufficiently mastered German to embark on a full course of study, to include the Pandects, the Institutions, Natural Law, the History of Roman Law, Huren's lectures on History and Saalfeld's political lectures.18 After consulting with some of the Göttingen professors and inquiring about other universities which would best suit his curriculum, he decided on the University of Berlin. There he found greater cultural opportunities and a more scholarly staff and student body. Savigny, the jurist and professor, was an additional attraction for Motley here. At Berlin he was again a classmate of Bismarck, and this time a roommate.19 Bismarck later...

19Ibid., p. 27.
confirmed this and recalled this period in a letter to Holmes:

"Motley, by that time, had arrived at talking German fluently; he occupied himself not only in translating Goethe's poem "Faust" but tried his hand even in composing German verses. An enthusiastic admirer of Shakespeare, Byron, and Goethe, he used to spice his conversation abundantly with quotations from these his favorite authors."²⁰

In a letter dated November 4, 1833, one notes Motley's familiarity with plays of Goethe and Schiller and his attendance at a production of Götz von Berlichingen:

"The chefs-d'oeuvre of Goethe and Schiller are not adapted to the stage. Some of them are occasionally given, but seldom with success. The other evening the drama of "Götz von Berlichingen with the Iron Hand," a magnificent picture of the old time in Germany, one of Goethe's masterpieces, was given..."²¹

Bismarck and Motley settled down to a serious study of law, sharing their mutual love of history and interest in foreign languages, yet not neglecting their less scholarly pursuits. Motley's chief interests were Roman Law and its history. In addition to attending the lectures of Savigny, he employed a Doctor of Laws, whom he called his "expounder of the divine science of Law" for two hours each morning to explain the Institutes and Pandects of the corpus juris.

after which Motley spent another several hours "stuffing noting books" with the knowledge he had gained. By following a definite course of reading at the library, and employing his "learned Theban," he hoped to complete the study of Roman Law by the end of the semester. 22

At the end of his first term in Berlin, Motley decided that his study of Civil Law was complete. He had also, in all probability, learned the "painstaking process of minute research which he was later to combine with the dramatic literary method in the writing of history." 23 Before returning to the United States, he decided to travel through Germany and Austria, and to spend enough time in both France and Italy to perfect the speaking and writing of the language of both countries.

Motley left Berlin in late spring of 1834 and set out on his travels, which were to take him over most of western Europe. His trip began with brief visits to several German cities. Weimar was his first stop, and he was welcomed by Ottilie von Goethe, but deeply regretted that he had not reached Europe before the great poet's death. A letter from Ottilie von Goethe to a Countess Finkenstein, a member of Tieck's family

22 Ibid., vol. I, p. 27.
23 Higby and Schantz, op. cit., p. xv.
in Dresden, afforded him introduction to that author. He was already an admirer of Tieck's writings for their "playful and sharp satire, poetry and plain sense." He was invited to tea and was disappointed at not hearing Tieck read from his works, as he often did to small groups of visitors. He found that "his conversation was pleasing and quiet, but without any great show or brillancy...His conversation was like his books, playful, full of bonhomie, good-natured sort of satire, and perhaps a little childish vanity." Soon after his visit with Tieck, he wrote to his mother:

"I do not know if many of Tieck's works have been translated into English. If they have, you will get them at the Athenaeum. Inquire for "Fantasas" [sic] or "Puss in Boots: or the "World Upside Down," or Tieck's novels, tales, novels in the original meaning of the word, full of old German legends and superstitions, and the authorship of which will entitle him to the title of German "Boccaccio.""

We assume that Motley's mother did not find a great number of Tieck translations, if any, for some years later, Motley contributed to the New World a translation of Tieck's five act drama Ritter Blaubart, which was prefaced by the following note:

"Tieck is the most popular living author of Germany; his writings are upon a variety of subjects, and his critical essays, particularly upon topics connected with the five acts,

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 36.

\(^{25}\) Curtiss, op. cit., p. 36.
rank very high in German literature. But his popularity is chiefly derived from his lighter works. His tales, poems, and satires are considered by his countrymen to be full of wit, humor, and a lively fancy."

In 1835, at the age of twenty-one, Motley returned home, faced with the necessity of selecting and beginning a career. For a time it was law, but he never became seriously engaged in this profession. In 1841 he was appointed Secretary of the Legation to the American Minister in Russia. But the severe Russian winters were too much for him and resulted in his resignation and return to Boston.

The first early cries for freedom and an expression of distaste for all that shackles the will of man are first heard in his letters of around 1840. While traveling through Prussia en route to St. Petersburg, he writes, "Prussia is a mild despotism to be sure. 'Tis the homoeopathic tyranny - small doses, constantly administered, and strict diet and regimes... Everything in fact, is regulated by the Government." He disapprovingly looks at its history. "Prussia has no history - the reigning family is an ancient one; but the state is new, and artificial patchwork, without natural coherence, mosaiced


out of bought, stolen and plundered provinces...”

In his diary of December 7, 1841, Motley makes mockery of the Russian form of government:

"The Legislative, the Executive and Judicial departments are all, of course, embodied in the Emperor, who is, like 'Cerberus, three Gentlemen at once.' He is also the head of the Church; and as the nobility all take rank, not according to birth or title, but by seniority in his service, the whole society of Russia, through all its myriad links, dangles like a great chain from his aristocratic thumb. He is Jupiter Juventas, and he looks the character and fortunately is equal to it."29

Motley concludes that an understanding of the Russian Emperor's despotic rule would require a long residence and close study, but adds that "it certainly would not repay the trouble or time expended; the barbarous, the arbitrary, the confused, the contradictory and the mysterious are the prevailing features."30

Between 1837 and 1847, Motley tried his hand at many genres of literature; fiction, both long and short, poetry, both original composition and translation, criticism, historical speculation, and formal history. Except for his stay at St. Petersburg, this period of his life was given over to literary experimentation.

28 Ibid., p. 70.
29 Ibid., p. 113.
30 Ibid., p. 113.
I shall revert to July, 1839, in order to include in the contents of this chapter an investigation of Motley's essay which appeared on this date in the New York Review entitled "Goethe", a review of "Goethe's Werke und nachgelassene Werke." This excellent article renders an important contribution to the study of Goethe in this country. It is also important to point out that Goethe did not enjoy a good reputation in Puritan New England at the time of the essay's publication. It was Schiller who was the exalted German 'Dichter' of the day. Motley, no doubt, was equally familiar with the works of Schiller and could have reviewed his works as well. But realizing that New England's criticism of Goethe was unjust, Motley took the journalistic pulpit in defense of the great master, just as Schiller would have no doubt done, if he had been in the same position. Throughout Motley's life and works, he sided with the persecuted, the downtrodden and the underdog. Motley saw this same predilection for the oppression of mankind throughout the works of Schiller and came to accept his role as a standard-bearer for freedom.

Motley carefully studied Goethe's works and showed himself to be a true scholar of the great German literary figure:

"Whether it be the revelation of a tormenting passion, the promulgation of a cherished theory, the prosecution of an intellectual nosology, it will still be observed that the subject matter is drawn out of himself, out of his own observations, passions, misfortunes or successes. The
productions through which he is immortal, have been spun from himself as the web from the spider; and every succeeding day involved him more deeply in the intricate but accurately woven and exquisitely developed production, which it was the natural instinct of his experience to weave. Whether, as in Werther, he lays bare his own bosom to the scalpel, and surrenders himself as it were to a spiritual autopsy; whether, as in Wilhelm Meister, he unfolds a vast plan of universal education; or whether, as in Faust, he expresses with a master's hand the longing which tempts man beyond the confines of his inferior nature, til [sic] he destroys himself against the adamantine barrier which restrains him in his allotted but unsatisfying sphere; whether we examine the one or the other of these various works of art, we shall find them each and all the result of an elaborate and systematic observation of his own individuality."

Motley places importance on the historical events taking place during Goethe's boyhood. He reviews the first conflict between "the half-fledged eagle of Russia, and the crushed and torpid Ottoman serpent; the first attempt of the Czars to monopolize the succession of the Caesars, and the first strides of the most modern Despotism to universal Empire."

He points out that while in the East, one tyranny was struggling to engulf another, the American Revolution was producing a Republic. Again we hear his dominating interest

---


32 Ibid., p. 2.
in the future of freedom in the words: "Thus the new Despotism and the new Democracy, both gigantic in their cradles, and both destined, perhaps, in the depths of futurity, to embody in one great struggle the conflict between the two opposite elements of humanity..."33

Motley recounts the remarkable events that characterized the second period of Goethe's life; the French Revolution, the final disruption of Poland, and the downfall of the Holy Roman Empire. He recalls the names of famous men with whom Goethe was in occasional or familiar contact - Frederik the Great, Maria Theresia, the Empress Catharine, Washington, Robespierre, Napoleon, and Charles X, to name only a few. It is interesting to note for the purposes of this study that the events and famous figures which Motley characterized as a part of Goethe's early life, were directly involved in the preservation of liberty or the destruction of it.

Fifteen pages of this essay are devoted to an interpretation of Faust. It is indeed penetrating and offers several new and interesting concepts of this great epic. Faust is presented in a vivid and intense picture:

"Faust is the eternal type of mind in which the equilibrium between human ambition and human ability is destroyed...It is a mind which has refused to piece out with faith,

33Ibid., p. 3.
the deficiencies of knowledge, in which the silver link, - call it hope, faith, trust, or aught else - by which alone the finite may be connected with the infinite has been broken."34

Motley contrasts Faust and Mephistopheles as the embodiment of two opposing principles existing in the world. According to Motley, the great principle of Mephistopheles's character, and the one which is developed in a masterly manner, is his contempt. He despises all things equally, but is incapable of hate.

In addition to his knowledge of Goethe and his works, Motley again shows his familiarity with the history of German literature:

"Before the eighteenth century there was no such thing as German literature. There was, to be sure, a mass of heroic and chivalric lyrics, popular ballads, and mythological fables, and so there is at this moment in Russia and Poland; but Europe no more recognized a German literature, than it now does a Polish or a Russian. In Goethe's youth, there was a guild of authors in Gottingen whose exertions may be said to have created the present belles-lettres of Germany. The two Stolbergs, Voss, Hölt, Bürger, and many others of less fame were assembled about Klopstock...Thus it may be said, that the present varied and splendid fabric of German poetry was created by a corporation."35

Motley's interpretation of Faust is confined to part one.

34 Ibid., p. 31.
35 Ibid., pp. 18-19.
We remember that Motley had worked on a fragmentary translation of *Faust* while a student in Germany. In this essay on Goethe, he takes the liberty of using, as a reference, his own translation with the note, "We would observe that we have had but one object in our translations, both of Goethe's prose and verse. We have endeavored to give the matter as nearly as possible word for word, and as far as may be, in the exact order in which the text is arranged."36

One must not leave Motley's study without mentioning briefly two fictional works of his which reflect Goethe's influence.

In 1839, Motley produced his first venture in the field of prose fiction, *Morton's Hope*. Although the novel was generally regarded as unsuccessful, its importance for our purpose lies in tracing the influence of Goethe and the impact that German literature had made on the young New England scholar. One can also discern the strong influence of German life and culture in this autobiographical work. The early scenes depict German student life - their clubs, beer journeys, duels, and such. Fox Rabenmark, one of the protagonists, is sketched in detail and is surely a fictitious representation of Prince Otto von Bismarck, a close friend of Motley.

during his student days in Germany.

There are many expressions contained in the novel that reflect Goethe's life, interests, and philosophy. The influence of Werther is pronounced, as the theme of rejected love leading to suicide is also employed by Motley. Even the Wertherian mechanical form of letters is used in the narration of many episodes. Again, Faust is not forgotten for one scene is set in Auerbach's Keller, with toasting with goblets of wine to such sweethearts as "Gretchen, and Minna."

The Chevalier de Sataniski, a twenty-thousand-word story, appeared in Graham's Magazine in the fall of 1844. The story derives from the Faust tradition. Mephistopheles is represented by the Chevalier de Sataniski. Faust is a young man by the name of Wolfgang Klotz who is, however, able to withstand his tempter, who offers social advancement. The young Wolfgang has been unsuccessful in winning over the parents of the girl of his dreams, who is, coincidentally, called Margaret, because he is not of aristocratic birth. But Wolfgang perseveres and receives the hand of Margaret without signing a pact with the Chevalier. Motley closes with the moral, "Be satisfied with your lot in life, be it high
or humble."  

In 1845 Motley completed his essay "Peter the Great," which was called "the turning point in his literary career." It was well received, and its success, probably, had a powerful influence on Motley.

This essay might be called a miniature history in itself. At any rate, it offered a model of Motley's future historical method. Holmes remarks that here Motley showed "in epitome his qualities as a historian and a biographer."  

Motley concerned himself with the historical scene surrounding Peter, particularly the great conflict in which the latter was involved. He focuses attention on the character of the great Czar, and follows his career with interest as he visits the countries of western Europe. Motley admired Peter's veneration for western progress and took special delight in his opposition to the clergy. Motley saw the clergy in Russia as enemies of progress and did not fail to heap scorn upon them. He was to do the same thing in his histories of the Netherlands.

Because of Motley's admiration for Peter the Great he

---


38 Higby and Schantz, op. cit., p. xviii.

39 Holmes, op. cit., p. 363.
referred to him as, "one of those few characters whose existence has had a considerable influence upon history."\(^{40}\) Motley realized the great dramatic possibility in dealing with Peter, and the literary value of the hero. This, no doubt, was later to make him aware of the literary opportunity in the life of William of Orange. Motley, on the other hand, disapproved of Peter's despotic rule. He writes, "But while we admire the concentration of purpose which sustained him throughout his labors, we cannot help deploring the great and fundamental mistake which made them all comparatively worthless. A despot by birth, education, and temperament, he had never the most glimmering notion of the existence of a people."\(^{41}\) His very disapproval had the effect of intensifying his imagination in its encounter with William of Orange, who had nearly all of Peter's virtues and none of his vices. In portraying Charles XII of Sweden, Peter's antagonist, Motley saw the literary value of having great antagonists. The undesirable qualities of one could illuminate the desirable qualities of the other. The ability to recognize antagonists became one of Motley's and Schiller's historical techniques and perceptions.


\(^{41}\)Ibid., p. 316.
In "Peter the Great" Motley employs one of his characteristic procedures. The essay opens with an account of a visit by the Duke of Marlborough to a shipyard in a certain Dutch village. The Duke sees a man of obviously aristocratic stature working along side the Dutch workers. He learns to his surprise that this figure is none other than Czar Peter. Thus Motley offers the contrast of the noble man along side of the common worker. Schiller and Motley each accomplish the same element of contrast in the scene of the abdication of Charles V. This time it is their hero, William of Orange, who stands at the side of the villain Charles V.

After the success of "Peter the Great", Motley contributed two additional articles to the North American Review. The first of these, "The Novels of Balzac", is a review of the latter's works, but offers little of significance to this study. But in the second of these articles, "Polity of the Puritans", Motley again airs his definite views on freedom and democracy. He lashes out at the impression that the colonization of New England was a democratic movement. He agrees that democracy resulted from that colonization, and that the seeds of political liberty were unconsciously contained and concealed in the principle of resistance to religious oppression, but he points out that "the real reason why the democratic principle prevailed was because it is a true principle, and because it never
before had so fair a chance to develop itself."\textsuperscript{42} The Puritans had desired to establish a "pure church," and that desire had produced, by chance, a democracy as well. Motley evaluates the Puritans with this statement: "Their virtues were many and colossal; their vices were few but formidable: for they were intolerance, cruelty, tyranny, and bigotry."\textsuperscript{43}

The colony was led and governed by aristocrats, with whom church reformation was the leading principle of their lives. They came to America to establish "not liberty of conscience, but the true church."\textsuperscript{44} Settlers who would not conform to the principles of that church fared no better than they themselves had in Europe. "There was no democracy, but on the contrary, great danger to the sacred principle of liberty."\textsuperscript{45} Motley saw the early government of Massachusetts as severe in many respects as a tyrannical system. The true fact was that religious toleration was not considered a virtue, but a crime. The colony government continued to impose its forced will upon the people and issued decrees on practically every basic freedom.


\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 477.

\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., p. 438.

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., p. 438.
In *Merry Mount*, a novel also dealing with the Puritans, Motley again objects to their violence and lack of toleration.

Blaxton, the hermit of Shawmut, voices Motley's opinion:

"I have read the riddle, answered the solitary, and the answer is Toleration. This mighty reformation, of which we hear so much in so many lands, and which hath hitherto proved in England but a mockery, is naught, so long as one fetter remains upon liberty of conscience. What matter that the scarlet mantle of Babylon should be rent into tatters to show the corruption which these gorgeous robes conceal? What matter that priests should be proved to be mumming mountebanks and mercenary quacks, so long as still some other fantastic delusion is to succeed, so long as the whole contest is but a petty struggle between rival impostors?"\(^{46}\)

Motley admires the "sterness" and common sense of the New England character, "which has descended from the Puritans," and is "the solid foundation of this Republic."\(^{47}\) He feels that inhabitants of Massachusetts "make few epigrams about liberty and equality, but the democratic principle is more deeply fixed here than anywhere else."\(^{48}\)

This essay is particularly important for an understanding of Motley's concept of freedom, for one is able to obtain from it a great deal of his theory of government. Motley essentially

---


\(^{47}\)Ibid., p. 498.

\(^{48}\)Ibid., p. 498.
believed that sovereignty rest with the people, and that govern-
ment should be adjusted to the needs of the people. To Motley,
history revealed the progress of the human race toward liberty
and freedom, that democracy was the climax of political progress,
and that American democracy, though far from perfection, was the
highest point of achievement up to that day. This was well ex-
pressed with the words,"the foundation of the government is
popular consent." For failure to understand that principle,
he had condemned Peter the Great. He saw this as the only true
principle which had remained from all the ideas back of the
founding of New England. In 1861 in a letter to the London
Times, which attempted to define the nature of the American
government, he asserted that the only intelligible source of
power in a country that was beginning its history after a re-
volution, and in a land never subjected to military or feudal
conquest, was "the will of the people of the whole land as ex-
pressed by a majority." For Motley, his principle received
its severest test in America during the Civil War, which he
saw as a revolt of the slaveholders "against the natural and

49Ibid., p. 477.

50John Motley, Causes of the American Civil War (New
legal and constitutional authority of the sovereign people."^{51}

Motley's acceptance of the doctrine of popular sovereignty did not allow him to carry it to extremes. Democratic government must rest, however, on a solid foundation of law and order. Liberty did not signify license, and the rule of the people was not the rule of the mob. In Morton's Hope, in a discussion of the weakness of the American confederation at the time of the Revolutionary War, he states:

"The mob will not learn that although it is a sovereign and an absolute one, it is not beneath its dignity to confide its powers to trustworthy ministers and servants. But there is no need of enlarging on the weakness of governments for it seems that we shall never grow wiser, and that we are still determined to neutralize our institutions by our hesitation to subscribe to that belief in human virtue which dictated their organization."^{52}

Here, natural goodness is not suggested as a justification of popular suffrage; Motley, instead, lashes out at the unwillingness of the people to delegate their authority.

Motley did not feel that democratic institutions could flourish in all places. He saw history moving to a gradual development of the democratic way of life, and toward the achievement of political and religious freedom. For Motley,


^{52}John Motley, Morton's Hope; or the Memoirs of a Provincial (New York: Harper and Bros., 1839), vol. 1, p. 184.
the foundations of democracy were political and religious freedom. From his belief in the importance of liberty in the development of any nation grew a hatred of slavery, and a feeling of shame that the government he considered the most democratic of all, should be the last to emancipate. Motley quotes the Puritan Winthrop to verify his belief that freedom must come under the control of the law:

"There is a freedom of doing what we like, without regard to law or justice; this liberty is indeed inconsistent with authority: but civil, moral, and federal liberty consists in every man's enjoying his property and having the benefits of the laws of his country; which is very consistent with a due subjection to the civil magistrate."53

Schiller, too, believed that force and violence were not the remedy for all grievances and more often resulted in the suffering of the innocent rather than the guilty. Each certainly recognized that rebellion was forbidden by the scriptures. Yet Schiller and Motley espoused the cause of freedom in the Dutch rebellion, and they do not seem to champion the preservation of law and order. How can one explain these contradicting views? First, one must not forget that this rebellion was already history when they chose to report it and, naturally, they could not alter the course of the action. But

more important, what must be remembered, is the fact that they believed that a monarch was bound to allow his subjects to believe what they wished and to live accordingly. But Charles and Philip did not abide by this principle and maintained that they intended to carry out the true religion by force and to use the sword to exterminate those who threatened the fold. Motley and Schiller could not regard this as maintenance of social order. Freedom was not only cruelly suppressed in the Netherlands, but almost non-existent; rebellion was, therefore, sanctioned.

In this study of freedom concepts, is it possible to consider Schiller a democrat in the same sense as one does Motley? This would be difficult to maintain. Schiller's political view might be described as benevolent despotism. The wise, humane, and farsighted monarch who devises good laws for his people was what he desired. Motley, on the other hand, saw as the foundation of our democratic faith, that it was the people's privilege of making its own laws and a fully accepted and regularly exercised responsibility for them. He saw this as constituting, in the long run, not only the best safeguard against oppression, but an educative agency as well. Although both men saw freedom as a mighty ideal, Schiller never had the opportunity to consider Motley's democratic principles. One must not forget that Schiller was primarily a man of the eighteenth century, and that he lived
to see only the first beginnings of that great democratic movement which characterized the nineteenth century.

In the "Polity of the Puritans", Motley had indeed found an intriguing topic; a historical subject which dealt with the principles of freedom, a theme that would occupy him throughout much of his historical works. One might now say that Motley's apprenticeship was completed. The years of the apprenticeship had led to the development of "a clear and picturesque style, the flow of humor and the eloquence which characterized his later historical writings."^54

---

CHAPTER IV

MOTLEY - THE HISTORIAN OF LIBERTY

Even before the last of the historical essays had come to the public's attention, Motley had turned his attention to history and had begun the study of the great period of the sixteenth century which would result, after some ten years, in *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, an historical narrative of the struggle of the Netherlands for independence from Spain.

No one can with certainty explain Motley's interest and attraction to the struggle of the Dutch people against Philip II and his successors. His early study of European history had introduced him to the heroic struggle of this country. We know he was fond of the dramatic and picturesque and this particular period abounded in material offering this type presentation.

Motley himself told the Dutch historian, Groen van Prinsterer, that he had been struck by the similarity of the Dutch war for independence and the struggle in his own country against Great Britain. Both countries contained small groups of democratically inclined people fighting against great empires; both had produced great leaders - William of Orange and George Washington. These men were of a unique mold, who stood
for ideals which Motley admired. They displayed great courage, patience, self-sacrifice, and military ability. Each led relatively small, Protestant, democratic peoples, engaged in a struggle for independence against strong, tyrannical rulers. In this respect Motley defended Martin Luther with the words, "I honour the man who establishes for a large part of the human race the fundamental principle that thoughts were free...I tell you without, Luther, there would have been no William of Orange or Washington."¹ Both men fitted Schiller's and Motley's ideal of what leaders ought to be because they had espoused the cause of freedom and justice against tyranny and oppression.

Edwin Whipple accounted for Motley's choice of subject by saying that "he ached to become the historian of human liberty in some era where aristocracy and democracy were most violently opposed, and where the event of the struggle was of world-wide importance."²

But Schiller's influence in the writing of this history cannot be overlooked. When Motley began his Dutch history, this field of inquiry had scarcely been treated. Schiller's


fragmentary work *Der Abfall der Vereinigten Niederlande* was one of the best known to readers on both sides of the Atlantic. No doubt, Motley knew this history well as he did the other works of Schiller. Schiller's love of freedom and hatred for tyranny, re-echoed again and again in the majority of his works, had made its impression on the German-trained Motley. It is apparent to the reader of both Motley's and Schiller's histories that many of the incidents and events are described in the same striking manner; there is the similarly full development of remarkable and opposite characters and a lucid delineation of their virtues and vices.

Not long after Motley began research for his history, he learned that Prescott was planning a history of Philip II and had already made considerable progress on it. 3

After several years' research in Boston and the actual writing of two volumes of the projected work, Motley realized the necessity of consulting European archives if he were to write the kind of history he desired. Documentation was to play an important role in this historical presentation. In 1851 he set sail with

---

3Holmes, *op. cit.*, p. 401. - When Motley heard of Prescott's projected *History of Philip II*, he said: "It then occurred to me that Prescott might not be pleased that I should come forward upon his ground...At the same time I thought it would be disloyal on my part not to go to him at once, confer with him on the subject, and if I should find a shadow on his mind at my proposition, to abandon my plan altogether." Prescott, however, urged the young Motley to proceed on his contemplated course for there was more than enough material for both authors. He even offered him the use of books in his own personal library.
his family for Europe. He did not realize, that, except for a few brief visits home, he would spend the rest of his life in Europe.

After his arrival in the Netherlands, Motley began to study the country and to visit the areas he was to describe. He took time to study both the physical features of the country and also some of its cultural aspects, especially the collections of the great Dutch and Flemish painters. As he traveled about the countryside, his admiration for the people grew, for "they had to contend with two of the mightiest powers in the world, the ocean and Spanish tyranny, and they conquered both." During his stay in the Netherlands, Motley did no actual writing of his history. In November he and his family moved to Dresden where he remained for the next two years. Here he began his research in earnest. There is no indication why he first settled in Dresden rather than The Hague or Brussels, which would seem more logical for research into Netherlands history. Perhaps he chose Dresden because Ticknor had given him letters of introduction to Prince John, the brother of the King of Saxony, and there he would have access to the library and to the mass of manuscripts dealing with William of Orange who had married Anna of Saxony.

\[^{4}\text{Curtiss, op. cit., I, 125.}\]
Motley intended at first merely to revise the manuscripts completed in Boston. He soon became convinced that this course was impractical and decided to begin anew. At Dresden, and later Berlin, The Hague, and Brussels, he worked patiently with the correspondence and records of the sixteenth century. He lived a simple life, apart from the ordinary activities of the world. In a letter to Holmes during this period, he said:

"Our life is as stagnant as a Dutch canal; not that I complain of it, on the contrary the canal may be richly freighted with merchandise, and be a short cut to the ocean of abundant and perpetual knowledge, but at the same time few points rise above the level of so regular a life, to be worthy of your notice...Whatever may be the result of my labours, nobody can say that I have not worked hard like a brute beast; but I do not care for the result. The labour is in itself its own reward and all I want."  

At the time he was finishing the Dutch Republic he wrote to his friend, Christina Forbes:

"All I care for, if my book does ever get into print, is that it may do some good as a picture of the most diabolical tyranny which was ever permitted to be exercised, and of a free commonwealth which was absolutely forced into existence and self-defense. If ten people in the world hate despotism a little more and love civil and religious liberty a little better in consequence of what I have written, I shall be satisfied."  

---

5Ibid., I, 162-163.
6Mildmay, op. cit., II, 42.
By February 1853 Motley had completed three volumes which brought his history to the point of the assassination of William of Orange in 1584. He stopped here, as the expense of publishing more than that at his own risk, which he thought would be necessary, was more than he wanted to undertake. But before seeking a publisher, he consulted the archives at The Hague and Brussels in order to make necessary corrections and additions.

Brussels was the center of his narrative. It had been the capital of the Netherlands while it was still a part of the Spanish Empire and had remained the capital of the Spanish Netherlands after the northern provinces had broken away. The events precipitating the revolution and which brought William of Orange into prominence had taken place in Brussels. In this market place Egmont and Hoorn had died, and in the nearby courts the nobles had met and formed the "Gueux" or "Beggars."

The research was finally completed; the additions and emendations were put into final form for the publisher. In 1856 The Rise of the Dutch Republic, in three volumes, was published in both London and New York.

The three volumes cover a period of twenty-nine years in the history of the Netherlands, from the abdication of the Emperor Charles V at Brussels on October 25, 1555, to the

7Curtiss, op. cit., I, 139-140.
assassination of William of Orange on July 10, 1584. Motley divides the work conveniently into six parts, each concerned with the events under the administration of one of the six governors who in turn represented the Spanish empire, beginning with Philip himself (1555-1559) and continuing through the eras of the Duchess Margaret (1559-1567), the Duke of Alba (1567-1573), Don Luis de Requesens (1573-1576), Don John of Austria (1576-1578), and Alexander of Parma (1578-1584).

Part I is prefaced with an "Historical Introduction" and gives a brief and rapid sketch of the development of the Netherlands as a nation during the previous sixteen centuries.

A long prologue traces the efforts of Philip II to destroy the freedom of the Netherlands and the final decision of its inhabitants to resort to armed resistance against his tyranny. Characteristically, the history proper opens with a vivid word picture of one of the magnificent pageants which Motley so loved to reproduce - the scene of the abdication of the Emperor Charles V at Brussels on October 25, 1555. This scene will be taken up in detail in the chapter devoted to Charles V. Philip did not remain long in the Netherlands. He organized the government of the Netherlands with Margaret, Duchess of Parma, illegitimate daughter of Charles V, as his Regent, and issued stern commands for the enforcement of all edicts against heretics. He withdrew to Spain
and never again returned to the Netherlands, though many there felt the power of his arm.

The administration of the Duchess Margaret, to which Part II of the history is devoted, was stamped with the mark of treachery on the part of Margaret and duplicity on the part of Philip. Protests were lodged in vain by Orange, Egmont, and Hoorn against the form of government being employed by Philip in the Netherlands. The outbreak of revolt was inevitable, as was the decision on the part of Orange to join the cause of the rebels.

Sympathy for the Reformation, and especially the efforts of the Inquisition to destroy and punish that sympathy, were the main causes of the revolt which erupted in the Netherlands against Spanish authority. Motley offers a vivid description of one facet of this Inquisition:

"It was a court owing allegiance to no temporal authority, superior to all other tribunals. It was a bench of monks without appeal, having its familiars in every house, diving into the secrets of every fireside, judging, and executing its horrible simplicity. It arrested on suspicion, tortured till[sic] confession, and then punished by fire. Two witnesses, and those to separate facts, were sufficient to consign the victim to a loathsome dungeon. Here he was sparingly supplied with food, forbidden to speak, or even to sing - to which pastime it could hardly be thought he would feel much inclination - and then left to himself, till[sic] famine and misery should break his spirit...

The rack was the court of justice: the criminal's only advocate was his fortitude...

The torture took place at midnight, in a gloomy
dungeon, dimly lighted by torches. The victim - whether man, matron, or tender virgin - was stripped naked, and stretched upon the wooden bench. Water, weights, fires, pulleys, screws - all the apparatus by which the sinews could be strained without cracking, the bones crushed without breaking, and the body racked exquisitely without giving up its ghost, was now put into operation."

While local indignation at the cruelties of the Inquisition was steadily increasing, the incipient revolt against Spanish tyranny was taking place among the nobles. The methods of government employed by Philip and Margaret and their complete contempt for the ancient rights of the provinces led to a break in the State Council itself. Cardinal Granvelle represented the force of absolutism in this body along with Philip and Margaret. It was only the Prince of Orange, Count Hoorn, and Count Egmont who attempted valiantly to restore constitutional government. Opposition to the Cardinal grew stronger throughout the country and finally resulted in his recall.

Throughout these years William of Orange was emerging as the leader of the revolting rebels. Aided by Hoorn and Egmont, he tried to force the administration of the Netherlands into constitutional channels and to resist the tyrannous measures authored by Granvelle. The gospel of the reformed religion spread

---

rapidly in the provinces in spite of the cruelties of the Inquisition. Rioting broke out in many cities as an expression of the growing discontent among the people.

Margaret's regency had only the prelude to the years of bitter persecution, heroic resistance, and savage conflict which made up the administration of Alba, to which Motley devotes Part III of his history. Philip had put this cruel warrior in charge of 10,000 well-trained troops with the task of subjugating the Netherlands and annihilating the last vestiges of heresy at any cost. Motley describes in detail the Blood-Council, a tribunal set up by Alba to assist him in the job of extermination and suppression. The personnel of the council included several presidents and councilors of the different provincial tribunals. However, two Spaniards, Del Rio and Vargas, were the only voting members. It was Vargas who was "a terrible reality." Motley characterizes him thus:

"No better man could have been found in Europe for the post to which he was elevated. To shed human blood was, in his opinion, the only important business and the only exhilarating pastime of life. His youth had been stained with other crimes. He had been obliged to retire from Spain, because of his violation of an orphan child to whom he was guardian, but, in his manhood, he found no pleasure but in murder. He executed Alba's bloody work with an industry which was almost superhuman, and with a merriment which would have shamed a demon."¹

¹Ibid., II, 140-141.
The Council held its first session on September 21, 1567. Agents had been dispersed over the provinces with the task of collecting information concerning all persons who might be incriminated for participation in the recent uprisings. An even greater crime was to be rich, for Alba was intent on extorting great amounts of money to fill his own coffers. Any man, woman or even child could be summoned to the court. Innocence was in reality impossible, according to the rules which had been laid down regarding treason. Motley writes:

"Thus the whole country became a charnel-house; the death-bell tolled hourly in every village; not a family but was called to mourn for its dearest relatives, while the survivors stalked listlessly about, the ghosts of their former selves, among the wrecks of their former homes. The spirit of the nation, within a few months after the arrival of Alba, seemed hopelessly broken." 10

On February 16, 1568, with few exceptions, the Spanish Inquisition condemned all the inhabitants of the provinces to death as heretics. Egmont and Hoorn were condemned and executed. Louis of Nassau attempted to take the offensive, but, handicapped by the fact that his poorly paid troops were rioting, suffered devastating loses in a principal battle. The Prince of Orange raised a large army in Germany and crossed into Brabant to attack the Spaniards, but suffered the same fate. To add to the woes of

10Ibid., II, 143-144.
the rebels, a great storm broke the dikes and flooded the country resulting in the loss of 100,000 lives. To add to the burdens of the harassed citizens, Alba conceived of adding another taxation decree upon all provinces, including the Catholic ones, which resulted in the consolidation of the opposition in all provinces to Alba.

As hatred for Alba grew on every side, so the popularity and power of William of Orange increased. A revolution at Flushing secured this city from Spanish control, and the uprising throughout Holland and Zealand spread. A provisional government was established unofficially under William of Orange who demanded religious toleration for all. But the Spaniards were not to be denied and later recaptured several important cities. As was so often the case after a Spanish victory, they brutally violated the terms of the surrender. Alba was hated not only by the Dutch themselves, but by the royal troops and officials as well. Many of them had not been paid for months, which naturally led to much discontentment. Such was the state of affairs when the administration of Alba came to an end in 1573.

Alba's successor, Don Luis de Requesens, was as cruel as Alba. The series of events of his brief administration, from 1573 to 1576, are discussed in Part IV of *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*. During these years, William of Orange continued his efforts to rid the Netherlands of Spanish tyranny. The whole task of guiding
the efforts of the patriots fell directly upon his shoulders. Even from his sick-bed, he directed the plans for the relief of Leyden, one of the most stirring events in the history of the Netherlands. The dikes had been torn down in order to make it possible for Admiral Boisot's fleet to sail inland and give aid to the desperate inhabitants of Leyden. The misery endured by the rest of the Netherlands never reached the intensity of that of Leyden.

"Bread, malt-cake, horse-flesh, had entirely disappeared; dogs, cats, rats, and other vermin, were esteemed luxuries...Starving wretches swarmed daily around the shambles where these cattle were slaughtered, contending for any morsel which might fall, and lapping eagerly the blood as it ran along the pavement...Women and children, all day long, were seen searching gutters and dunghills for morsels of food, which they disputed fiercely with the famishing dogs. The green leaves were stripped from the trees, every living herb was converted into human food, but these expedients could not avert starvation. The daily mortality was frightful - infants starved to death on the maternal breasts, which famine had parched and withered; mothers dropped dead in the streets, with their dead children in their arms."\n
After overcoming seemingly impossible odds, the fleet of Boisot entered Leyden on the morning of the 3rd of October, 1574. The town was relieved, and the remaining citizens saved.

\[\text{\cite{Ibid.}, II, 569-570.}\]
The Netherlands by this time were nearly exhausted by this completely unequal struggle. It was obvious to Orange that conciliatory negotiations with the Spaniards must be made or assistance obtained from a foreign power. The latter possibility could not be implemented as long as the provinces remained subject to Spain. Holland and Zealand were united and their government was formally organized with Orange as its chief. On the first of October, 1575, he proposed to the estates that they separate from the King of Spain and change their sovereign in order to obtain the protection of some other power. Soon after the two little provinces declared themselves free from their Spanish master. But England, France, and Germany all refused him assistance. The Prince was seized by a desperate resolution:

"His project was to collect all the vessels, of every description, which could be obtained throughout the Netherlands. The whole population of the two provinces, men, women, and children, together with all the movable property of the country, were then to be embarked on board this numerous fleet, and to seek a new home beyond the seas. The windmills were then to be burned, the dykes pierced, the sluices opened in every direction, and the country restored for ever to the ocean, from which it had sprung."\(^{12}\)

But Requesens died unexpectedly and the plan was forgotten.

As Requesens had appointed no successor, The Council of

\(^{12}\) *Tbid.*, III, 49.
State assumed control of the government. All the members, with
the exception of one were, at that time, natives of the country.
These men were, although staunch Catholics, ready to demand
that the Dutch nobles share in the government of the Netherlands.
Philip did not immediately appoint a successor to Requesens,
and William seized the opportunity to stimulate the spirit of
patriotism in the provinces. Hitherto the land had been divided
into two unequal portions, with Protestant Holland and Zealand
on the side of the Prince, while the other fifteen provinces,
in which about half the population was Catholic, were, for the
most part, loyal to Philip. But the reign of terror and tyranny
under Alba and Requesens had finally incensed all the inhabitants
of the seventeen provinces, making possible a union of all the
Netherlands in spite of the differences in religious opinion.
A general mutiny of unpaid Spanish troops followed, whom the
powerless State Council was forced to declare as outlaws. The
prosperous city of Antwerp was soon captured and pillaged by
these outlawed troops. Now Protestant Holland and Zealand, and
the fifteen Catholic provinces were united in their hatred for
the foreign soldiery. At the suggestion of William of Orange,
they sent representatives to the Congress of Ghent and there
officially united under William and, at the same time, demanding
religious toleration throughout all the provinces.
Don John of Austria was the next to come to the Netherlands as Governor-General. The events of his brief administration (1576-1578) are surveyed in Part V of the history. But Don John had a great fear of the Netherlanders, and almost immediately requested that he be relieved of his new post.

The concluding section of Motley's history extends from the accession of Alexander of Parma in 1578 to the assassination of the Prince of Orange in 1584. These years were characterized by religious discord and strife. Parma seized the opportunity again to split the Netherlands. He used large sums of money to bribe many nobles and ecclesiastics to desert the cause of the patriots. William, too, was tempted by a large bribe but refused it. He was determined to maintain the unity of the provinces and to fight Spanish tyranny. However, Parma campaigned successfully in the Walloon provinces and forced them into a reconciliation with the royal government. Notwithstanding, in January, 1579, the Union of Utrecht, the foundation of the Republic, was signed by seven of the provinces guaranteeing them religious liberty and acceptance of the civil and political constitutions. On July 26, 1581, the provinces declared their independence from Philip.

At the insistence of Cardinal Granvelle, Philip proclaimed a ban against William of Orange and set a price on his head. William was the true leader of the rebellion, and if the Spanish
were to crush the rebels, William would have to be out of the way. Assassination seemed the best route. Several attempts had been made on the life of Orange before the final death blow arrived. On July 10, 1584, a certain Gérard Balthazar inflicted the fatal wound, and the Netherlands were deprived of their devoted leader. Shortly after his death, the important cities of Ghent and Antwerp fell again into royalists’ hands, thus separating the Southern Netherlands from the new republic. The history closes with a sketch of William, who had played the leading role in the rise of the Netherland Republic.

The labor of ten years was at last finished. The work was received with success around the world. The historical critic Froude wrote:

"All the essentials of a great writer Mr. Motley eminently possesses. His mind is broad, his industry unwearied. In the power of dramatic description no modern historian, except perhaps Mr. Carlyle, surpasses him, and in analysis of character he is elaborate and distinct."\(^{13}\)

The same article offered words of praise which could easily pertain to Schiller and his ideals. "His principles are those of honest love for all which is good and admirable in human character wherever he finds it, while he unaffectedly hates oppression, and despises selfishness with all his heart."\(^{14}\)


\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 177.
The flaw in Motley's concept of history is the same as that of Schiller. By focusing attention on striking individuals and dramatic events, important forces and factors which are not as colorful get scant attention. Similarly, economic factors are all but neglected, though commerce is mentioned as one of the causes of the national spirit of liberty. The force of religion does, however, receive full recognition, the passion of the Dutch people for religious liberty being noted as the strongest single factor in sustaining the revolt.

As stated previously in this study, Motley and Schiller's conceive of history as a drama in which the actions of striking personages are represented on a stage pictorially set is admirably illustrated here by Motley. William the Silent is the protagonist of the action, Philip is the antagonist, plotting to defeat his noble rival. The minor characters are such figures as Count Louis of Nassau, Count Hoorn, Hoogstraaten, and de la March on one side, the Duchess Margaret, Alba, the Grand Commander Requesens, Don John of Austria, and Alexander of Parma on the other. We can say that Motley's and Schiller's history of the Netherlands is a conflict between these personages rather than a conflict of nations. The people themselves provide the background against which the action occurs. The setting is completed with a succession of word pictures, and a sketching of the spectacular. The reader feels that he is witnessing a great
spectacle, a tragic struggle which, though it concludes with
the death of the hero, does not appear hopeless so far as the
principle of freedom and the cause of humanity are concerned.

In Motley's concept of history as a field for scientific
research, he anticipated the later historians; his method was
scientific. His quest for facts was indefatigable, spending
up to ten hours a day "digging raw material out of subterranean
depths of black-letter folios in half a dozen different languages."15
Motley did not fail to consult all the authorities and to go to
all the sources - Dutch, Flemish, French, Italian, German;
Catholic and Protestant.16

15 Curtiss, op. cit., I, 142.
16 Motley's sources are acknowledged in the Preface to The
Rise of the Dutch Republic, I, vii-viii. The correspondence of
Philip II and of William the Silent, edited by M. Gachard; the
Archives and Correspondence of the Orange-Nassau family, edited
by Green van Prinsterer; the unpublished documents in the Archives
of The Hague, of Brussels, and of Dresden; and the works of Bor,
Meteren, DeThou, Hoofd, Bakhuyzen, Groen van Prinsterer, Mendoza,
and Strada.

We can say that Motley's position as an historian is between
the older group of historical writers and the modern school. In
America the art of writing history was introduced in the seventeenth
century by certain of the early colonial leaders; there were frus­
trated examples of historical writing in the eighteenth century.
Only after the American Revolution do we have the first successful
historical attempts. A few years later the works of the school of
writers called the Middle Group of American Historians, began to
appear with such names as Washington Irving, Jared Sparks, George
Bancroft, William Prescott holding prominence. Motley possessed
much of the spirit and many of the methods of the pioneer members
of the modern school of scientific historians. He was not satisfied,
as many of the older writers of history had been, to repeat what
earlier historians had written. He believed in going to the primary
sources. Yet Motley still belonged to the older school of histori­
ans, as did Bancroft and Parkman and Schiller, in that, like them,
he believed in vivid writing; these men conceived of history as
being "literature" - not merely a prosaic record of facts.
One notes throughout Motley's histories the modern apparatus of close documentation, hardly a page being free of footnotes, the source of every significant statement being indicated and many sources being quoted.

The Rise of the Dutch Republic has been charged with being biased and partisan. Just as in the case of Schiller's work, the charge is true to a degree. They sympathized with Orange and the Netherlands in their struggle for religious and political freedom, and sometimes failed to achieve complete objectivity. Motley himself was aware of this tendency and wrote to Prescott concerning this author's portrayal of Philip:

"I can vouch for its extraordinary accuracy, both of narration and of portrait-painting. You do not look at people or events from my point of view, but I am, therefore, a better witness to your fairness and clearness of delineation and statement. You have by nature the judicial mind which is the costume de rigueur of all historians...I haven't the least of it - I am always in a passion when I write and so shall be accused very justly perhaps, of the qualities for which Byron commended Mitford, 'wrath and partiality'."\(^7\)

The second of the major historical writings of Motley, the History of the United Netherlands contains four volumes and surveys the events in Dutch History from the assassination of William the Silent in 1584 to the beginning of the twelve years.'

\(^7\)Harry T. Peck, William Hickling Prescott (New York, 1905), pp. 165-166.
truce in 1609. This second work of Motley's is different from that of his first. Here, the materials did not easily lend themselves to Motley's favorite scheme for the writing of history - that of dramatic treatment. The characters were not of great historic mold. Philip had passed from the immediate scene and William was dead. There is less color, less characterization, less intense action in the History of the United Netherlands than in The Rise of the Dutch Republic. The action is no longer confined mainly to the Netherlands as was the case in the earlier work. The history of the Netherlands is now intimately linked with that of England, France, in fact, all of Europe. Much space is devoted to events which occur beyond the boundaries of the Dutch republic, and the result is an obvious lack of unity in the narrative. It is not that this work lacks entirely the popular qualities of its predecessor, - but there is some diminution of interest in spite of frequent brilliant passages.

Volume I of the History of the United Netherlands opens with a survey review of the situation in the Netherlands at the death of William of Orange, with the small nation thrown against the mighty Spanish empire. Sovereignty was an immediate problem, as the death of Orange had robbed the country of a chief. A temporary solution was found in the establishment of a State Council, a provisional executive board set up
for three months. Again despairing inhabitants of the existing Dutch Federation sought assistance from France and England. Long and tortuous negotiations with Queen Elizabeth and Henry III (1551-1589) ended in complete failure. Germany offered no assistance to her neighbors for the antipathy between Lutherans and Calvinists was nearly as great as between Protestants and Papists.

Meanwhile Philip's attention had become attracted to France and he neglected his interests in the Netherlands. Farnese was appointed to serve the King of Spain in the Dutch provinces. Motley considered him the ablest man who had hitherto served. His ingenuity, as well as the deplorable lack of leadership among the Dutch after the death of Orange, is illustrated in one of the best passages in this history - the account of the siege of Antwerp. William the Silent's plan for the defense of the city, delivered before his death to Saint Aldegonde, was rejected. Handicapped by a lack of funds, Farnese was able to achieve what seemed almost the impossible. He threw a bridge across the Scheldt, closed the river to navigation, and cut the line of supplies to the beleaguered city. The rebels made a courageous attempt to destroy the bridge by floating fire-ships down the river under cover of darkness. The countryside had been flooded, and an attempt was made to secure relief for Antwerp by sailing ships across the flooded countryside. But the plan was doomed after the Kowenstyn dike defeat and Antwerp
was forced to capitulate.

As previously stated of this history, the diminishing dramatic quality lies in the fact that Motley could not find a dramatic hero for this second history who should serve to unify the action as William the Silent had done in *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*. Motley wrote to his mother:

"The great cause of regret that I have... admits of no remedy. There is no great hero. It is difficult to scare up another William of Orange, and whatever success or virtue my other book may have had, is owing to my having discovered one of the great men of the world's history, who was, I think, not generally known or appreciated."\(^{18}\)

Indeed, Motley puts his finger on the vital difference between the two histories. On the death of Prince William in 1584 the Netherlands were without a leader.

Although Motley failed to find a great hero for his history, he did find a number of villains. The great villain Philip survived Orange by fourteen years and continued to occupy an important place in the volumes of the *History of the United Netherlands*. He is still the evil genius whose machinations are held responsible for the plight of the Netherlands. Motley writes:

"And all this human wretchedness was the elaborate work of one man - one dull, heartless bigot, living, far away, a life of laborious ease and solemn sensuality; and, in reality, almost as much removed from these fellow-creatures of his, whom he called subjects, as if he had been the inhabitant of another

\(^{18}\)Curtiss, op. cit., II, 141.
planet. Has history many more instructive warnings against the horrors of arbitrary government - against the folly of mankind in ever tolerating the rule of a single irresponsible individual, than the lesson furnished by the life-work of that crowned criminal, Philip the Second?"19

Motley did not abandon his biographical concept of history. He believed in the importance of the individual in determining the course of history.

"Can the influence of the individual, for good or bad, upon the destinies of the race be doubted, when the characters and conduct of Elizabeth and Leicester, Burghley and Walsingham, Philip and Parma are closely scrutinized and broadly traced throughout the wide range of their effects?"20

Again after recounting the assassination of Henry III, Motley adds this statement:

"Another illustration was exhibited of the importance of the individual - even although that individual was in himself utterly despicable - to the working out of great historical results."21

For the purposes of this study, we might conclude that it was fortunate that Motley failed to find the single hero for whom he was searching. He was now forced to devote his attention to other persons and events. Partly because of the de-


20Ibid., II, 244.

21Ibid., III, 1.
creased dramatic quality of the History of the United Nether-
lands, and the corresponding increase in exposition and analysis, 
Motley is in this work even more dedicated to the didactic 
purpose of history than he was in the earlier work. The theme 
is recurrent. "The deep-laid conspiracy of Spain and Rome 
against human right," he declares, "deserves to be patiently 
examined, for it is one of the great lessons of history." 22 
Motley believed in self-government and that the ultimate goal 
of progress was the triumph of democratic principles. This we 
have seen to be implicit in all of his work: a true hero like 
William of Orange was a hero to both him and Schiller because 
he was the very incarnation of the principle of freedom. 

Motley and Schiller believed that the study of history is 
valuable mainly if it enables the present generation to study 
the past epochs and to profit by their errors. History had a 
valuable lesson for those who would emulate the example of na-
tions which did battle for freedom against the forces of tyranny 
and oppression. Thus Schiller and Motley chose the story of the 
Dutch people as the subject of their histories. Motley states: 

"Liberty of speech, liberty of the press, 
liberty of thought on political, religious, 
and social questions existed within those 
Dutch pastures and Frisian swamps to a far 
greater degree than in any other part of the 

22Ibid., I, iii.
world at that day; than in very many regions of Christendom in our own time. Personal slavery was unknown...In the battle for human liberty no nation has stood with cleaner hands before the great tribunal, nor offered more spotless examples of patriotism to be emulated in all succeeding ages, than the Dutchmen in their gigantic struggle with Philip of Spain."^3

The brave Netherlander furnished future nations with an example to be followed by those who fight the battle of freedom. In their successful struggle against Spain they preserved the very principle of freedom that in all probability changed the course of history for other nations.

"They had come to disbelieve in the mystery of kingcraft, in the divine speciality of a few transitory mortals to direct the world's events and to dictate the laws to their fellow-creatures. What they achieved was for the common good of all.

They fought for the liberty of all. And it is for this reason that the history of this great conflict deserved to be deeply pondered by those who have the instinct of human freedom. Had the Hollander basely sunk before the power of Spain, the proud history of England, France, and Germany would have been written in far different terms."^4

It is in this common struggle for human freedom that Motley identifies the interests of the Protestant countries of Europe at the close of the sixteenth century and the opening of the

^3Ibid., III, 17-18.

^4Ibid., III, 18.
seventeenth. We can say that it is his didactic purpose which enlarges the scope of the History of the United Netherlands to include not only the history of the Netherlands but that of the most of western Europe.

England, Holland, the Navarre party in France, and a considerable part of Germany were contending for national unity and independence, for vested and recorded rights. Much farther than they themselves or their chieftains dreamed, those millions of men were fighting for a system of temperate human freedom; for that emancipation under just laws from arbitrary human control, which is the right - however frequently trampled upon - of all classes, conditions, and races of men; and for which it is the instinct of the human race to continue to struggle under every disadvantage, and often against all hope, throughout the ages, so long as the very principle of humanity shall not be extinguished in those who have been created after their Maker's image. 25

Motley concludes his second history with this statement of his didactic aim: "If by his the author's labours a generous love has been fostered for that blessing, without which everything which this earth can afford is worthless - freedom of thought, of speech, and of life - his highest wish has been fulfilled." 26 The faithful reader of his work can never escape the conviction that Motley was constantly inspired by the same

25 Ibid., III, 154.
26 Ibid., IV, 572.
passionate love of liberty which Schiller espoused in his Dutch history fifty-odd years earlier.

It is even apparent to the casual reader that Motley's view of the didactic purpose of history has intimate connection with his faith in human progress. In the summation of the fourth volume of the History of the United Netherlands Motley expresses the opinion that the history of the forty-year struggle shows the progress of the Dutch people as a gigantic step in the march of humanity.27

Motley's long-range view of history reveals progress along several lines, one of the most important being the constant movement toward political freedom. "There can be little doubt," he writes, "to those who observe the movements of mankind during the course of fourteen centuries since the fall of the Roman Empire - a mere fragment of human history - that its progress, however concealed or impeded, and whether for weal or woe, is towards democracy..."28

Progress was also being made in the sixteenth century toward religious freedom. The Ghent pacification which granted public exercise of the reformed religion in Holland and Zealand was

27Ibid., IV, 549-550.

28Ibid., III, 513.
called, "one of the great landmarks of progress." During the course of this period of history, Motley notes with satisfaction that there was an improvement of conditions in the Netherlands. It was no longer universal practice to throw overboard and drown all prisoners taken at sea. Land warfare, too, was becoming more humane. Motley stresses that it was the customary procedure of Maurice, upon capturing a town, to allow the garrison to march out with all the honors of war and to permit the inhabitants to leave or to remain as they might choose. Even the Spanish commander Parma was moved to humane treatment of captured towns. The barbarous days of Alba, when everyone was put to death and cruel atrocities committed, were almost over. Only in Spain did Philip and his aids still resort to the use of poison to rid themselves of their principal opposition. But Motley sees an improvement of conditions in the practice, "It may at least be counted among the signs of human progress that assassination is no longer one of the commonplace means employed by anointed sovereigns against each other, and against individuals obnoxious to royal displeasure." Motley's concept of progress occupied an important place in Motley's thought at the time he was writing The History of the United Netherlands. In its history he discovered evidence of

29 Ibid., II, 248.
30 Ibid., IV, 104.
progress toward political and religious freedom, toward greater humanity in man's treatment of his fellow man, and toward world peace and international good-will. Because progress is slow in its upward movement, the best evidence that it is not illusory may be found in a retrospective view which comprehends long periods of time - hence his didactic value of the study of history. The history of the Netherlands possessed this value to a great degree, which Motley found to his liking.

In considering the question of partisanship in Motley's work, one must repeat what has been said earlier about The Rise of the Dutch Republic. Like Schiller, Motley was certainly not completely objective; his sympathies in The History of the United Netherlands are quite obviously with the Netherlanders. However, he does not withhold evidence which is damaging to the cause which he embraces. He reports the "brutal infamous butchery" perpetrated by the Dutch after their naval victory at Gibraltar in 1607. The Prince of Parma is consistently given fair treatment, the picture of this commander forming an interesting contrast with that of the Duke of Alba as presented in The Rise of the Dutch Republic. He is praised, for example, for his conduct at the capitulation of Antwerp in 1585: "It redounds to the eternal honour of Alexander Farnese - when the fate of Naarden and Haarlem and Maestricht, in the days of Alba, and of Antwerp
itself in the horrible 'Spanish fury,' is remembered - that there were no scenes of violence and outrage in the populous and wealthy city, which was at length at his mercy after having defied him so long.\footnote{Ibid., I, 253-254.}

Motley's historical presentation was supported by documentation. He did not conceive it the duty of history, however, to report with complete scientific objectivity, to be merely the non-committal recorder of events. History has a moral purpose; it must pass judgment on the deeds recorded which is consistent with the concept of the didactic purpose of history, as discussed earlier. The question of Motley's political bias, and of his supposed religious bias, probably hinges on his estimation of Philip. Let him state his own case:

"It is from no abstract hatred to monarchy that I have dwelt with emphasis upon the crimes of this king, and upon the vices of the despotic system, as illustrated during his life-time...It matters comparatively little by what name a government is called, so long as the intellectual and moral development of mankind, and the maintenance of justice among individuals, are its leading principles. A government, like an individual, may remain far below its ideal; but, without an ideal, governments and individuals are alike contemptible. It is tyranny only - whether individual or popular - that utters its feeble sneers at the ideologists, as if mankind were brutes to whom instincts were all in all the ideas nothing. Where intellect and justice are enslaved by that holy trinity - Force, Dogma, and Ignorance - the tendency of governments, and of those subjected to them, must of
necessity be retrograde and downward."\textsuperscript{32}

We conclude that Motley does not achieve complete objectivity, but is not wholly guilty of narrow religious and political bias. Holmes, commenting on \textit{The History of the United Netherlands}, says that in this history "he could not help writing more or less as a partisan, but he was a partisan on the side of freedom in politics and religion, of human nature as against every form of tyranny, secular or priestly..."\textsuperscript{33}

It seems necessary to make a few summary remarks about the style of \textit{The History of the United Netherlands}. It has already been pointed out that the style of this work is in general less agreeable than that of \textit{The Rise of the Dutch Republic}. There is not the fast moving narrative which engrosses the reader, although many sections such as the account of the siege of Antwerp, the defeat of the "Invincible Armada," are done in true Motley tradition. There is not the same moving intensity or vividness of effect. This can be explained by the nature of the material with which Motley had to work with in composing his second history. Unity was practically impossible with the scene shifting from England to France and back to the Netherlands. The style was affected, too, by the fact that Motley was not

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., III, 512-513.

\textsuperscript{33}Holmes, \textit{op. cit.}, XI, 434-435.
able here, as he had been in the earlier work, to put his story into dramatic form, with a great hero to symbolize the principles for which the Netherlanders were fighting. There is often more exposition and analysis than dramatic narrative. A still further explanation of the changed character of Motley's style lies in the conflicting interest which occupied his mind in those days. His extreme anxiety over the situation in America which was gripped in the Civil War tended to interfere at times with his occupation with the events of the sixteenth century.

Only four years elapsed between the date of *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* (1856) and the appearance of the first two volumes of *The History of the United Netherlands* (1860), but eight more years went by before the next two volumes were published (1868).
CHAPTER V

THE RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC

AND

DER ABFALL DER NIEDERLANDE

Introduction

In the introductions to their works, Motley and Schiller relate their unique interest in the history of the Netherlands. Schiller felt that the sixteenth century ranked among the brightest of the world's epochs because it established "die Gründung der niederländischen Freiheit." Oppressed humanity had struggled against overwhelming odds, yet triumphed "über die furchtbaren Künste der Tyrannie..." (Ibid., p. 3) He was encouraged in the reflection that there was a recourse against the usurpations of despotic power and that nations would throw off the shackles placed upon them by the outstretched arm of tyranny. Both Schiller and Motley champion the genius of liberty that inspired the Netherlands to resistance. Motley recalls that foreign tyranny had always coveted this small nation but its people had staunchly

1 Schiller, Sämtliche Werke, Sakular-Ausgabe, op. cit., XIV, 3.

Unless otherwise stated, all quotations from Schiller are taken from this same volume.
resisted oppression. He saw the rise of the Dutch Republic as an organized revolt against ecclesiastical tyranny and universal empire. It was the empire of Charles V that "was erected on the grave of liberty." He saw the preservation of freedom in Holland and Zealand in the sixteenth century as only a single chapter in the long history of freedom. The revolutions in England and America were all links in this chain. The Dutch Republic originated "in the opposition of the rational elements of human nature to sacerdotal dogmatism and persecution - in the courageous resistance of historical and chartered liberty to foreign despotism." (Ibid., p. xxviii) Schiller offers his history to exhibit to the world "dieses schöne Denkmal bürgerlicher Stärke" and "in der Brust meines Lesers ein fröhliches Beispiel zu geben, was Menschen wagen dürfen für die gute Sache und ausrichten mögen durch Vereinigung." (Ibid., p. 3)

Schiller and Motley explore in their introductions the period of Dutch history prior to Charles V. Motley credits the Romans with providing the earliest information concerning the territory called the Netherlands. Each recalls the fact that the Romans were the first to wage war there.


Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from Motley are taken from this same volume.
"The wars waged by that nation (Rome) with the northern barbarians have rescued the damp island of Batavia...from obscurity in which they might have remained for ages...Julius Caesar has saved from oblivion the heroic savages who fought against his legions in defense of their dismal homes with ferocious but unfortunate patriotism." (Ibid., p. 1)

Schiller stated it much in the same way:

"Auf eben diesem Boden, wo jetzt die Niederländer ihrem spanischen Tyrannen die Spitze bieten, haben vor fünfzehnhundert Jahren ihre Stammvater, die Batavier und Belgen, mit ihrem römischen gerungen." (Ibid., p. 17)

Schiller and Motley saw a parallel between the Spaniard of the sixteenth century and the Roman of the first century. Both the Spanish and the Roman armies were made up of courageous soldiers who took pride in their conquests and inspired the same state of terror in the hearts of their enemies.

Schiller recalls the period of the Frisian residence in the territory of the Netherlands and the fact that they were the last group to be subdued by the neighboring tribes, but "setzen sich zuerst wieder in Freiheit." (Ibid., p. 20)

After the conquest of the territory by the Franks, it was again the Frisians who threw off the tyrannical yoke which had been placed upon them and re-appeared as free people.

Motley, too, discusses the Frisians' struggle for freedom and designates them as the "free Frisians whose name is synonymous with liberty." (Ibid., p. 27) He quotes this statement
from their statute book: "The Frisians shall be free as long as the wind blows out of the clouds and the world stands." (Ibid., p. 27)

Motley echoes his sentiments in favor of freedom as he enthusiastically develops the rise and fall of Charlemagne's empire. He calls attention to Charlemagne's principle "that his officers should govern according to local custom" and by doing so help the inhabitants achieve their own independence. "This," he says, "preserves all that is left of national liberty and law." (Ibid., p. 31) Motley records the chaos which existed in the territory of the Netherlands after the death of Charlemagne. He points out that this territory was never actually united under one empire before the arrival of Charles V. Motley can not resist previewing the era several hundred years later in which he was to devote his complete historical attention. He describes it in this manner:

"Edicts issued by a power, as it were, supernatural demands implicit obedience. The people, acquiescing in their own annihilation, abdicate not only their political but their personal rights. On the other hand, the great source of power diffuses less and less of light and warmth...The scepter, stretched over realms so wide, requires stronger hands than those of degenerate Carlovingians...Functionaries become sovereigns, with hereditary, not delegating, right to own people, to tax their roads and rivers, to take tithings of their blood and sweat, to harass them in all the relations of life. There is no longer a metropolis to protect them from official oppression. Power the more subdivided
becomes the more tyrannical. The sword is the only symbol of law, the cross is a weapon of offense, the bishop is a consecrated pirate, every petty baron a burglar, while the people, alternately the prey of duke, prelate, and seignor, shorn and butchered like sheep..." (Ibid., p. 32)

Motley returns to earlier Dutch history and expresses his admiration for Claudius Civilis, an early Batavian who first fostered the cause of Dutch freedom after having served twenty-five years in the Roman armies. Motley compares him with Arminius, in that he, too, received a Roman education, "and had learned the degraded conditions of Rome. He knew the infamous vices of her rulers; he retained an unconquerable love for liberty and for his own race."(Ibid., p. 17) He saw the shameless evils at hand, and "it seemed a time to strike a blow for freedom." (Ibid., p. 17) Motley credits Civilis's courage, eloquence and talent for political machinations, with effecting the general confederation of the Netherlands' tribes. Motley remarks that the details of this revolt have been preserved by Tacitus, whom he describes as a great historian. He adds, "The spectacle of a brave nation inspired by the soul of one great man and rising against an overwhelming despotism will always speak to the heart from generation to generation."(Ibid., p.18) Like Schiller, Motley was attracted to the deeds of Civilis and the contest between Rome and him. They saw it as a foreshadowing of the future conflict with Spain. Motley writes,
"The characters, the events, the amphibious battles, desperate sieges, slippery alliances, the traits of generosity, audacity, and cruelty, the generous confidence, the broken faith, seem so closely to repeat themselves that History appears to present the selfsame drama played over and over again, with but a change of actors and of costume." (ibid., p. 21)

He saw more than a "fanciful" resemblance between Civilis and his historical standard-bearer of freedom, William the Silent, and compares their similarities of person and position. (Ibid., p. 21)

As we have noted, Schiller observes the analogy between the early Dutch struggles against Rome and those against the Spaniards. (See Schiller's remarks on page 94 of this chapter.) Both the Romans and the Spaniards were dictatorial masters who enjoyed the advantage of a similarly unequal struggle. In each instance, hatred for the ruling sovereign had armed the whole nation. Just as William the Silent was the leading figure in the later struggle, again it was "ein einziger Mensch, für seine Zeit geboren, deckt ihr das gefährliche Geheimnis ihrer Kräfte auf und bringt ihren stummen Gram zu einer blutigen Erklärung," (Ibid., p. 17) in the person of Claudius Civilis. Schiller, too, regards Civilis as the man who "rettet seine Insel" - just as William had done in saving the city of Leyden centuries later. Schiller considers the only difference between the two revolts was, that the Romans and Batavians fought
humanely. Unlike their successors, this war did not center around religion.

Both Schiller and Motley discuss the favorable geographical location of the Netherlands. An open sea, three large navigable rivers and numerous artificial canals contributed to the unprecedented prosperity enjoyed by the region. The city of Bruges was recognized as the focal point of European commerce.

However, Schiller reports that the author Comines, who traveled through the Netherlands around the middle of the fifteenth century, did not feel that this prosperity was leading to any good.

"Die Pracht und Eitelkeit der Kleidung wurde von beiden Geschlechtern zu einem ungeheuren Aufwand getrieben. Auf einen so hohen Grad der Verschwendung, wie hier, war der Luxus der Tafel bei keinem anderen Volke noch gestiegen. Die unsittliche Gemeinschaft beider Geschlechter in Bäder und ähnlichen Zusammenkünften, die die Wollust erhitzen, hatte alle Schamhaftigkeit verbannt..." (Ibid., p. 31)

Both authors call this prosperity the provider and destroyer of freedom. Wealth had attracted unscrupulous despots, who had sought their own aggrandizement by violating the human rights of the citizens and subjugating them to tyrannical wills. Schiller believes that, "Schwankende Gesetze und die despotische Willkür eines räuberischen Fürsten würden alle Vorteile vernichtet haben... Nur die unverletzbare Heiligkeit der Gesetze kann dem Bürger die Früchte seines Fleisses versichern..." (Ibid., p. 35)
Motley's histories have been criticized for their prejudicial nature. As we have seen, Motley conceded this shortcoming. Yet, we must smile at his estimate of earlier Dutch historians. "Doubtless the history of human liberty in Holland and Flanders, as everywhere else upon earth where there has been such a history unrolls many scenes of turbulence and bloodshed, although these features have been exaggerated by prejudicial historians." (Ibid., p. 48) Motley did not see any contribution to the development of European freedom in the ascension of Philip (1419-1467), surnamed "the Good," a name not in keeping with his character. Motley writes: "the ascension of so potent and ambitious a prince as the good Philip boded evil to the cause of freedom in the Netherlands." (Ibid., p. 52) Of these prominent personages who played a role in early Dutch history, Motley regards only Jacqueline (Jacoba) 1401-1436, the heroine of Dutch ballads and drama, as imbued with the "spirit of liberty." It is significant that Motley places her "in the perpetual existence of the Iphigenias, Mary Stuarts, Joan of Arc...," not only because they were all great women, but because either Schiller or Goethe had ennobled them in drama." (Ibid., p. 50)

With the death of Charles the Bold, Motley saw a dawning of new hope in the Netherlands. "A sudden spasm of liberty gives the whole people gigantic strength." (Ibid., p. 62) The cities of Holland, Flanders, and certain provinces met at Ghent and
declared that their provinces had been impoverished and oppressed by the enormous taxation imposed upon them by Charles the Bold. He had constantly violated their provincial and municipal charters and they demanded a complete reform of the existing statutes and restoration of their human rights. The result was that on February 10, 1477 Mary of Burgundy (1457-1462) granted the 'Groot Privilegie', the Magna Charta of Holland, which established the foundation of the Dutch Republic although it was afterwards violated and even abolished. This charta did not actually provide any new privileges, but set forth the recognition of all former rights. Motley called this charta "good work," for now the country could re-establish its independence and prosperity. He adds, "This summary annihilation of all the despotic arrangements of Charles the Bold was enough to raise him from the tomb." (Ibid., p. 64)

The rights of the people were no longer in the hands of a sovereign, but in those of the parliament. This congress now had the power to levy taxes, regulate commerce, declare war, coin money, and raise armies. The liberty of the citizens themselves was amply provided for by the re-establishment of the jus de non evocando, the habeas corpus of Holland. Motley writes: "Certainly, for the fifteenth century, the Great Privilege (Groot Privilegie) was a reasonably liberal constitution. Where else upon earth, at that day, was there half so
much liberty as was thus guaranteed?" (Ibid., p. 64) This law recognized people as human beings with hopes and aspirations. "It was a noble and temperate vindication of natural liberty... to the stout burghers of Flanders and Holland belongs the honor of having battled audaciously and perennially in behalf of human rights." (Ibid., p. 65) Unfortunately, these efforts were in vain, for the territory was not able to escape from the greedy and tyrannical hands of Charles V and Philip II.

Motley traces the early religious development in the provinces of the Netherlands and the growth of the power of the Catholic Church. Members of the clergy, particularly bishops, grew wealthy and powerful. They did not cater to the needs of the people as they were instructed, but took every opportunity to exploit them. Many priests of lower rank became merchants and profited from selling tax exempt products. Motley saw in the Pope and his monks, "but faint resemblance to Jesus and his apostles." (Ibid., p. 89) The sale of absolutions had reached unbelievable proportions. Prices for God's pardon were advertised in every town according to a graduated tariff. Forgiveness for every sin imaginable could be bought, "even for the rape of God's mother..." (Ibid., p. 93) Motley describes it thus, "Criminals buying paradise for money, monks spending the money thus paid in gaming houses, taverns, and brothels - this seems to those who have studied
their Testaments, a different scheme of salvation from that promulgated by Christ." (Ibid., p. 93) Motley concludes, "Was it strange that a century or so of this kind of work should produce a Luther?" (Ibid., p. 89) Luther entered the scene "armed only with a quiver filled with ninety-five propositions, and a bow which can send them all over Christendom with incredible swiftness." (Ibid., pp. 93-94)

Motley turns to the sixteenth century and the Reformation and discusses the position of Erasmus in this movement. He censures him for his "middle of the road" position not having actively supported Luther's cause.

"The sage of Rotterdam was a keen observer, a shrewd satirist, but a moderate moralist. He loved ease, good company, the soft repose of princely palaces, better than a life of martyrdom and a death at the stake. He was not of the stuff of which martyrs are made... Moderate in all things, he would have liked, he said, to live without eating and drinking, although he never found it convenient to do so, and he rejoiced when advancing age diminished his tendency to other carnal pleasure in which he had moderately indulged. Although awake to the abuses of the Church, he thought Luther going too fast and too far. He began by applauding, ended by censuring the monk of Wittenberg. The Reformation might have been delayed for centuries had Erasmus and other moderate men been the only reformers." (Ibid., p. 91)

Motley offers this metaphoric contrast of Erasmus and Luther:

"Meantime the man whose talk is not of doves and owls, the fierce physician who deals not with ointments and cooling draughts, strides past the crowd of gentle quacks to smite the foul disease." (Ibid., p. 95)
We recall that Motley was often inclined to vent his wrath against the Catholic Church. In his essay, *Historic Progress* and *American Freedom*, he attacks the seat of Catholicism for its disregard of human rights.

"Rome, both in her military and legal glory, and in her shameful and crampulous decrepitude, remains a perpetual memory to encourage human progress, and to warn from the dangers of luxury, ambition, and ineffable disdain of human rights by which she justly perished." ³

But Motley expresses disappointment in the progress of human rights after the initial success of Martin Luther: "The passionate rising for freedom, the great mutiny against Rome, resulted only in new and heterogeneous forms of despotism. ⁴

Motley was dominated by his love of political liberty and his belief in the republican form of government. He did not think, however, this could be imposed upon all nations without modifications. He realized that a nation had to achieve a certain stage of development before it could adopt a democratic form of government. Government should adapt to the conditions of the people to be governed and insure the greatest good for the governed, yet at the same time embody as many of the principles of popular self-government as possible. Motley points out in his essay on Peter the Great that this great ruler made one

---

³Higby and Schantz, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁴Ibid., p. 96.
fundamental error:

"A despot by birth, education, and temperament, he had never the most glimmering notion of the existence of a people...A people may be humanized, cultivated, brought to any degree of perfection in arts, and arms, and sciences; but he undertook to civilize a state in which there was but one man, and that man himself."\(^5\)

Motley closes his historical introduction with a summary of the first sixteen centuries of the Netherlands' existence. Like Schiller, he saw as the one prevailing characteristic or master passion - the love of liberty. Both authors were aroused by the indomitable spirit of freedom and their hatred for tyranny. Motley eloquently summarizes the rise of freedom in the Netherlands and its movement toward fulfillment:

"Largely compounded of the bravest Teutonic elements, Batavian and Frisian, the race ever battles to the death with tyranny, organizes extensive revolts in the age of Vespasian, maintains a partial independence even against the sagacious dominion of Charlemagne, refuses in Friesland to accept the papal yoke or feudal chain, and throughout the dark ages struggles resolutely toward the light, wresting from a series of petty sovereigns a gradual and practical recognition of the claims of humanity. With the advent of the Burgundian family the power of the commons has reached so high a point that it is able to measure itself undaunted with the spirit of arbitrary rule, of which that engrossing and tyrannical house is the embodiment. For more than a century the struggle for freedom, for civic life, goes on; Philip the Good, Charles the Bold, Mary's hus-

\(^5\)Motley, Peter the Great, p. 316.
band Maximilian, Charles V, in turn, assailing or undermining the bulwarks raised, age after age, against the despotic principle. The combat is ever renewed. Liberty, often crushed, rises, again and again from her native earth with redoubled energy. At last, in the sixteenth century, a new and more powerful spirit, the genius of religious freedom, comes to participate in the great conflict."(Ibid., p. 114)
Schiller entitles a chapter of his first book, "Die Niederlande unter Karl dem Fünften," and opens with a discussion of the enviable position which the provinces enjoyed in Europe prior to the time of Charles V. Schiller maintains that none of the preceding Burgundian dukes had attempted to overthrow the existing constitutions of the territory or to suppress the freedom of the inhabitants. Motley, on the other hand, stressed that the territory of the Netherlands had often been the object of a tyrannical despot such as the Burgundian, Philip the Good. To explain this discrepancy, we can assume that Schiller probably did not consider the usurpations of the Burgundians because they were less flagrant than those committed by Charles V and his son Philip II. Motley admits that the Burgundian Philip the Good granted "especial privileges," but called them, "grants of monopoly, not concessions of rights." (Ibid., p. 57) The tendency of his government was "to repress the spirit of liberty." (Ibid., p. 56) Disregarding the question of freedom, Schiller and Motley agree that the Burgundian princes conceded that their wealth was a result of the prosperity of the territory and citizens.
But the reign of Charles V brought about a transition and a darker era in the history of the Netherlands. Schiller writes: "Jetzt waren sie einem Herrn zugefallen, dem andre Werkzeuge und andere Hilfsquellen zu Gebote standen, der eine fremde Macht gegen sie bewaffnen konnte." (Ibid., p. 36)

The Netherlands were determined initially that Charles should respect their rights and freedoms. He was recognized as an absolute monarch in his Spanish dominion, but in the Netherlands he was "nichts als der erste Bürger." (Ibid., p. 37)

But the more Charles tasted the pleasures of unlimited power, the higher he raised his opinion of his own greatness, and "desto ungerne musste er hier zu der bescheidenen Menschheit heruntersteigen, desto mehr musste er gereizt werden, dieses Hindernis zu besiegen." (Ibid., p. 38) This superior attitude of Charles awakened a distrust among the people which, Schiller says, always accompanies a feeling of inferiority. (Ibid., p. 18)

He adds:

"Nie waren sie für ihre Verfassung empfindlicher, nie zweifelhafter über die Rechte des Souveräns, nie vorsichtiger in ihren Verhandlungen gewesen. Wir finden unter seiner Regierung die gewaltätigsten Ausbrüche des republikanischen Geists und die Anmassungen der Nation oft bis zum Missbrauch getrieben, welches die Fortschritte der königlichen Gewalt mit einem Schein von Rechtmäßigkeit schmückte." (Ibid., p. 38)
However, in spite of their conciliatory efforts, the Netherlands slowly came to realize that they were but a mere province in Charles's kingdom, deprived of their natural rights. Charles quickly organized the former local governmental officials into a large constitutional body for the purpose of carrying out his various aims. Every facet of the provincial government was organized to advance his power. He demanded that he be master of his empire and saw to it that his ignoble wishes were carried out. The high court at Malines, originally established with independent jurisdiction, was subjected to his decrees and made a mere organ of his will. He brought in foreigners, whose only support was royal favor, for the most important governmental positions. Charles did not hesitate to wage war whenever he desired to bring a new territory into his empire.

To support this militant policy, large financial resources had to be found. Taxes on new domains proved to be the most profitable source. New and ignominious taxes were imposed upon the people of the Netherlands, a violation of their most sacred right. "Die ganze Regierungsgeschichte dieses Monarchen in den Niederlanden ist beinahe nur ein fortlaufendes Verzeichnis eingeforderter, verweigerter und endlich doch bewilligter Steuern." (Ibid., p. 40) He maintained foreign troops on Dutch soil, also in direct violation of the Dutch constitution and, equally flagrantly, he recruited men in certain of the provinces.
for his army. The terrible subjugation of Ghent, ordered by Charles, announced to the other provinces that, indeed, their territorial constitution was now severely altered for the sole purpose of expediting Charles's autocracy. Charles realized that the favorable trade advantages in the provinces were the strength of the nation, "und ihres Handels grundfeste Freiheit." Because of this strength and the fact that he wanted to exploit the provinces to the fullest, he made certain concessions to their demands for liberty. He attempted in certain cases to adapt his despotic principles to the exigencies which existed in the provinces. For this reason Schiller considers Charles a greater politician and a shrewder manipulator of men than Philip, yet only moderately less tyrannical.

Schiller and Motley believed that constitutional rights foster happy individuals and communities. They were angered by the fact that a nation could be deprived of these rights. This was no doubt a large factor in their attraction to this period of history. Schiller notes that men who have been exposed to an enlightened environment and who have enjoyed the pleasures of free society, "werden sich schwerer als andere in die blinde Herrschaft eines dumpfen despotischen Glaubens ergeben und sich früher als andre wieder davon emporrichten." (Ibid., p. 41)
It is natural that Schiller turns to a discussion of the Roman Catholic Church, since the Dutch revolt centered around religious freedom. He insists there were definite and unique circumstances responsible for the diffusing of the Catholic religion throughout the world. Italy, the great seat of intellectual culture and Catholicism, accepted this religion unequivocally. He contends that this form of religion, because of its pomp and splendor, appealed to the romantic Italian sensibilities. On the other hand, the Dutch who prided themselves on common sense and a factual approach to reality, "einem solchen Volke wird sich ein Glaube empfehlen, der weniger auf Mystik als auf Sittenlehre dringt, weniger angeschaut als begriffen werden kann." (Ibid., p. 42) Schiller expresses it precisely in these words, "Die katholische Religion wird im ganzen mehr für ein Kunstlervolk, die protestantische mehr für ein Kaufmannsvolk taugen." (Ibid., p. 42) Schiller concludes that for these reasons the new doctrines of Luther found a congenial soil in the Netherlands.

Like Motley, Schiller was contemptuous of the evil practice of certain members of the clergy. Referring to the Netherlands, he said, "In einem Lande, endlich, wo Arbeitsamkeit die gerühmteste Tugend, Bettelei das verachtlichste Laster war, musste ein Orden des Müßiggangs, der Mönchstand, lange anstössig gewesen sein." (Ibid., p. 43)
In general, the new religion received a warm welcome in the Netherlands with an ever-increasing number of converts. Charles, however, defied the new religion and took the position, "die ein Despot nicht verfehlen kann, setzte dem zunehmenden Strome der Neuerung die nachdrücklichsten Mittel entgegen." (Ibid., p. 43) He was temporarily successful in his endeavor. Although justice was not on the side of Calvinism, freedom could not be suppressed forever, for it was destined to overflow the banks to which it had been channeled. "Der wieder auflebende Geist der Freiheit und der Prüfung, der doch nur in den Grenzen der Religionsfragen hätte verharren sollen, untersuchte jetzt auch die Rechte der Könige." (Ibid., p. 43)

Schiller had previously cited Charles for his political wisdom in attempting to adapt his methods to certain Dutch principles. Yet, when it came to the question of religious freedom, Charles steadfastly refused to grant any concessions to the Netherlands. All religious meetings or discussions were forbidden under the threat of severe penalties. A man convicted of spreading heretical doctrines could be sentenced to death. Courts were established to enforce all edicts. Schiller gives this picture: "So musste die Religion dem Despotismus die Hand führen, Freiheiten, die dem weltlichen Arm unverletzlich waren, mit heiligem Griff ohne Gefahr und Widerspruch anzutasten." (Ibid., p. 45)
In spite of Charles's severe edicts, the new religion continued to flourish. Hundreds joined the Protestant ranks daily. Charles realized that other measures would have to be enforced if the Catholic Church was to remain supreme in the Netherlands. The Inquisition, as practiced for hundreds of years in Europe, seemed a definite solution. Commercial business in Antwerp came to a standstill when word spread of its possible introduction and merchants of every nationality prepared to flee the city. Commercial affairs became so curtailed that the city appeared destined for economic ruin, until Charles agreed in part to give up this cruel resolve. In reality, however, the Inquisition was introduced by Charles at this time. The only real attempt to disguise it was made in the title of the Inquisitor, who functioned under the name "geistlicher Richter." In order to maintain commerce in Antwerp, Charles forbade any interference or persecution of foreign merchants there. But luck was not with the other provinces, for "dieses Tribunal fuhr fort, mit dem unmenschlichen Despotismus zu wüten, der ihm eigentümlich ist." (Ibid., p. 46) Schiller estimates that fifty thousand people lost their lives at the hand of the executioner during the reign of Charles V.

It has been shown previously that the primary fighting in the Dutch rebellion occurred under the reign of Philip II, the
son of Charles. Schiller points to the seemingly surprising fact that the rebellion did not break out earlier and in greater fury during the reign of Charles, in view of the excessive outrages committed by him. Schiller attributes this to Charles's powerful position in Europe. He was responsible for raising commercial prosperity in the Netherlands to even greater heights than it had already achieved. It was through his influence that the Netherlands were able to obtain favorable commercial treaties with other nations and to overcome the long dominance of the Hansa towns. Spain, Italy, and Germany were now all parts of Charles's empire which opened up ready-made markets for Dutch products. Even more important than these commercial advantages, he united six of the provinces with certain hereditary states in Burgundy, thus establishing the political entity of this territory. On another occasion, he settled a war between two provinces which eventually produced for that area a new era of prosperity. For these reasons, Schiller calls Charles "ein Wohltäter dieser Völker." (Ibid., p. 47)

In addition, Charles's impressive victories dazzled the eyes of many admiring citizens and those who were opposed to him, were awed by his apparent invincibility. Thus Schiller did not refuse to recognize the beneficial aspects of Charles's reign in spite of the many atrocities. We recall that Motley, too, cites the genius and affability of Peter the Great, yet considered him a cruel despot.
In order to maintain strict control of his subjects, Charles made frequent visits to the various states of his empire. He saw to it that his courts were quick and severe in their sentences, which assured a continued state of anxiety among the citizens.

Charles was born in the Netherlands and professed a love for the little nation he subjected to his tyranny. He found Dutch manners to his liking and prided himself on mixing with the citizens. He spoke Dutch fluently and observed many of their customs in his private life. Again, Schiller recognizes his diplomatic genius.

"Diese kleinen Kunstgriffe gewannen ihm ihre Liebe, und während dass seine Armeen ihre Saatfelder niedertraten, seine räuberischen Hände in ihrem Eigentume wühlten, während dass seine Statthalter pressten, seine Nachrichten schlachteten, versicherte er sich ihrer Herzen durch eine freundliche Miene." (Ibid., p. 48)

Schiller concludes his chapter on Charles with a description of his abdication at Brussels. This occasion marked the official transfer of the throne from Charles to his son Philip II. Schiller quotes in part from Charles's address and describes the scene of Philip kneeling before his father to receive his paternal blessings: "Seine Augen waren feucht zum letztenmal. Es weinte alles, was herum stand. Es war eine unvergessliche Stunde." (Ibid., p. 50) Just as Motley was unmoved by the
emotionalism of this ceremony, Schiller, too, expresses his contempt for this "ruhrende Gaukelspiel."

Let us now turn to Motley's portrayal of this infamous emperor. The reader is first introduced to Charles at his court during the historical period of the chastisement of Ghent. Charles is seated on the throne, surrounded by his many princes. At their feet, the prominent senators and citizens of Ghent have been forced to kneel in humiliation.

What distressed these men most, Motley says, "was to have the laster on their necks, which they found hard to bear, and if they had not been compelled, they would have rather died than submit to it." (Ibid., p. 82) Motley dramatically describes Charles's struggling with apparently mixed emotions as he considers a pardon for these dishonored citizens. The queen, too, plays her part in the spectacle. Turning to him "with all reverence, honor, and humility, she begged that he would concede forgiveness, in honor of his nativity, which had occurred in that city." (Ibid., p. 82) Motley pictures Charles replying with feigned benignity "that in consequence of his 'fraternal love for her, by reason of his being a gentle and virtuous prince, who preferred mercy to the rigor of justice, and in view of their repentance, he would accord his pardon to the citizens."

(Ibid., p. 82)
Just as Schiller delights in describing the ceremony at the abdication of Charles, Motley, too, offers a dramatic description of this event. He first takes the reader on a romantic tour of Brussels as well as the adjoining fields, gardens, and forests. Returning to the ceremony, Motley recalls Charles's love of spectacle and its influence upon the masses. He credits Charles with the ability to plan such exhibitions "in a striking and artistic style." (Ibid., p. 119)

In this respect, he recalls the chastisement of Ghent: "We have seen the theatrical and imposing manner in which he quelled the insurrection at Ghent and nearly crushed the life forever out of that vigorous and turbulent little commonwealth." (Ibid., pp. 119-120)

Motley next sketches a full-length picture of Charles. As a youth, he had been a strong, well-proportioned athlete, adept in all sports. But now these pleasing characteristics had vanished. He is pictured as a crippled and prematurely aged man of fifty-five, forced to support himself on a crutch with the aid of an attendant. His face left much to be desired and "time had not improved his physiognomy." (Ibid., p. 128) Motley recalls his Burgundian inheritance, "The lower part of his face was famous for its deformity. The under lip...was heavy and hanging; the lower jaw protruding so far beyond the upper that it was impossible for him to bring together the few fragments
of teeth which still remained, or to speak a whole sentence in an intelligible voice." (Ibid., p. 128) Eating and talking, of both which Charles had always been fond, had become more and more difficult.

Like Schiller, Motley quotes from Charles's farewell address. Supported by his crutch and the arm of William of Orange, he reviewed rapidly the progress of events from his youth up to the present day. He pointed with pride to his nine expeditions to Germany, six to Spain, seven to Italy, four to France, ten to the Netherlands, and two to England. He sketched some of his wars and subsequent victories, assuring those present that the welfare of his subjects and the security of the Roman Catholic religion had always been his only concern. He regretted that his health was ebbing away and that he could no longer lead his people, but assured them that Philip was a capable leader and a man whom he hoped would conduct himself with regard for the rights of his subjects. "Posterity would applaud his abdication, should his son prove worthy of his bounty; and that could only be by living in the fear of God, and by maintaining law, justice, and the Catholic religion in all their purity, as the true foundation of the realm." (Ibid., p. 134) He concluded his address by begging his subjects to forgive him of his transgressions and assured them that he would never forget their obedience and affection. He then
stated that he was placing the remainder of his life in the hands of God. Motley tells of the aroused sensibilities of the audience, already excited and softened by the impressive character of the ceremony. "The abdicating emperor was looked upon as a hero", and "the stage was drowned in tears." (Ibid., p. 138)

With the orations and ceremony terminated, Motley regards the "drama" as a success. Unlike the crowd, however, he refuses to accept the predominant sentiments which prevailed there as, "heroic self-sacrifice, touching confidence, ingenuous love of duty, patriotism, paternal affection...filial reverence, with a solemn regard for public duty and the highest interests of the people." (Ibid., p. 137-138) Thus Charles was successful in his endeavor to create a spectacle which would play on the emotions of the crowd. However, Motley reflects gravely on the emotions aroused in the impressionable minds of the audience and attempts to comprehend how the inhabitants of the Netherlands could forget Charles's policy of "unmitigated oppression." He asks:

"What to them were all these forty voyages by sea and land, these journeyings back and forth from Friesland to Tunis, from Madrid to Vienna? What was it to them that the imperial shuttle was thus industriously flying to and fro? The fabric wrought was but the daily growing grandeur and splendor of his imperial house; the looms were kept moving at the expense of their hardly earned treasure, and the wool was often dyed red
in the blood of his bravest subjects. The interests of the Netherlands had never been even a secondary consideration with their master. He had fulfilled no duty toward them, he had committed the gravest crimes against them. He had regarded them merely as a treasure upon which to draw, while the sums which he extorted were spent upon ceaseless and senseless wars, which were of no more interest to them than if they had been waged in another planet." (Ibid., p. 139)

Of the five million in gold Florins which Charles derived from his empire, two million came from the Dutch provinces while only an half a million came from Spain. "Yet the artisans, the farmers, and the merchants by whom these riches were produced were consulted about as much in the expenditure of the imposts upon their industry as were the savages of America as to the distribution of the mineral treasures of their soil." (Ibid., p. 140) Not only did he drain their wealth, but he was also in constant conflict "with their ancient and dearly bought political liberties." (Ibid., p. 141) Motley offers the city of Tournay as an illustration: "He destroyed its liberties without a tolerable pretext, and reduced it to the condition of a Spanish or Italian provincial town." (Ibid., p. 142) This case was only one of many which could be cited, "if it were not a superfluous task to prove that Charles was not only a political despot, but most arbitrary and cruel in the exercise of his despotism." (Ibid., p. 142)

Motley stresses that Charles's crimes against the Netherlands were more than just financial and political oppression. He finds
It strange that a man who had committed such dark crimes should even have been allowed to give a farewell address. "History will not forget that it was his hand that planted the Inquisition in the Netherlands." (Ibid., p. 142)

Motley estimates the number of Netherlanders that lost their lives at the hands of Charles to be as many as one hundred thousand and no less than fifty thousand. He calls the Inquisition "the gift of Charles to the Netherlands, in return for their wasted treasure and their constant obedience." (Ibid., p. 143) He asserts that Charles's name, "deserves to be handed down to eternal infamy, not only throughout the Netherlands, but in every land where a single heart beats for political or religious freedom." (Ibid., p. 143)

Motley shows that even the Catholic religion suffered at the hands of Charles. His only concern was for himself and the continuance of his empire. Motley recalls: "The man whose armies sacked Rome, who laid his sacrilegious hands on Christ's vicegerent and kept the infallible head of the Church a prisoner to serve his own political ends..." (Ibid., p. 144) Charles believed in nothing but his own power. Religious reformers were only political heretics disguised in the dogma and tradition of the Church. He was determined to fight them until his death. Just as Schiller had cited Charles's political wisdom, Motley, too, considers Charles as "too shrewd a politician not to
recognize the connection between aspirations for religious
and for political freedom." But his hand was "ever ready
to crush both heresies in one." (Ibid., pp. 144-145)

Motley credits many factors as responsible for the popu­
larity of Charles. He attended mass daily, took confession,
and received the sacrament four times a year. He spoke German,
Spanish, Italian, and Flemish.

"He could be stately with Spaniards, familiar
with Flemings, witty with Italians. He could
strike down a bull in the ring like a matador
at Madrid... he could ride at the ring with
the Flemish nobles, hit the popinjay with
his cross bow among Antwerp artisans, or
drink beer and exchange rude jests with
the boors of Brabant." (Ibid., pp. 146-147)

But Motley does not accept these pleasing personal characteristics
as an accurate portrayal of Charles. "For virtues such as these,
his grave crimes against God and man, against religion and
charted and solemnly sworn rights, have been palliated, as if
oppression became more tolerable because the oppressor was an
accomplished linguist and a good marksman." (Ibid., p. 147)

Admitting that Charles was a brave soldier, Motley main­
tains that he despised everything that was good and for the
cause of liberty. Motley describes him as "false as water"
and willing to destroy anyone or anything that stood in his
way." (Ibid., p. 149) He was a despot by birth and inclination
and remained so all his life. Motley asserts that Charles knew
men and recognized in them their weaknesses. He knew how much
they would tolerate and that small grievances could often incense them more than specific and deliberate injustices. He employed local citizens in many of the subordinate positions in the provinces, for he believed "that men might be tyrannized more intelligently by their own kindred." (Ibid., p. 152)

Motley calls Charles's career a "failure" for, in reality, he did not succeed in most of his projects. The Protestant faith grew in spite of his efforts. At the time of his abdication he was a disappointed and sick man. Forty years of gluttony had reduced him to infirmity. Motley closes the section devoted to Charles with the statement that these many loathsome characteristics "compose a spectacle less attractive to the imagination than the ancient portrait of the cloistered Charles. (Ibid., p. 165)

Historians generally are in agreement that Charles was a noble and heroic figure; a man of great strength and humility. Edward Armstrong's Emperor Charles V, the standard biography, is for the most part favorable in its judgment. William Robertson in his The History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles the Fifth recognizes Charles for his contributions to the welfare of mankind. Charles MacLaurin in his Post-Mortems of Mere Mortals calls Charles V the greatest man between Charlemagne and Napoleon. Yet, it is significant that Motley has chosen to portray Charles from Schiller's point of view: the tyrannical despot, rather than as the munificent sovereign.
CHAPTER VII

PHILIP II

This chapter will study the life and general character of Philip II as depicted by Schiller and Motley. Each regards him as one of the most odious personages in the annals of European freedom, a cruel tyrant who brought untold hardships to the cause of liberty in the Netherlands.

Schiller considers Philip in many respects the direct opposite of his father, Charles V. He understood little of human nature and possessed none of Charles's faculties for inspiring his subjects. His somber personality prevented him from ever developing this ability. He was, however, as ambitious as Charles, but cared even less for the rights of men, for "hatte er sich ein Ideal von der königlichen Herrschaft entworfen, welches Menschen nur als dienstbare Organe der Willkür behandelt und durch jede Äußerung der Freiheit beleidigt wird." (Ibid., p. 48) He spoke only Spanish and retained only Spaniards as associates. He received a strict ecclesiastical education which developed a gloomy exterior formality which he never lost. Schiller refers to the Dutch "fröhliche Mutwille" as being incompatible with Philip's temperament. He believes that Charles V erred in bringing Philip to the Netherlands, for the
Dutch might have tolerated his son's rule if he had remained in Spain and placed the country in the hands of capable subordinates. But the impression Philip first made in the Netherlands revealed to the citizens "den verderblichen Anschlag gegen ihre Freiheit..., den er schon damals in seiner Brust auf und niedерwälzte." (Ibid., p. 49) They realized his evil purpose and resolved to resist him.

Schiller quotes in part from the oath which was administered to Philip at the time of his ascension. Philip vowed to be a good and just ruler and to maintain the privileges and liberties of the towns and subjects as well as their customs and rights. Schiller notes the fact that distrust of Philip was already visible in the formula of the oath which was more explicit in its terms than that that had been administered to Charles. Charles had not been required to swear to the preservation of Dutch customs and rights. The Dutch had mistakenly assumed he would. Schiller also calls attention to the oath which the Dutch states took to Philip as a sign of the mistrust in the future justice of the new sovereign. They promised no other obedience than that which was consistent with the rights of the country. The last clause of their oath of allegiance designated Philip as "nur der natürliche, der geborne Fürst, nicht Souverän oder Herr." (Ibid., p. 51)

Schiller notes that Philip assumed the throne of the Netherlands in the brightest period of their prosperity. He was the first prince to unite all of the provinces under one separate
The nation enjoyed a period of unparalleled splendor and abundance. The Dutch were regarded as people of happy temperament, possessing emotions tempered by moderation.

"Ein ruhigeres Blut, durch einen strengeren Himmel gekältet, lässt die Leidenschaften hier weniger stürmen; Gleichmut, Massigkeit und ausdauernde Geduld, Geschenke dieser nördlicheren Zone; Redlichkeit, Gerechtigkeit und Glaube, die notwendigen Tugenden seines Gewerbes; und seiner Freiheit liebe Früchte, Wahrheit, Wohlwollen und patriotischer Stolz, spielen hier in sanfteren Mischungen mit menschlichern Lastern. Kein Volk auf Erden wird leichter beherrscht durch einen verständigen Fürsten, und keines schwerer durch einen Gaukler oder Tyrannen."

(Schiller, p. 52)

Schiller probes into the character of Philip in order to gain a better understanding of his tyrannical behavior. "Freude und Wohlwollen fehlten in diesem Gemüte." (Ibid., p. 55) He was consumed by only two matters, "sein Ich, und was über diesem Ich war." (Ibid., p. 55) He was a devout Catholic. God was the only being whom he feared because he was the only being whom he had to fear. Unlike most mortals to whom God acts as consoler, Philip saw God as an image of fear, a check on his human omnipotence. He tried to be both king and Christian but was poorly suited for each. "Egoismus und Religion sind der Inhalt und die Überschrift seines ganzen Lebens." (Ibid., p. 55)

Philip was almost thirty when he ascended the Spanish throne. His youthful pride had always suffered under the superior genius of his father. Charles had permitted him only limited participa-
tion in the affairs of state prior to his abdication. This fact served to ignite a fierce longing in Philip's heart for unlimited power. Schiller remarks, however, that when he assumed this unlimited power, it soon lost much of its charm.

Schiller compares Philip's position on the purpose of religion with that of Charles. The latter embraced religion because religion promoted his own goals. He put to death thousands under the banner of the Roman Catholic Church. At the same time, he ridiculed the very doctrines for which he was sacrificing countless humans. Philip, as we have seen, placed his faith in religion. Because of his religious conscience, he sometimes refused to commit atrocities which Charles would have done without hesitation. When one considers Philip's countless crimes against humanity, this fact seems indeed a paradox. "Der Kaiser war Barbar aus Berechnung, sein Sohn aus Empfindung. Der erste war ein starker und aufgeklärter Geist, aber vielleicht ein desto schlimmerer Mensch; der zweite war ein beschränkter und schwacher Kopf, aber er war gerechter." (Ibid., p. 56)

In this history Schiller examines briefly his conception of the role of religion in life. He stresses that religion finds both hope and fear in the hearts of men and makes itself mistress of both. Thus it is possible that religion can direct the will of man and transform millions of independent beings into a single stereotype. Liberty then ceases to play a role
in these lives. Under these circumstances, a ruler can easily
direct every move of the citizenry. He calls uniformity the
common aim of despotism and "Priestertum." Schiller concludes
that Philip's primary aim, as a despot, was the establishment
of this "Einiformigkeit" in both religion and law.

Schiller credits the Roman Catholic Church with providing
the main support of royal power. Both factions attempted to
triumph through the ignorance and weakness of men. "Der bürgerliche Druck macht die Religion notwendiger und teurer; blinde Ergebung in Tyrannengewalt bereitet die Gemüter zu einem blinden, bequemen Glauben, und mit Wucher erstattet dem Despotismus die Hierarchie seine Dienste wieder." (Ibid., p. 54)
Throughout the provinces, bishops and prelates were ardent sup­porters of Philip and of the crown and were ready to sacrifice the welfare of the citizens to the temporal advancement of the Church as well as to the political interests of the sovereign.

Schiller points out that Charles turned over to Philip a
state of limited monarchy, but in reality the constitutional
limitations placed on Philip were scarcely observed, for the
crown continued to exert its transcendent supremacy over the spirit of liberty. Re-enforcing the power of Philip and adding to the woes of liberty, many impoverished Dutch nobles who had held powerful positions prior to Charles, now courted Philip on behalf of their own selfish interests. Schiller depicts this era as:

Schiller devotes a chapter to "Das Inquisitionsgericht," in which he develops the cruel tyrannical devices of Philip. Once firmly established in the Netherlands, Philip turned his complete attention to the job of "Glaubensreinigung" which "die Furcht seiner niederländischen Untertanen wahr machte." (Ibid., p. 59)
The ordinances and edicts against heretics which his father had instituted were renewed with force. He appointed tribunals which were so unjust and merciless that only the name Inquisition was lacking from their titles. Still Philip did not consider any of these measures completely successful until he could transplant the true Spanish Inquisition to the Netherlands, "weil sie ihm das geschickteste Werkzeug zu sein schien, den Geist dieses Volks zu verderben und für eine despotische Regierung zuzubereiten."

(Ibid., p. 64) Schiller discusses the history of the Inquisition in Europe and particularly its role in the Netherlands. Charles's diluted version of the Inquisition, as practiced in the Netherlands, had been more humane than that in Spain. He recalls Charles's ap-
pointment of the first Inquisitor in Brabant and the fact that the people of Antwerp were successful in resisting the Inquisition in their city because of their large tax contributions. Philip strengthened gradually the existing ordinances against heresy and extended the power of the Inquisitors making their fiendish proceedings devoid of any civil jurisdiction. Only a few months were required for Philip to make the Dutch version of the Inquisition as brutal as that of the Spanish.

Schiller expresses no surprise that such intolerable tribunals goaded the Dutch to revolt. The terror which it inspired was intensified by the Spanish troops maintained in the country. Whereas Charles had been forgiven for their introduction, "Jetzt erblickte man in diesen Truppen nur die fürchterlichen Zurüstungen der Unterdrückung und die Werkzeuge einer verhassten Hierarchie." (Ibid., p. 66) The corrupt behavior of these Spanish troops whose pay was long in arrear and who indemnified themselves at the expense of the citizens completed the exasperation and despair of the population. Many inhabitants preferred to abandon their native country rather than submit to the wanton brutality of Philip's troops. Although he insisted that these troops were retained for the protection of the citizens, their true purpose was to give weight to his edicts and to support additional innovations which he planned to make in the constitution. "Sie waren ihm gleichsam die Gewährsmänner der allgemeinen Ruhe und
Philip's decision to retain troops in the Netherlands met with great discontentment. The Dutch provinces protested violently and insisted that there were more than adequate native garrisons to provide for national security. In order to lull their fears and to appease this general discontent among the populace, Philip offered the chief command of these troops to two favorite Dutch sons, the Princes of Orange and Egmont. Both, however, declined the offer with the statement that they could not serve in a position which was contrary to the best interest of their country. In reality, this offer was not made in good faith for Philip intended to keep the troops under his personal control and have the two princes act only as figureheads. Philip eventually agreed to remove these troops within a period of four months, but eighteen months were required before the last company departed for Spain.

Philip also violated the Dutch constitution by appointing Spaniards and other foreigners to important political positions. Certain Spanish factions had been successful in persuading Philip that his power in the Netherlands would never be firmly established until Spaniards held the most influential positions. The Bishop of Arras was the first to be forced upon the Flemings. Philip announced the appointment of Feria, a Castilian, to a seat in the council of state. This attempt met with bolder resistance from William of Orange and the provinces than Philip had expected,
"und seine despotische Allmacht scheiterte diesmal" (Ibid., p. 69)

In summation, Schiller rejected the historically accepted picture of a benevolent Philip as painted later by such historians as William Prescott. As a tyrant, Philip obstructed the course of freedom in the Netherlands. He believed that the spirit of liberty had to be vanquished, but it refused to die.

Motley's historical commentary on Philip opens with an introduction to the period just prior to Philip's initial arrival in the Netherlands. The provinces, as a whole, had arranged extensive and elaborate preparations in honor of their king's arrival. In Antwerp alone, twenty-eight elaborate triumphal arches were erected. We read:

"The rich and prosperous city, unconscious of the doom which awaited it in the future, seemed to have covered itself with garlands to honor the approach of its master. Yet icy was the deportment with which Philip received these demonstrations of affection, and haughty the glance with which he looked down upon these exhibitions of civic hilarity, as from the height of a grim and inaccessible tower." (Ibid., p. 170)

Like Schiller, Motley records the unfavorable impression that Philip first made on the Dutch. He offers this quick preview of his reign. "His many projects were to meet with futility." (Ibid., p. 173) Motley, too, contrasts Philip with his father's more appealing qualities of which he, Philip, possessed none. Motley describes Philip's lack of personal appeal in this way:
"He was disagreeable to the Italians, detestable to the Flemings, odious to the Germans." (Ibid., p. 174) Let us use Motley's own words in the contrast of father and son. He writes:

"Charles sought great enterprises; Philip would avoid them. The emperor never recoiled before threats; the son was reserved, cautious, suspicious of all men, and capable of sacrificing a realm from hesitation and timidity. The father had a genius for action, the son a predilection for repose. Charles took "all men's opinions, but reserved his judgment," and acted on it, when matured, with irresistible energy; Philip was led by others, was vacillating in forming decisions, and irresolute in executing them when formed."

(Ibid., pp. 176-177)

We recall that Schiller and Motley delight in descriptions of leading figures and make this an integral part of their historical presentations. This passage portraying Philip is a noteworthy example of Motley's technique. We read:

"The world, in his opinion, was to move upon protocols and apostils. Events had no right to be born throughout his dominions without a preparatory course of his obstetrical pedantry. He could never learn that the earth would not rest on its axis while he wrote a program of the way it was to turn. He was slow in deciding, slower in communicating his decisions. He was prolix with his pen, not from affluence, but from paucity of ideas. He took refuge in a cloud of words, sometimes to conceal his meaning, oftener to conceal the absence of any meaning, thus mystifying not only others, but himself...He was entirely a Spaniard. The Burgundian and Austrian elements of his blood seemed to have evaporated, and his veins were filled alone with the ancient ardor which in heroic centuries had animated the Gothic champions of Spain. The fierce enthusiasm
for the cross, which in the long internal warfare against the crescent had been the romantic and distinguishing feature of the national character, had degenerated into bigotry...He was by birth, education, and character a Spaniard, and that so exclusively that the circumstance would alone have made him unfit to govern a country so totally different in habits and national sentiments from his native land. He was more a foreigner in Brussels, even, than in England. The gay, babbling, energetic, noisy life of Flanders and Brabant was detestable to him. The loquacity of the Netherlands was a continual reproach upon his taciturnity." (Ibid., pp. 178-179)

Motley delves into other facets of Philip's personal habits and character and like Schiller, pictures them in an unfavorable light. He, too, recalls that Philip was strict in religious observances and attended mass and vespers regularly. On the other hand, he was "grossly licentious." His favorite pastime was "to issue forth at night disguised, that he might indulge in vulgar and miscellaneous incontinence in the common haunts of vice. This was his solace at Brussels in the midst of the gravest affairs of state." (Ibid., p. 181) He was not, however, a parsimonious individual and reportedly distributed alms to the poor in the streets of Brussels during a cold winter night. Motley reminds the reader that Philip was not considered by the world at that time to be cruel by nature. He was often described as a "clement, benign, and debonair" prince. (Ibid., p. 182) But Motley adds "Time was to show the justice of his claims to such honorable epithets." (Ibid., p. 182)
Philip hated charters or constitutions which interfered with any of his ideas. He put into effect two powerful instruments which facilitated the destruction of human rights: the courts of Mechlin and the Inquisition.

"The civil tribunal was to annihilate all diversities in their laws by a general cassation of their constitutions and the ecclesiastical court was to burn out all differences in their religious faith. Between two such millstones it was thought that the Netherlands might be crushed into uniformity." (Ibid., p. 193)

One of the earliest measures of Philip's reign against heresy was to re-enact the dreaded edict of 1550 which he did on the express advice of the Bishop of Arras. As Charles was the original author of this edict, Motley admits that it could be argued that Philip introduced nothing new, but wonders at the same time whether one can consider "burning, hanging, and drowning for religious differences a part of the national institutions..." (Ibid., p. 193)

The revolt in the Netherlands was only a part of the wars and military skirmishes which were taking place in Europe at that time and were to occur in the near future. France, the perennial enemy of the Spanish Empire, became involved in war with Philip in the summer of 1557. The battle of St. Quentin was one of the most notorious sieges of that war. Philip's army assaulted the town for weeks, yet achieved only token success. Against the advice of his generals, Philip refused
to advance to Paris until the town was totally decimated. Philip's numerical superiority was eventually successful against the courageous French defenders led by Colligny. However, the pernicious aftermath which Philip sanctioned was sheer depravity. Human beings were "butchered" in almost every house. For the most part, however, women were not violated, but were stripped of their clothes to prevent the concealment of valuables. Many of these women were slashed in the face with knives; partly in sport, and partly in punishment for concealing treasures.

"The soldiers even cut off the arms of many among these wretched women, and then turned them loose, maimed and naked, into the blazing streets... The streets were already strewn with the corpses of the butchered garrison and citizens, while the survivors were now burned in their houses. Human heads, limbs, and trunks were mingled among the bricks and rafters..." (Ibid., p. 231)

No effort was made to extinguish the fires which had been burning for days.

"The work of killing, plundering, and burning lasted nearly three days and nights. The streets, meanwhile, were encumbered with heaps of corpses, not a single one which had been buried since the capture of the town. The remains of nearly all the able-bodied male population, dismembered, gnawed by dogs, or blackened by fire, polluted the mid-summer air." (Ibid., p. 231)
The women had been driven into the cathedral and remained there throughout the siege. On August 29th, Philip issued an order that they should be driven out of the city and into French territory. Philip intended that not a single French person was to remain another hour in the town. The men had already been silenced. More than three thousand women were now forced to leave the cathedral and the city.

"Some were in a starving condition; others had been desperately wounded; all, as they passed through the ruined streets of what had been their home, were compelled to tread upon the unburied remains of their fathers, husbands, or brethren...and thus the ghastly procession of more than three thousand women, many with gaping wounds in the face, many with their arms cut off and festering, of all ranks and ages, some numbering more than ninety years, bare-headed, with gray hair streaming upon their shoulders,others with nursing infants in their arms, all escorted by a company of heavy-armed troopers, left forever their native city." (Ibid., p. 232)

Philip's interest in the Netherlands began to wane. One might conclude, as Schiller did, that the novelty of being an autocrat had worn thin in a country that refused to submit to his despotic methods. He had spent four years trying to bend the strong will of the freedom-loving Dutch, but, for the most part, without success. In addition, he was now more "involved" in other European affairs which required his presence elsewhere.

Philip planned to annex St. Quentin and make it part of the Flemish provinces since it had belonged to them seventy years earlier.
He felt confident that he could leave the territory in the hands of his illegitimate sister, Margaret of Parma, and with his supervision from Spain could continue to drain the citizens of desperately needed revenue. Thus his decision was made.

On August, 7th 1559, Philip convened the Estates of the provinces in Ghent to give a farewell address. However, he was unwilling or unable to give the address himself and delegated the reading of it to the Bishop of Arras. In the words of this Bishop, Philip lamented that he could no longer remain in his beloved provinces, for there were many factors which compelled his departure. Philip recalled that his father Charles V had come to the Netherlands "for the good of the country" and never returned to Spain except to die. In his case, he felt that Spain particularly needed his presence now. He reflected upon his conduct during his reign in the Netherlands and maintained that he had been solely motivated by his intense love for the citizens. The money he had received from them had only been spent for their protection and welfare. He did not fail, however, to express his hopes that the Estates would favorably consider his current "request" for three millions in gold Florin, all of which of course would be expended for the good of the provinces. Philip announced the selection of Margaret as regent of the Netherlands and recalled her Dutch birth and deep affection for the Dutch provinces. Philip ex-
pressed confidence that she would act always in their best interests. Motley believes that Philip no doubt hoped that her first and only concern would be for Spain. Motley attacks Philip's discourse for not mentioning such vital questions as the removal of Spanish troops, and the reduction of taxes. To the chagrin of the citizens, Philip announced instead a new tax levy. Although the nation secretly rejoiced at the departure of Philip, his absence in reality offered little new hope to the movement of freedom in the Netherlands.

In this manner Philip's residence in the Netherlands came to an end. But many arduous years would pass before his oppression would be lifted. Philip continues to play a leading role in both Motley's *The Rise of the Netherlands* and the *History of the Dutch Republic*. It would be superfluous to this study to elaborate more extensively on Motley's characterization of Philip II. As we have seen, his historical depiction of Philip reveals that he shares Schiller's estimate of him. Both historians regarded Charles as a contemptible despot, and together they voice the same castigation of Philip.
CHAPTER VIII

PRINCE WILLIAM OF ORANGE

As didactical historians, Schiller and Motley select William of Orange as their personal hero in the Dutch rebellion. This esteemed and beloved leader of the Dutch patriots is contrasted with the reprehensible and hated Philip II. Schiller and Motley take pleasure in vividly portraying diametrically opposite characters. This equally balanced contrast was a part of their historical method - evil on one side, good on the other.

Philip's primary concern, prior to his departure from the Netherlands, was the selection of a suitable leader to fill the position of Oberstatthalter. Schiller stresses the significance of this position because of its almost unlimited power. It was, therefore, vital to the crown that they secure a person who would carry out "...die gewagten Anschläge der Regierung auf die Freiheit des Landes..." (Ibid., p. 70) The feeling among the people in the provinces was equally divided between Egmont and Orange. "Beide hatte ein glänzender Rang zunächst an den Thron gestellt." With this decision still unsettled, Schiller introduces the reader to William of Orange.

Schiller recalls William's noble lineage and, the fact, that his ancestors had been prominent European nobles for eight cen-
turies. The land holdings of the House of Orange were extensive both in the Netherlands and in France. William grew up a precocious child whose capabilities soon came to the attention of Charles V. The emperor honored him by selecting him to complete his education at the court. Although his earlier religious instruction had been under Protestant supervision, he was now educated as a Catholic. William remained at Charles's court for nine years, during which time Charles "ehrte ihn durch ein Vertrauen welches über seine Jahre ging." (Ibid., p. 72) Charles confessed openly, "dass dieser junge Mensch ihm öfters Anschläge gebe, die seiner eignen Klugheit würden entgangen sein." (Ibid., p. 72) Schiller recalls that William was twenty-three at the time of Charles's abdication. In preference to the nobles in his court, Charles entrusted William with the task of presenting the Imperial crown to his brother Ferdinand. On another occasion, Charles made him a military commander, against the recommendations of his military council who felt that William was too young and inexperienced. "Abwesend und von niemand empfohlen, zog ihn der Monarch der lorbeervollen Schar seiner Helden vor, und der Ausgang liess ihn seine Wahl nicht bereuen." (Ibid., p. 72)

Schiller discusses the image of William as seen through the eyes of Philip. The very fact that William had received such marked favor with Charles was, in itself, sufficient grounds to incur Philip's distrust. He recognized William's
attractive personal characteristics and resented them. In William, Philip was forced to deal with a man who was opposed to his policy of oppression, and at the same time "dem bei einer guten Sache auch die Hilfsmittel der schlimmen zu Gebote standen." (Ibid., p. 75) This last condition establishes, "warum er unter allen gleichzeitigen Sterblichen diesen am unversöhnlichsten hasste und so unnatürlich fürchtete." Added to Philip’s distrust for William, there remained the question of William's religious bias. Philip was of the opinion that William had not lost his ardor for Protestantism. Although William, in fact, was later converted to the faith of the Calvinists, Schiller feels assured that whatever church he may have preferred at a certain period of his life, no other possessed him at that time more completely. He adds: "Gegen die spanische Tyrannie verteidigte er mehr die Menschenrechte der Protestanten als ihre Meinungen; nicht ihr Glaube, ihre Leiden hatten ihn zu ihrem Bruder gemacht."

We recall that Schiller and Motley delight in brilliant graphic portraits of individuals, presented with a poetic flair. Let us compare examples of this technique in their descriptions of William the Silent.

"Wilhelm von Oranien gehörte zu den hagern und blassen Menschen, wie Cäsar sie nennt, die des Nachts nicht schlafen und zu viel denken, vor denen das furchtloseste aller Gemüter gewankt hat. Die stille Ruhe eines immer gleichen Ge- sichts verbarg eine geschäftige, feurige Seele,
die auch die Hülle, hinter welcher sie schuf, nicht bewegte und der List und der Liebe gleich umbetretbar war; einen vielfachen, fruchtbaren, nie er müdenden Geist, welch und bildsam genug, augenblicklich in alle Formen zu schmelzen; bewahrt genug, jeden Glückwechsel zu ertragen. Menschen zu durchschauen und Herzen zu gewinnen, war kein grösserer Meister als Wilhelm; nicht dass er, nach der Weise des Hofs, seine Lippen eine Knechtschaft bekennen liess, die das stolze Herz Lügen strafte, sondern weil er mit den Merkmalen seiner Gunst und Verehrung weder karg noch verschwenderisch war und durch eine kluge Wirtschaft mit demjenigen, wodurch man Menschen verbindet, seinen wirklich Vorrat an diesen Mitteln vermehrte. So langsam sein Geist gebar, so vollendet waren seine Früchte; so spät sein Entschluss reifte, so standhaft und unerschütterlich ward er vollstreckt. Den Plan, dem er einmal als dem ersten gehuldigt hatte, konnte kein Widerstand er müd, keine Zufälle zerstören, denn alle hatten, noch ehe sie wirklich eintraten, vor seiner Seele gestanden. So sehr sein Gemüt ü ber Schrecken und Freude erhaben war, so unterworfen war es der Furcht; aber seine Furcht war früher als die Gefahr, und er war ruhig im Tumult, weil er in der Ruhe gezittert hatte. Wilhelm zerstreute sein Gold mit Verschwendung, aber er geizte mit Sekunden. Die Stunde der Tafel war seine einzige Feierstunde, aber diese gehörte seinem Herzen auch ganz, seiner Familie und der Freundschaft; ein bescheidener Abzug, den er dem Vaterland machte." (Ibid., p. 73)

Motley offers this portrait:

"Yet we are not to regard William of Orange... by the light diffused from a somewhat later period. In no historical character more remarkable than in his is the law of constant development and progress illustrated. At twenty-six he is not the pater patriae sic, the great man struggling upward and onward against a host of enemies and obstacles almost beyond human strength, and along the dark and dangerous path leading through conflict, privation, and ceaseless labor to no repose but death... He was still
among the primrose paths. He was rich, powerful, of sovereign rank. He had only the germs within him of what was thereafter to expand into moral and intellectual greatness...His enemies never contested the subtlety and breadth of his intellect, his adroitness and capacity in conducting state affairs, his knowledge of human nature, and the profoundness of his views. In many respects it must be confessed that his surname of "the Silent," like many similar appellations, was a misnomer. William of Orange was neither "silent" nor "taciturn," yet these are the epithets which will be forever associated with the name of a man who, in private, was the most affable, cheerful, and delightful of companions, and who on a thousand great public occasions was to prove himself both by pen and by speech, the most eloquent man of his age. His mental accomplishments were considerable..."

(Ibid., p. 296)

Schiller recalls the delightful and luxurious hospitality offered by William and the House of Orange to princes and ambassadors which "machten seinen Wohnsitz einem souveränen Fürstenhofe gleich." (Ibid., p. 74) Although some citizens censured William for his apparent submissiveness to royal authority, the extravagance of his estate only secured the affections of the people "dem nichts mehr schmeichelt, als die Schätze des Vaterlands vor Fremdlingen ausgestellt zu sehen..." (Ibid., p. 74)

Schiller believes that there was no more capable man to direct the Dutch revolt than William. Schiller gives this penetrating depiction. He writes:

"Ein durchdringender fester Blick in die vergangene Zeit, die Gegenwart und die Zukunft, schnelle Besitznehmung der Gelegenheit, eine Obergewalt über alle Geister, ungeheure Entwürfe, die nur dem weit entlegenen Betrachter Gestalt und Ebenmass zeigen, kühne Berechnungen,
die an der langen Kette der Zukunft hinunter
spinnen, standen unter der Aufsicht einer er-
leuchteten und freieren Tugend, die mit festem
Tritt auch auf der Grenze noch wandelt."
(Ibid., p. 74)

Schiller discusses the virtues of Egmont and his outstanding
qualifications for the position of Oberstatthalter, which will be
taken up in the next chapter. He points out that the selecting
of a final choice between two such deserving candidates might
have embarrassed most men. But in the case of Philip, the fact
remained, that he never considered seriously either candidate.
"Eben die Vorzüge, mit welchen sie ihr Recht darauf unterstützten,
waren es, was sie ausschloss; und gerade durch diese feurigen Wün-
sche der Nation für ihre Erhebung hatten sie ihre Ansprüche auf
diesen Posten unwiderruflich verwirkt." (Ibid., p. 73) Philip had
no intention of placing a popular man in this position, a man who
could command the good will and actions of the citizens. Being an
ambitious leader, William was disappointed in not gaining the re-
gency. This, however, did not deprive him of his continued influ-
ence with the people of the Netherlands. After it became apparent
to him that he would not be Philip's choice, he devised a naive
plan which he hoped would place him in a controlling position with
the office of regency. One of the prominent candidates for the
regency was Duchess Christina of Lorraine, an aunt of Philip and
a principal mediator in the peace of Chateau-Cambray. William
sought the hand of the Duchess's daughter in marriage, feeling
that by combining her territory with that of the House of Orange, would result in strengthening the Duchess's position in her bid for the regency. Apparently, William was still not aware of Philip's personal enmity for him. The Duchess's bid was denied, however, on grounds that her territories were too dependent on the whims of France. Schiller, however, recognizes the real reasons for her rejection, "Weil sie dem niederländischen Volk und dem Prinzen von Oranien willkommen war." (Ibid., p. 79) Margaret of Parma was Philip's eventual choice for the regency of the Netherlands.

With Philip's departure for Spain, the State Council or Parliament in the Netherlands recovered much of its lost power. Its position was to assist Margaret in the administration of state affairs. The leading figure in this body was William of Orange. In addition to this position, Philip appointed him governor of the combined provinces of Holland, Zealand, Utrecht and West Friesland which gave him supreme command of the military forces of these provinces as well as supervision of the civil and judicial branches of the government.

It may seem surprising that Philip would consent to have either William or Egmont serve in any official governmental capacity. Schiller explains it thus: "So tief schon damals der Hass gegen die beiden und gegen den letztern besonders, bei ihm Wurzel gefasst hatte, so gab er ihnen jedoch diese
The personal estates of William and Egmont were exempted from taxes, and one also notes that the wealthiest provinces were placed under their control. "Aber zu eben der Zeit, wo er den Prinzen durch diese öffentlichen Beweise seiner Achtung verpflichtete, wusste er ihn in geheim desto empfindlicher zu verwunden." (Ibid., pp. 86-87)

Philip was apprehensive that William's marriage into the House of Lorraine would result in a powerful alliance against him. In order to circumvent this possible conspiracy, he interceded in the pending marriage and prevented the union to which Schiller adds, "Eine Krankung, welche der Prinz ihm niemals vergessen hat." (Ibid., p. 87)

Philip never ceased to maintain his violent hatred for William, to the point that he even allowed it to affect his normally cold demeanor. On the occasion of his departure from the Netherlands, Philip verbally assaulted William in the presence of a group of nobles. He accused him of being the subversive and agitating source of his political problems in Flanders. Unperturbed by this denunciation, William replied calmly that the reaction in these provinces was instigated by their own leaders and with good cause. Philip could scarcely control his emotions and seized William's hand and shook it violently saying,
"nicht die Staaten, sondern Sie! Sie! Sie!" (Ibid., p. 57)

William was now stunned by this violent rebuke and was unable to utter a rebuttal. Without waiting for Philip's departure, he wished him a safe voyage and promptly departed. Schiller summarizes William's personal animosity for Philip and its subsequent results.

"So machte Privathass die Erbitterung endlich unheilbar, welche Wilhelm gegen den Unterdrücker eines freien Volks längst schon im Busen trug, und diese doppelte Aufforderung brachte zuletzt das grosse Unternehmen zur Reife, das der spanischen Krone sieben ihrer edelsten Steine ent-rissen hat." (Ibid., p. 57)

The problems in the Netherlands remained a constant thorn in Philip's side. Margaret of Parma had been unsuccessful in directing Philip's plans to eradicate Protestantism from Dutch soil. Meanwhile, Egmont returned from Spain with the joyous news that Philip had decided to relax his policies of oppression. For a brief moment, there appeared to be new hope for the spirit of freedom in the Netherlands. Unfortunately, however, this news was quickly contradicted by the announcement of even stricter edicts against heretics. The dreaded Spanish Inquisition was to be reactivated with new severity. This announcement resulted in complete pandemonium in the Netherlands.

Terrified by the rumors of violence which were being circulated, Margaret summoned the councilors of state to request
their advice on the course of action in this crisis. Vigilius, the aged president of the assembly, insisted that these edicts could not be put into force, because the people would not stand for it, and believed that Philip should be apprised of this fact. At that moment, to the complete astonishment of the assembly, William of Orange arose and opposed this popular motion. He said, "Der Wille des Königs sei zu klar und zu bestimmt vorge- tragen, sei durch zu viele Deliberationen befestigt, als dass man es noch weiterhin wagen könnte, mit seiner Vollstreckung zurückzuhalten, ohne den Vorwurf der sträflichsten Halsstarrig- keit auf sich zu laden." (Ibid., p. 152) The regent Margaret as well as the members of the assembly could scarcely believe what they had heard. William was reversing his former position against Spanish tyranny by insisting on the promulgation of the royal edicts. Although Margaret was first inclined to consider the proposal of Vigilius, she now felt reassured in making her decision in favor of William's proposal. In this way, she could continue to support the policies of Philip with the official support of the most popular and influential man in the Nether- lands. But Schiller offers this preview of the eventual fate of royal power in the Netherlands:

"Die Folgen ihres unglücklichen Gehorsams werden in die Augen leuchten...Diese Sitzung machte der Ruhe der Oberstatthalterin ein Ende; von diesem Tage an zählen die Nieder- lande alle Stürme, die ohne Unterbrechung von nun an in ihrem Innern gewütet haben." (Ibid., p. 154)
This brings the researcher to a possible explanation of William's motives in this declaration. For what reasons did he sanction the renewed enforcement of Philip's edicts? Schiller discusses at length the historical verdict of William's motives. Because of this declaration, he was attacked by those who maintained that, by taking this position, William had proved both his dishonesty and disloyalty. Historians who attack William recall that he had unequivocally opposed Philip's policies of oppression up to that time by both word and deed. Now for the first time he sought to enforce them. They maintain that this act was both treacherous and disloyal to Philip and the Netherlands, in that it was not done in good faith. In reality, he hoped that enforcing these edicts, would lead to the final destruction of Philip's oppression in the Netherlands but, in doing so, he would sacrifice the lives of thousands of Netherlanders. Thus these adversaries conclude, "dass das Beste seines Volks weniger Gewalt über ihn hat als sein schlimmer Wille gegen den König. Um seinen Hass gegen diesen zu befriedigen, kommt es ihm nicht darauf an, jene mit aufzuopfern." (Ibid., p. 155) But Schiller questions whether one can call the promulgation of these edicts as a sacrifice of the nation. Schiller admits that it was likely that these edicts would be frustrated when put into force. The state of ferment and tension which existed in the Netherlands was reason enough to expect uncontrollable opposition to these new
edicts. But Schiller takes William's aspirations one degree higher by insisting that he, William, believed that violent resistance on the part of the Dutch to these new measures, would force Philip to rescind them. Schiller substantiates this belief by quoting William himself:

"Jetzt hat meine Nation die nötige Schwungkraft, um mit Glück gegen die Tyrannen zu kämpfen. Versäume ich diesen Zeitpunkt, so wird diese letztere Mittel finden, durch geheime Negotiationen und Ränke zu erschleichen, was ihr durch offene Gewalt misslang." (Ibid., p. 155)

Schiller contends, therefore, that with regard to Philip, William only changed his language, but as far as the people were concerned his conduct was perfectly consistent. "Und welche Pflichten kann er gegen den König haben, die von dem, was er der Republik schuldig ist, verschieden sind?" (Ibid., p. 155)

Schiller describes the universal spirit of revolt which pervaded the whole Dutch nation. Practically all provincial governors threatened to resign if forced to comply with the stipulations of the new edicts. The citizens of Brabant loudly protested and based their appeal for justice on the recognition of their original constitution, the "Great Privilege," instituted almost a hundred years earlier. They reminded Philip of his oath to observe their statutes and of the conditions under which they had sworn their allegiance to him. Many of the other provinces protested personally to the regent. Again, she was forced to summon her council to seek advice which, this time,
she heeded. She declared that the new edicts must be interpreted in accordance with the former statutes of the provinces. Moderation was to be the prime consideration. But the Dutch were no longer in the mood to wait for the execution of promises. Before Margaret was able to take any definite steps, the citizens had reacted. All financial support for the Inquisition was withdrawn and its powers rendered almost void. Unrest flared up in every province. Still no actual fighting had broken out. In Antwerp a placard was set up in several places calling upon the town council to file accusation against Philip in the supreme court at Speyer for having broken his oath of allegiance by violating the liberties of the country. Thus the pen became a powerful weapon during this tumultuous period. "Man streut freie gefährliche Schriften ins Publikum, die die spanische Tyrannen mit den gehässigsten Farben malen, die Nation an ihre Privilegien und gelegenheitlich sic auch an ihre Kräfte erinnern." (Ibid., p. 160)

But Philip refused to alter his position. He prepared to wage war, if necessary, against those provinces which refused to support his policies. This announcement served only to increase the already intense hatred for Philip.

This was the distressing state of affairs which faced Margaret. To complicate matters even worse, she lost the support of the person who was, at that moment, practically indispensable
to her. She received a letter from William of Orange in which he outlined his intentions:

"Ohne einen Bürgerkrieg zu entzünden, sei es jetzt schlechthin unmöglich, den Befehlen des Königs nachzukommen. Würde aber dennoch darauf bestanden, so müsse er sie bitten, seine Stelle mit einem andern zu besetzen, der den Absichten Sr. Majestät mehr entspräche und mehr als er über die Gemüter der Nation vermöchte. Der Eifer, den er bei jeder andern Gelegenheit im Dienst der Krone bewiesen, werde, wie er hoffe, seinen jetzigen Schritt vor jeder schlimmen Auslegung sicherstellen; denn so, wie nunmehr die Sachen stünden, bleibe ihm keine andre Wahl, als entweder dem König ungebührsam zu sein oder seinem Vaterland und sich selbst zum Nachteil zu handeln." (Ibid., p. 161)

William resigned his position from the Council of State and returned to Breda, the town of his birth. His intention was to act only as an observer of Dutch affairs and not to take an active part in its tribulations. William's retirement left the regent without a trusted mind to whom she could turn for advice. Schiller exalts William at the expense of Margaret with the words, "Die Entfernung des Prinzen von Oranien, dem die Not sowohl als sein überlegener Verstand allen den Einfluss auf die Regentin gegeben, der grossen Geistern bei kleinen Seelen nicht entstehen kann..." (Ibid., p. 161) However, William's "retirement" was short lived.

Schiller discusses the growing discontentment among the nobles at the conditions in their country. For the most part, these aristocrats had passively favored Philip and the crown in spite of the fact, that he did nothing to encourage their sentiments. His
insufferable policies finally succeeded in alienating their affections. They realized that, in order to be an effective force against the crown, they would have to unite. This group did act as a unifying force in the growing resistance movement. Schiller points to the political crisis in the Netherlands at that time as being totally conducive to a revolution. He says:

"Ein Weib am Ruder des Staats; die Provinzstatthalter verdrossen und zur Nachsicht geneigt; einige Staatsräte ganz ausser Wirksamkeit; keine Armee in den Provinzen; die wenigen Truppen schon längst über die zurückgehaltene Zahlung schwierig und zu oft schon durch falsche Versprechungen betrogen, um sich durch neue locken zu lassen; diese Truppen noch ausserdem von Offizieren angeführt, welche die Inquisition von Herzen verachteten und errötet haben würden, nur das Schwert für sie zu heben..." (Ibid., pp. 166-167)

Margaret was eventually able to persuade William to reassume his position in the Council of State with the hope that he would be able to dissuade the citizens from further acts of violence. William's efforts, however, met with little success.

Like Motley, Schiller discusses the formation of the "Gueux" and their later role in securing liberty for the Netherlands. He pictures the mobs of degenerates called Der Bildersturm, as leaving an undistinguished mark on the patriots' efforts and aspirations for freedom. Their ignoble acts of destruction and desecration were abhorred by William. It was only through his efforts that many churches and ancient religious artifacts were saved from the
onslaught of these fanatics. William acted also as a leading force in securing severe punitive measures for these culprits. With conditions such as these, the eruption of hostilities was inevitable, and the nation was soon thrown into a long series of sieges in which both forces suffered staggering losses. Still William refused to lead the patriots or to take part in their revolts. He felt that his duty was to effect a reconciliation between the two warring factions and to secure specific concessions for freedom in the Netherlands.

At this time, a great number of state officials had become disloyal to the crown and proved a constant source of torment to Margaret. She resolved to have an oath of allegiance administered to all appointed state officials in which they would swear, among other things, to advance the Catholic faith and to extirpate heresy. The purpose of this oath was not, in reality, to guarantee the sincerity of these officials or to secure their continued services, but "er sollte ihr zu einem rechtlichen Vorwände dienen, die Verdächtigen zu entfernen, ihnen eine Gewalt, die sie missbrauchen konnten, aus den Händen zu winden, wenn sie sich weigerten, ihn zu schwören, und sie zur Strafe zu ziehen, wenn sie ihn brächen." (Ibid., p. 272)

The Prince of Orange refused to take this oath, a circumstance which served to arouse again the suspicions of Philip. "Eine sehr niederschlagende Erfahrung hatte ihn gelehrt, wie
unsicher die Hoffnungen sind, die man gezwungen ist auf den
grossen Haufen zu grunden, und wie bald dieser vielversprechende
Eifer dahin ist, wenn Taten von ihm gefordert werden." (Ibid.,
p. 274) The Duke of Alba, William's detested enemy, was already
advancing towards the Netherlands with a large army. William
realized the immediate fate of the country. The only possible
salvation lay in raising an army to prevent the Duke's entry
into the territory. But there were neither funds nor unity
among the Protestants to effect this solution. William pre­
sented his resignation to Margaret and departed for his home
in Breda, eventually settling in Germany, accompanied by several
hundred loyal followers who desired to share his voluntary exile.
Because Schiller's history is only fragmentary, William's exit
marks his final appearance in this work. Schiller offers these
final words of eulogy:

"Die Nation sah ihren guten Engel mit ihm
weichen; viele hatten ihn angebetet, alle
hatten ihn verehrt. Mit ihm sank der Pro­
testanten letzte Stütze; dennoch hofften
sie von diesem entflohenen Manne mehr als
von allen mit einander, die zurückgeblieben
waren. Die Katholiken selbst sahen ihn nicht
ohne Schmerz entweichen. Auch für sie hatte
er sich der Tyrannei entgegengestellt, nicht
selten hatte er sie gegen ihre eigene Kirche
in Schutz genommen; viele unter ihnen hatte
er dem blutdurstigen Eifer der Sekten ent­
rissen." (Ibid., pp. 281-282)

Motley, too, proceeds to develop the noble lineage of William
of Orange and his rise to prominence in the court of Charles V.
Like Schiller, he recalls the incident in which King Henry of France inadvertently revealed to William a plot against the Protestants, not realizing that "he had given warning of inestimable value to the man who had been born to resist the machinations of Philip and Alba." (Ibid., p. 293) This experience led to William's surname, "the Silent," because the manner in which he received this information did not reveal the terrible blunder the king had committed.

William always refused to co-operate in the persecution of Protestants. Motley recalls one occasion when Philip instructed William to have several persons put to death who were suspected of joining the new Church. William did not carry out this command, but, instead warned the suspects and urged them to flee, "thinking it more necessary to obey God than man." (Ibid., p. 295)

Like Schiller, Motley recalls that William originally had little sympathy for the religious reformation of which he was later to be one of the "most distinguished champions." He outwardly observed the Catholic faith, but only to the extent necessary for a person of such high rank. Basically, however, he did not occupy himself with theology. "His determination to protect a multitude of his harmless inferiors from horrible deaths did not proceed from sympathy with their religious sentiments, but merely from a generous and manly detestation of murder." (Ibid., p. 297) Motley concludes that if his early life with Protestant
parents had planted the germ of his future conversion to Protestantism, it indeed, remained dormant a long time.

Like Schiller, Motley recalls the luxurious courtly life that William enjoyed and the cordial and regal hospitality he offered to all guests. He says:

"Twenty-four noblemen and eighteen pages of gentle birth officiated regularly in his family...The reputation of his table remained undiminished for years...In this hospitable mansion the feasting continued night and day. From early morning till[sic]noon, the breakfast-tables were spread with wines and luxurious viands in constant succession, to all comers and at every moment. The dinner and supper were daily banquets for a multitude of guests. The highest nobles were not those alone who were entertained. Men of lower degree were welcomed with a charming hospitality which made them feel themselves at their ease. Contemporaries of all parties unite in eulogizing the winning address and gentle manners of the prince. "'Never,'" says a most bitter Catholic historian, "'did an arrogant or indiscreet word fall from his lips.'" (Ibid., pp. 297-298)

William possessed a manner toward people that was familiar, yet never beyond the limits of propriety. "He had the good breeding which comes from the heart, refined into an inexpressible charm from his constant intercourse, almost from his cradle, with mankind of all ranks." (Ibid., pp. 298-299)

Historians like Johannes Renier and Ruth Putnam do not portray William of Orange with the same esteem and respect as Schiller and Motley do. Motley recalls the fact, that many persons were of the opinion that William was, in regard to his military
conduct, "of a timid temperament." He was even accused of cowardice in the battle of Philippeville for attempting to flee the fortress there. Motley answers this charge with the statement that, if it were true, he was only one of many historical figures "originally of an excitable and even timorous physical organization, whom moral courage and a strong will have afterward converted into dauntless heroes." (Ibid., pp. 301-302) Motley insists that William always acted with caution in everything he undertook and calls this "one of the chief sources of his greatness." (Ibid., p. 302)

Motley reviews the provisions of the Edicts of 1550, which were re-enacted by Philip at the express advice of Cardinal Granvelle, and does not neglect to mention the additional edicts and bishoprics which Philip instituted in the years 1560-1561. (Ibid., pp. 320-324) William of Orange was the principal crusader who staunchly resisted these tyrannical barbarisms of Philip. He could not tolerate persecutions of any sort and continually made his beliefs known to Philip, Margaret of Parma, and Granvelle. Although he was successful in the removal of some Spanish garrisons from Dutch soil, he could do little to mitigate the horrendous practices of Granvelle.

Motley focuses attention on William's relationship with Granvelle, which underwent a transformation from friendship to open hostility. Referring to the Cardinal, Motley wrote,
"He found himself confronted by an intellect as subtle, an experience as fertile in expediencies, a temper as even, and a disposition sometimes as haughty as his own." (Ibid., p. 347)

Granvelle never underestimated William's capabilities and called him a man "of profound genius, vast ambition - dangerous, acute, politic." (Ibid., p. 347) But their principles were irreconcilable, and the final breach between the two was inevitable.

Motley, too, discusses the intrigue associated with the announcement of marriage of William to the daughter of the Duchess of Lorraine. Although some historians have attributed the dissolution of this affair to the fact that the princess could never bring herself to love William, Schiller and Motley trace the break up to the clandestine machinations of Philip and Cardinal Granvelle.

"The king, in consequence, secretly instructed the Duchess of Lorraine to decline the proposal, while, at the same time, he continued openly to advocate the connection." (Ibid., p. 363)

The next encounter in Motley's history, The Rise of the Dutch Republic, with William of Orange occurs in the year 1564, shortly after he resumed his position in the State Council. Again Motley depicts him as laboring for the restoration of political justice and freedom for the Netherlands. Most of his efforts were thwarted by the complete internal corruption of the provincial government. Philip's highest officials had become "the most mercenary hucksters who ever converted the divine temple of justice into a den
of thieves. Law was an article of merchandise sold by judges to the highest bidder.\(^1\) Throughout all of this corruption, William stood out as the one man who refused to take advantage of any situation which would benefit him financially. Even Cardinal Granvelle cited his honesty. William was, however, denounced for being overly ambitious in his attempt to concentrate all the powers of government into the State Council, making it the omnipotent force in the country. It was contended that William's aim was to gain control of this body, thus assuring himself of the most powerful position in the Netherlands. Although William is criticized by some historians for such practices, Motley defends him in this manner, "No doubt the prince was ambitious. Birth, wealth, genius, and virtue could not have been bestowed in such eminent degree on any man without carrying with them the determination to assert their value." (Ibid., p. 82) Motley also concedes that William was inclined to political machinations and intrigues, which was "a blemish upon the purity of his moral nature." (Ibid., p. 158) Still, the important thing was, that "he had mastered...the nobles purposes to which a great and good man can devote his life - the protection of the liberty and the religion of a whole people against foreign tyranny." (Ibid., p. 209)

\(^1\)Motley, The Rise of the Dutch Republic, Vol. II, p. 81. All quotations by Motley in this chapter, unless otherwise stated, are from this same volume.
In July, 1566 conditions in Antwerp had become so critical, that both the inhabitants of the city and the regent requested William to attempt to mediate the differences between the two factions. His arrival in Antwerp was greeted with wild enthusiasm. Thirty thousand people turned out to welcome him. Motley gives this picture of William's first encounter with the crowds:

"A discharge of pistol-shots was fired by way of salute, which was the signal for a deafening shout from the assembled multitude. The crowd thronged about the prince as he advanced, calling him their preserver, their father, their only hope." (Ibid., p. 206) On all sides were heard loud cries of "Long life to the beggars." This outburst was sharply rebuked by Orange, however, who did not approve of rebellious slogans. When the crowd realized that this type of conduct was distasteful to the prince, they dispersed, yet with a sense of relief "from impending danger in the presence of the man to whom they instinctively looked as their natural protector." (Ibid., p. 206) During the remainder of July and the early part of August, William worked diligently in an effort to prevent any further provocations. Motley points out that William's enemies view his conduct at this time as an attempt to appear loyal to the crown, but, in reality, he was "insidiously formenting the troubles which he appeared to rebuke." (Ibid., p. 208) Nevertheless, he was successful, for the moment, in preventing any further outbreaks. For his efforts, he
received letters of gratitude from the regent and even Philip himself. Motley regards this through the critical eyes of William and makes this comment:

"The prince read or listened to all this commendation, and valued it exactly at its proper worth. He knew it to be pure grimace. He was no more deceived by it than if he had read the letter sent by Margaret to Philip, a few weeks later, in which she expressed herself...that it was the intention of Orange to take advantage of the impending tumults for the purpose of conquering the provinces and of dividing the whole territory among himself and friends." (Ibid., p. 209)

Motley rejects this pronouncement with the words, "Nothing could be more utterly false than so vile and ridiculous a statement." (Ibid., p. 211) William's conduct was always exemplified by honesty. He worked for religious toleration during a period of universal dogmatism and tried to effect mutual respect among conflicting opinions, "when most reformers fiercely proclaimed, not liberty for every Christian doctrine, but only a new creed in place of all the rest..." (Ibid., p. 268) He believed that there was not just one path to salvation, but that there were several, depending on a man's beliefs. These were the "sins" for which William was attacked by his adversaries. Motley says, "If such sentiments and purposes were sins, they would have been ill exchanged for the best virtues of the age." (Ibid., p. 269)

Motley maintains, that it was only now that William first entertained treasonable thoughts.
"In the hearts of Philip and Margaret he already saw treachery and revenge indelibly imprinted... He was already convinced that the country was to be conquered by foreign mercenaries, and that his own life, with those of many other nobles, was to be sacrificed. The moment had arrived in which he was justified in looking about him for means of defense, both for himself and his country... The time was fast approaching in which a statesman placed upon such an elevation before the world as that which he occupied would be obliged to choose his part for life. To be the unscrupulous tool of tyranny, a rebel, or an exile, was his necessary fate... Moreover, he thought it doubtful, and events were most signally to justify his doubts, whether he could be accepted as the instrument of despotism, even were he inclined to prostitute himself to such service."

(Ibid., p. 287)

William believed that it was time to attempt "the protection of ancient and chartered liberties against a foreign oppressor."

(Ibid., p. 287)

He dispatched an envoy to Egmont informing him of his grave suspicions. He considered that Catholics as well as Protestants would be crushed in the invasion of the Netherlands by the Duke of Alba. William refused to remain in the Netherlands to witness this inevitable desolation unless something could be done to obviate the impending danger. If he could receive the cooperation of Egmont and Hoorn, as well as the consent of the States-General, William was willing to resist the armed invasion of Alba. Motley writes:
"To make use of his own influence and that of his friends, to interpose between a sovereign insane with bigotry and a people in a state of religious frenzy, to resist brutal violence if need should be by force, and to compel the sovereign to respect the charters which he had sworn to maintain, and which were far more ancient than his sovereignty - so much of treason did William of Orange already contemplate, for in no other way could he be loyal to his country and his own honor." (Ibid., p. 288)

The support William requested and required was denied to him. Egmont opposed the plan on the grounds, that "it was wrong to entertain any such ill opinion of so good a king as Philip, that he had never done unjust [sic] toward his subjects, and that, if any one was in fear, he had better leave the country." (Ibid., pp. 292-293) Hoorn, too, refused to join William, and without the support of these men, effective resistance against the invasion of Alba was out of the question. William now felt that Philip's purpose was inalterably fixed. Motley writes:

"He made no secret of his determination never to lend himself as an instrument for the contemplated subjugation of the people. He had repeatedly resigned all his offices. He was now determined that the resignation once for all should be accepted. If he used dissimulation, it was because Philip's deception permitted no man to be frank...It was his duty to save his country and his friends from impending ruin." (Ibid., pp. 298-299)

In this state of mind, William joined the irrascible noble Brederode, whose conduct and seditious actions he had heretofore denounced. Motley contends, however, that the explosive and violent actions of Brederode and the subsequent
outbreak of hostilities in Valenciennes could not have been prevented by Orange. William's efforts, on the whole, met with little success. Ironically, the regent Margaret again summoned him to assist her in quelling a new series of outbreaks. But this time, "The prince...was very ill disposed to come to her relief. An extreme disgust for the policy of the government already began to characterize his public language." (Ibid., p. 314) Like Schiller, Motley records the trying period between William's two resignations and his self-imposed exile to Germany. We recall that in Schiller's history this exile marks the final appearance of Orange.

Because of the scope of Motley's work, he continues to trace William's life through volumes III, IV, and V of The Rise of the Dutch Republic. William is depicted as the courageous, self-sacrificing individual who labors in the name of freedom to rid the Netherlands of Spanish tyranny. Volume V describes in detail the dark day - Tuesday, July 10th, 1584 - on which William fell at the hand of the assassin Gérard Balthazar, an individual whose only motive was to collect the reward offered by Philip II for William's death. Motley irrefutably places William among the greatest representatives of freedom in the history of the world. He adds:

"The life and labors of Orange had established the emancipated commonwealth upon a secure foundation, but his death rendered the union of all the Netherlands into one republic
Hopeless...So long as the prince remained alive, he was the father of the country..." (Ibid., p. 356)

Motley relates the dire consequences faced by the cause of liberty because of William's death. Antwerp, the center of the nationalistic movement, fell before the onslaught of Parma. The provinces of Holland and Zealand reverted to Spanish control. Motley regrets that Orange could not have lived twenty years longer, for then he alone could have rid the country of Spanish tyranny. Instead, two generations were required before Spain recognized the independence of the Netherlands. Although the death of Orange retarded the movement of liberty in the Netherlands, Motley metaphorically describes the history and future of Dutch liberty in this manner:

"The ancient rugged tree of Netherlands liberty, with its moss-grown trunk, gnarled branches, and deep-reaching roots, which had been slowly growing for ages, was full of sap, and was to deposit for centuries longer its annual rings of consolidated and concentric strength. Though lopped of some luxuriant boughs, it was sound at the core, and destined for a still larger life than even in the healthiest moments of its medieval existence." (Ibid., p. 362)

Motley presents a detailed physical description of William. He was a man of average height and build, with a small, symmetrically-shaped head, which combined "the alertness and compactness characteristic of the soldier with the capacious brow, furrowed prematurely with the horizontal lines of thought, denoting the statesman and the sage." (Ibid., p. 363)
Motley calls "resistance," the labor of William's life. "To exclude the Inquisition, to maintain the ancient liberties of his country, was the task he appointed to himself..." (Ibid., p. 364) His intellectual faculties were described as "various and of the highest order." (Ibid., p. 365) He was considered by many to be second to none as a military genius and authority. As a soldier, his virtues were "constancy in disaster, devotion to duty, hopefulness in defeat...He was therefore a conqueror in the loftiest sense, for he conquered liberty and a national existence for a whole people." (Ibid., p. 366) He never assumed the role of a follower in the action of his country, "but always led her in the path of duty and of honor...He never failed to administer ample chastisement to parsimony, to jealousy, to insubordination, to intolerance, to infidelity, wherever it was due..." (Ibid., p. 368) Because of his oral and written eloquence, he could exert great influence upon his people. He had a rare understanding of human character as well as a photographic mind "which never lost a face, a place, or an event, once seen or known. He read the minds, even the faces of men, like printed books." (Ibid., p. 370)

Motley recalls that William's adversaries found him false and governed only by selfish motives. But he defends William with the venerable words,
"But as far as can be judged by a careful observation of undisputed facts, and by a diligent collation of public and private documents, it would seem that no man - not even Washington - has ever been inspired by a purer patriotism." (Ibid., p. 373)

William always presented an even temperament and a cheerful countenance, even to the point, that he laughed off his wife's prophetic apprehension at the sight of his would-be assassin. Motley closes The Rise of the Dutch Republic with this final encomium:

"He went through life bearing the load of a people's sorrow upon his shoulders with a smiling face...The people were grateful and affectionate, for they trusted the character of their "Father William," and not all the clouds which calumny could collect ever dimmed to their eyes the radiance of that lofty mind to which they were accustomed, in their darkest calamities, to look for light. As long as he lived, he was the guiding star of a whole brave nation." (Ibid., p. 376)
Schiller reports that Egmont's ancestral lineage was no less
noble than that of William of Orange. He was a descendant of the
Dukes of Guelders and his marriage with the Duchess Sabrina of
Bavaria added luster to his name as well as combined two strong
noble families. Schiller recalls that Charles V had conferred
upon Egmont the order of the Golden Fleece, and that it was under
the banner of Charles that he received his first military experi­
ence, culminating in two brilliant victories at St. Quentin and
Gravelines. These two important conquests made him the hero of
the age. Whenever he appeared publicly, he was greeted by large
cheering crowds. "Jedes Auge, das auf ihn geheftet war, erzälte
sein Leben; in der Ruhmredigkeit seiner Kriegsgeführten lebten
seine Taten; ihren Kindern hatten ihn die Mütter bei ritterlichen
Spielen gezeigt." (Ibid., p. 77) He was admired for his affable
courteous manner and his many amiable and chivalric virtues.

After recognizing these aspects of Egmont's exploits and
character, Schiller examines what he considers as the unattractive
side of Egmont's career and personality. Schiller describes his
religious beliefs as "sanft und menschlich," yet not very en­
lightened, "weil sie von seinem Herzen und nicht von seinem Ver-
stande ihr Licht empfing." (Ibid., p. 77) He was motivated more by his conscience than by fixed principles. He did not develop his own insights and principles but simply accepted and lived by those of others. He considered men to be either completely good or bad. "Darum entschied bei ihm oft eine einzige gute Seite für den Mann." (Ibid., p. 77) Schiller credits Egmont with being a better military strategist than William, but far inferior to him as a statesman. William was a realist, whereas Egmont viewed the world "in dem magischen Spiegel einer verschönernden Phantasie." (Ibid., p. 77) Schiller compares Egmont with Julius Caesar, in respect that he achieved great success without ever stopping to analyze the true circumstances and source of his success. He blindly attributed it to some miraculous power in which he insanely placed his trust. Schiller describes it thus:

"Trunken von Verdiensten, welche die Dankbarkeit gegen ihn übertrieben hatte, taumelte er in diesem süßen Bewusstsein wie in einer lieblichen Träumwelt dahin. Er fürchtete nichts, weil er dem unsichern Pfand vertraute, das ihm das Schicksal in der allgemeinen Liebe gegeben, und glaubte an Gerechtigkeit, weil er glücklich war. Selbst die schrecklichste Erfahrung des spanischen Meineids konnte nachher diese Zuversicht nicht aus seiner Seele vertilgen, und auf dem Blutgeruste selbst war Hoffnung sein letztes Gefühl." (Ibid., p. 78)

Schiller remembers that William of Orange had broken with Philip and the crown because his tyrannical oppression was offensive to his pride. Egmont, on the other hand, was vain and valued the
favors of the monarch. William was a citizen, not only of the Netherlands, but of the world, whereas Egmont "ist nie mehr als ein Flämiger gewesen." (Ibid., p. 78)

Philip was indebted to Egmont for the brilliant military victories he achieved for Spain, and it appeared to most Dutch observers that the regency of the Netherlands was the only appropriate reward. From every standpoint, he was equally as qualified as Orange for this position. But, just as in the case with Orange, Philip had no intention of placing a man who commanded the respect and admiration of the people in such an important position. In Egmont's case there was the additional factor that he was a descendant of the House of Guelders, a hereditary foe of the Spanish empire. With these considerations, it was not surprising that Philip passed over both nobles in favor of Margaret of Parma. Schiller points out that Philip might have pretended that neither candidate could be selected in order not to offend the pride of either.

One recalls, however, that Philip did appoint both Egmont and William to the Council of State, whose primary task was to advise the regent and to attempt to intervene between the citizens and the royalists to the satisfaction of both. The latter project continually proved to be almost impossible. This parliamentary body proposed that an envoy be sent to Madrid in order to apprise Philip of the existing conditions in the Netherlands
and to prevail upon him to institute definite measures of reform. There was but one man to carry out this mission, Egmont. His appointment would be acceptable to both the Dutch and the crown. He could plausibly represent the Netherlands, because of his "erklärter Hass gegen die Inquisition, seine vaterländischen und freien Gesinnungen und die unbescholtene Rechtschaffenheit seines Charakters leisteten der Republik hinlängliche Bürgschaft für sein Betragen." (Ibid., p. 139) At the same time, he would be the most acceptable choice to Philip because of his obsequious attitude toward the crown.

In January, 1565 Egmont departed for Spain and was welcomed by the court "mit einer Güte und Achtung, die keinem seines Standes vor ihm widerfahren war." (Ibid., p. 146) The nobles in the Spanish court appeared to put aside their ancient distrust for Flemish nobility as they made every effort to gain his confidence and favor. Philip, too, extended him the warmest hospitality and assured him in the strongest terms of his love for his Dutch subjects. But Schiller gives this verdict: "Die verstellte Sanftmut des Königs und die Beteurungen eines Wohlwollens für die niederländische Nation, das er nicht empfand, hintergingen die Redlichkeit des Flamanders." (Ibid., p. 147) At the time of Egmont's departure, Philip presented him with a gift of fifty-thousand florins, benevolently requesting him to give part of it to his oldest daughter upon her marriage. Schiller and Motley
regard this act as an outright bribe.

Egmont departed from Madrid, joyful in the conviction that his mission had been successful and that Philip would soon make concessions to their demands. Scarcely had Egmont returned to the Netherlands, when severer edicts against heretics were announced. Philip maintained that he would rather lose a thousand lives than change one word of any edict. These announcements were accompanied with a transcript of the decrees of the Council of Trent which had been accepted in Spain and were to be carried out now in the Netherlands.

William's reaction against Egmont was violent. Schiller quotes Orange thus, "Der Graf ist durch spanische Kunst überlistet worden. Eigenliebe und Eitelkeit haben seinen Scharfsinn geblendet; über seinem eigenen Vorteil hat er das allgemeine Beste vergessen." (Ibid., p. 150) Again, Spanish treachery was exposed, a thing which aggravated the already existing indignation of the citizens. Schiller reports that no one felt more despondent than Egmont, who, for the first time, realized that he had been a tool of Spanish duplicity and unwittingly a betrayer of his country. Egmont lamented this with the words:

"Diese scheinbare Güte also war nichts als ein Kunstgriff, mich dem Spott meiner Mitbürger preiszugeben und meinen guten Namen zu Grund zu richten. Wenn der König die Versprechungen, die er mir in Spanien getan, auf eine solche Art zu halten gesonnen ist, so mag Flandern übernehmen, wer will; ich"
Schiller points out that Philip could not have executed a surer method of discrediting a man of such high rank than by making him a victim of Spanish delusion. It was this type of continued treachery that led to William's resignation from the Council of State.

In spite of the humilitating experience which Egmont suffered at the hands of Philip, he still vacillated "zwischen der Republik und dem Throne." He still believed that he could make the Dutch citizens obedient subjects. Schiller reproaches Egmont for taking advantage of William's retirement by gladly accepting the position of adviser to the regent. Referring to Margaret, Schiller says, William's retirement "hatte in ihr Vertrauen ein Lücke gerissen, von welcher Graf Egmont, vermöge eine Sympathie, die zwischen der feigen und gutherzigen Schwäche sehr leicht gestiftet wird, einen unumschränkten Besitz nahm." (Ibid., p. 161) For the royalists, Egmont was the perfect adviser for the regent, for he still retained the admiration and respect of the Dutch citizens and, at the same time would serve as a dupe for their schemes.

Like William, Egmont was appointed provincial governor and, to a large degree, endeavored to carry out the wishes of Philip. But he steadfastly refused to participate in the persecution of
heretics and protested against the severe punitive measures of the edicts. This breach of faith incurred the wrath of Granvelle, for which he never forgave Egmont. Yet he worked under the banner of the Spanish crown, insisting that the rebels should be severely punished and the Roman Catholic religion re-established wherever it was not being practiced. He maintained that Philip had only the best interest of the Dutch at heart. But Schiller accuses Egmont of deceit and self-deception. He writes:

"Egmont war dem König wirklich ergeben; das Andenken seiner Wohltaten und des verbindlichen Betragens, womit er sie begleitet hatte, lebte noch in seinem Gedächtnis. Die Aufmerksamkeiten, wodurch er ihn vor allen seinen Freunden ausgezeichnet, hatten ihre Wirkung nicht verfehlt. Mehr aus falscher Scham als aus Parteigeist hatte er gegen ihn die Sache seiner Landsleute verfochten; mehr aus Temperament und natürlicher Herzensgüte als aus geprüften Grundsätzen die harten Massregeln der Regierung bekämpft. Die Liebe der Nation, die ihn als ihren Abgott verehrte, riss seinen Ehregeiz hin. Zu eitel, einem Namen zu entsagen, der ihm so angenehm klang, hatte er doch etwas tun müssen..." (Ibid., p.247)

It soon became evident, however, that Egmont had outlived his usefulness to Philip. It was again William who tried to show Egmont the treachery in Philip's actions and to warn him that his life would soon be in great jeopardy. Schiller writes:

"Oraniens Warnung kam aus einer trübsinnigen verzagten Seele, und für Egmont lachte noch die Welt. Herauszutreten aus dem Schosse des Überflusses, des Wohlebens und der Pracht, worin er zum Jüngling und zum Manne geworden war, von allen den tausendfachen Gemächlich-
Egmont was adamant in the conviction that he would not look at the situation in the same gloomy light as William and ignored the latter's warning. He still insisted that his duty was to crush the rebels and restore peace and order in the provinces.

But this success was to be denied Egmont. In October 1567 he and Hoorn were arrested by the crown and charged with conspiring to overthrow Spanish authority in the Netherlands. Eight months later he was tried, found guilty and sentenced to die. A scaffold was erected in the market place where he was to be beheaded publicly and his head was to be placed upon a pole for everyone to see.

Up to the very end, Egmont seemed unable to convince himself that Philip was sincere in his order to take his life, and that this severity would be taken no further than the mere terror of the execution. Even in the final minute he inquired whether there was no hope of a pardon. The answer remained no. In this manner, the life of Count Lamoral Egmont came to an end on June 4, 1568.

Motley first introduces Egmont in his history just prior to the battle of St. Quentin, in which he was to achieve his great renown. He was thirty-six years old at the time and was considered in the prime of his career, which "was to be so soon and
so fatally overshadowed. Not one of the dark clouds which were in the future to accumulate around him had yet rolled above his horizon." (Ibid., p. 212) Like Schiller, Motley recalls his noble birth, wealth, valor, and physical attractiveness. (Ibid., pp. 213-215) After Egmont's brilliant victory at St. Quentin, his name was on the lips of every citizen throughout Philip's empire. He had distinguished himself personally for bravery and established a reputation as a shrewd military strategist. Again like Schiller, Motley takes up the inglorious side of Egmont's career and expresses almost the same censuring remarks. He writes:

"Eager for general admiration, he was at the same time haughty and presumptuous, attempting to combine the characters of an arrogant magnate and a popular chieftain. Terrible and sudden in his wrath, he was yet of inordinate vanity, and was easily led by those who understood his weakness. With a limited education, and a relating to the camp, he was destined to be as vacillating and incompetent as a statesman as he was prompt and fortunately audacious in the field. A splendid soldier, his evil stars had destined him to tread, as a politician, a dark and dangerous path, in which not even genius, caution, and integrity could insure success, but in which rashness alternating with hesitation, and credulity with violence, could not fail to bring ruin." (Ibid., p. 215)

Like Schiller, Motley discusses Egmont's appointment as special envoy to the Spanish court. He records Egmont's arrival at the palace and the fact that, he "was feasted and flattered by all the great dignitaries of the court as never a subject of
the Spanish crown had seen before."¹ Motley reports that Egmont was completely taken in by these pompous overtures and made practically no effort to carry out the instructions given him by the council of state and William of Orange. It was if he had forgotten the purpose of his trip. On the whole, there was little negotiation "between the monarch and the ambassador."

(Ibid., p. 110) Needless to say, Egmont completely failed to obtain any ameliorations for the Netherlands. On his departure, Egmont was instructed by Philip to report to the council of state that he, Philip, was determined not to permit any religious changes in his dominions and that the execution of heretics would not cease. Yet, in light of this information, "Egmont, who immediately after receiving these instructions set forth upon his return to the Netherlands, manifested nothing but satisfaction."

(Ibid., p. 113) Egmont assured the council that most of their demands would soon be met, although Philip had insisted that the existing religious edicts were to be enforced to the letter. Egmont avowed that he would devote his life and fortune to the accomplishments of the king's commands, "and declared his uncompromising hostility to all who should venture to oppose that loyal determination." (Ibid., p. 115) He again described Philip
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as "the most liberal and debonair of princes." (Ibid., p. 115)

Like Schiller, Motley reports that, in a very short time, new and more severe edicts were announced, thus shattering the peaceful illusion which Egmont had created. William and the Council of State were outraged at this Spanish treachery. Egmont, too, was beside himself with rage. "With his usual recklessness and wrath, he expressed himself at more than one session of the State Council..." (Ibid., p. 115) Motley gives this verdict;

"It must be confessed that he had been an easy dupe. He had been dazzled by royal smiles, intoxicated by court incense, contaminated by yet baser bribes. He had been turned from the path of honor and the companionship of the wise and noble to do the work of those who were to compass his destruction." (Ibid., p. 117)

William reproached him for not having represented the views of his associates and the best interests of his country, "while he had well remembered his own private objects and accepted the lavish bounty of the king." (Ibid., p. 117) Egmont was humiliated by this reproof from one whom he honored, and "became sad and somber for a long time, abstained from the court and from society, and expressed frequently the intention of retiring to his estates." (Ibid., p. 117)

Like Schiller, Motley records Egmont's appointment as provincial governor and his refusal to assist William in resisting the impending invasion by the Duke of Alba. Motley, too, recalls
William's final exhortation and warning to Egmont. He writes:

"He was anxious that his friend should prefer the privations of exile, with the chance of becoming the champion of a struggling country, to the wretched fate toward which his blind confidence was leading him. Even then it seemed possible that the brave soldier, who had been recently defiling his sword in the cause of tyranny, might become mindful of his brighter and earlier fame. Had Egmont been as true to his native land as, until "the long divorce of steel fell upon him," he was faithful to Philip, he might yet have earned brighter laurels... Was he doomed to fall, he might find a glorious death upon freedom's battlefield, in place of that darker departure then so near him, which the prophetic language of Orange depicted, but which he was too sanguine to fear." (Ibid., p. 357)

As we have seen, William's refusal to take the oath of allegiance and his subsequent retirement placed Egmont in the most influential position in the Netherlands next to Margaret of Parma. Egmont did not hesitate in taking the oath which William had refused and made himself the obsequious correspondent for Philip's orders. He received a congratulatory letter from Philip, commending him for taking the oath. He thanked him for the excellent manner in which he was doing his duty and the helpful assistance he was giving Margaret. But these words "were written by the royal hand which had already signed the death-warrant of the man to whom they were addressed." (Ibid., p. 360) Motley finds it incredible that Egmont fail to take heed of the almost daily warnings he received. "It is diffi-
cult to comprehend so very sanguine a temperament as that to which Egmont owed his destruction. It was not the Prince of Orange alone who had prophesied his doom. Warnings had come to the count from every quarter..." (Ibid., p. 395)

Egmont's and Hoorn's inevitable arrest ensued, as well as the belated trial of mockery. Motley describes the trial as a complete travesty of justice. He writes:

"Trial there was none. The tribunal was incompetent; the prisoners were without advocates; the government evidence was concealed; the testimony for the defense excluded...The case had been settled in Madrid long before the arrest of the prisoners in Brussels...The proceedings were a mockery, and so far as any effect upon public opinion was concerned, might as well have been omitted. Every constitutional and natural right was violated from first to last. This certainly was not a novelty..."1

There was no question about the injustice committed. Motley points out that, in reality, one could consider that Egmont was entitled to a special commendation instead of death because of his dedicated service to Philip. Like Schiller, Motley describes in detail Egmont's last hours and actual execution, as well as the fact that he believed to the end that a pardon was forthcoming. Motley paints this graphic picture:
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"Having ascended the scaffold, he walked across it twice or thrice. He was dressed in a tabard robe of red damask, over which was thrown a short black mantle embroidered in gold. He had a black silk hat, with black and white plumes on his head, and held a handkerchief in his hand... Sanguine to the last, he passionately asked Romero whether the sentence was really irrevocable, whether a pardon was not even then to be granted. The marshal shrugged his shoulders, murmuring a negative reply... The count rose again to his feet, laid aside his hat and handkerchief, knelt again upon the cushion, drew a little cap over his eyes, and folding his hands together, cried with a loud voice, "Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit." The executioner then suddenly appeared, and severed his head from his shoulders at a single blow."

(Mbid., p. 68)

Motley examines Egmont's life and calls him a great historical figure, "but not a great man." (Mbid., p. 73) He then reflects on Philip's stupidity for not converting Egmont into a highly useful tool for royal purposes. Philip had everything to gain through his association with Egmont and nothing to lose.

Motley judges Egmont with these final words:

"He had no sympathy with the people, but he loved, as a grand seignor, to be looked up to and admired by a gaping crowd. He was an unwavering Catholic, held sectaries in utter loathing, and, after the image-breaking, took a positive pleasure in hanging ministers, together with their congregations... Upon more than one occasion he pronounced his unequivocal approval of the infamous edicts, and he exerted himself at times to enforce them within his province... Upon the departure of Orange, Egmont was only too eager to be employed by Philip in any work which the monarch could find for him"
to do. Yet this was the man whom Philip chose, through the executioner's sword, to convert into a popular idol and whom poetry has loved to contemplate as a romantic champion of freedom." (Ibid., pp. 73-74)

One cannot help but feel that these last words bear reference specifically to Goethe's drama of the historical count.

Thus we have seen that Schiller and Motley arrived at the same verdict for Count Lamoral Egmont. They could not regard him as the valiant hero who fought for the cause of liberty. For this reason they choose to censure him for his actions in the history of the Dutch revolt.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly both Schiller and Motley considered freedom one of the noblest words in the vocabulary. They were inspired throughout a large part of their literary careers by the ideal of freedom. They maintained that freedom, whether political, civil, or religious, was the most sacred of all possessions and the most valued goal of man's striving. No matter what significant question of justice or freedom stimulated their faculties, it always aroused the greatness of their fertile and richly stored intellects, bringing forth words which were alive with ardor for what is true and right, and a disdain for everything false, mean, base, and cruel. Schiller and Motley never ceased to remain acutely sensitive to the values of the individual and abhorred the greed and tyranny of despotism. As historians of liberty in its struggle with political and ecclesiastical despotism, Schiller's and Motley's frank nature expresses itself in their works. They considered the struggle between liberty and authority the most conspicuous feat of Dutch history. Each work is characterized by the same genuine sympathy with liberty and the spirit of humanity which pervades it. Both authors were incensed by the cruelty and
injustice of the Habsburg reign in the Netherlands. In a sense, both felt that they themselves had been victimized. Each possessed the powerful and insurgent willingness to seek out and confront that odious tyranny which existed in the sixteenth century and to publish it for the world's edification. In this way the reader of their histories is brought face to face with both the new facts and striking thoughts which the two communicate and by the direct communication of each author's soul to his own soul.

Schiller and Motley grew up to witness much in the history of mankind's search for freedom. The second half of the eighteenth century was a real period of ideas and ideals, an era of enlightenment, of political, moral, and literary awakening. Much of this spirit still existed a few years after the birth of Motley.

Motley, as a man of intellect, nourished in the culture and refinements of his New England environment, distinguished himself as a scholar. He attended prep school at the famous Round Hill academy, where he first became exposed to German culture and literature through the tutelage of George Bancroft, one of the foremost German scholars in America at that time. Motley continued his interest in German literature at Harvard, where he submitted a translation of Schiller's Der Geisterseher to the Harvard Collegian. Some years later he published a translation of Schiller's ballad "Der Taucher" in the North American Review. No doubt Motley knew intimate-
ly all of Schiller's works and ideals, and this lead to his acceptance of Schiller's ideal of freedom which he expresses so often and so vividly in his Dutch histories. Motley repeatedly comes to the aid of the oppressed, and battles for the rights of mankind against despotism in the truly Schillerian manner. Goethe, too, elicited his admiration, for he delivered an essay, "The Genius and Character of Goethe," at the Harvard exhibition in his senior year at that university. Eight years later he published a long essay in the New York Review, entitled "Goethe," in which he favorably reviewed most of Goethe's best known works. Motley studied for two years at the Universities of Göttingen and Berlin, and this study served to strengthen the German influence upon him. It was not only the content of the university curricula that proved most valuable to him, but also his immersion into the intellectual atmosphere as well as the first-hand contact with German literature. He had occasion to meet both Frau Ottilie von Goethe and Ludwig Tieck.

Motley and Schiller must be considered among the most picturesque historians of the nineteenth century. They believed in the power of prose to explain the past. Through their vivid picturing of events and personalities, they not only make the reader a witness of a ceremony, siege, conflict, or martyrdom, but enlist his sympathies and mentally force him
to become a participant. They were not only colorful painters, but skillful narrators of actions and events. This picturesqueness is not a condemnation of their historical method, for they did not allow it to interfere with the action. In this manner they used it to their advantage by enlarging the traditional presentation of history. They seemed willing on many occasions to let prose modify the majestic forms of history. This historical form can be traced to their unusual gift for dramatic and literary expression; for both writers achieved success in the field of belles-lettres. It is not surprising that their histories often read like the writings of a good fiction writer. They often drew from literary types which are encompassed in drama, or better said, in tragic drama. This gave them the opportunity for a careful inspection of unhappy destinies. The tragic drama sanctioned their interest in the tragedy of history. It perhaps provided them with the impetus by which they penetrated the mysteries of the sixteenth century. They expected to find tragedy and were not disappointed. There was the tragedy of Egmont, who chose his doom on the basis of inadequate information and blurred perception. In Motley's history, the death of Orange provided the tragedy of a good man in a great career who was destroyed by the power he was committed to oppose.

Throughout the historical works of both Schiller and Motley, we encounter a tabloid of sound prose. It is clear, forthright,
eloquent and often intensified to produce heroic effects. In this respect one might label their histories as heroic prose. They delighted in the descriptions of great men. Personal power, for those rightly placed, was enormous in the days of Philip II and William of Orange. The Dutch rebellion was strongly influenced by a few men. Therefore, Schiller and Motley concentrated a great deal of attention on those few individuals. They would often choose facts which would open the way to dramatize a personality. They possessed intricate knowledge and insight into the human personality. Their penetrative imagination led them into the innermost heart of beings. Their vivid accuracy and concentrated dramatic power could illuminate a great figure and his relations to a whole epoch. Their portrayal of William, for example, was given new scope and intensity. Each found the same leading persons and built their histories around them. They took delight in portraits of Charles V., Philip II, William of Orange, and Egmont. This was their historical method, and by no means an inferior one.

In writing history, authors are sometimes more consumed with incidents than ideas. Schiller and Motley, however, place a great deal of importance on the ideas. In many cases they subordinate their picturesque presentation of incidents to their representation of ideas which existed in the sixteenth century. Schiller’s *Don Carlos* and *Der Abfall der Niederlande*
are products of the same struggle. The reality of the ideas in Don Carlos concerns Schiller far more than do the fidelity of the character to history. Posa is there not because there ever was an historical Posa, but because, through him and in him, the conflict of ideas is made more evident. These same ideas return again and again in Schiller's Abfall.

Schiller and Motley no doubt realized that their ideas were not always completely objective, either in light of historical fact or as an undeniable conception of a main personnage. Yet they did not make history a complete romance. They knew they must not invent characters or incidents to illustrate an idea. They attempted to acquire the true facts which would form clear conceptions of persons and events, as well as the ideas which shaped characters and determined destinies. They were interested in the political ideologies that came about, especially the freedom-loving ones.

Although both Schiller and Motley choose to use their pens to attack the Church and Papacy, it was Motley who was more interested in the religious aspect of the revolt. Both authors believed, however, that the Papacy constituted a great obstacle to the development of free and efficient secular government at that time. They asserted that the clergy had no right to speak in the name of the Church, for those men were mere mortals and entitled to no special privileges. They regarded the struggle
between the Catholic Inquisition and the Protestant Reformation as a war of enslavement against the principles of freedom. The Inquisition, instead of restoring the country to the Roman Catholic fold, convinced the Dutch that only through independence could they achieve the religious and political freedom they were seeking.

One must conclude that Motley was the superior historian. But Schiller's historical writings must be taken as part of a great period of German literature and considered objectively. Unlike Motley, Schiller began his history of Dutch rebellion without knowing Dutch or Spanish. It must be remembered that after Schiller's death, there developed a new school of scientific historiography, led and trained by Leopold von Ranke. Motley enjoyed the advantage of having some of the most famous published works of Ranke and his disciples at his disposal. In addition, the correspondence of most of the principal historical figures involved in the Dutch rebellion was published after Schiller's death, but Motley was able to use it in its entirety. Motley took the methods of the modern school of scientific historiography and went to the primary sources. Schiller's state of health and financial resources prevented him from making use of these sources. Both writers must be singled out for their contributions to history. They will always be read for colorful historical presentation and enjoyment.
In their Dutch histories neither Schiller nor Motley develop in detail all of the historical topics available to them. This is definitely more the case with Schiller, whose work is only a fragmentary introduction to the history he intended to write. Nevertheless, one notices that both authors neglect to report in detail several of the same topics. The varied functions and aspects of the Dutch economy seem to be of little interest to them. They were less informed about economic matters probably because such affairs held little interest for them and did not present the opportunity for dramatization. They scarcely consider the every day customs and routines of the citizens.

We recall Motley's speech, "Historic Progress and American Democracy," which sums up all of his love of country and commitment to his favored ideas of freedom. Like Schiller, Motley believed in progress as a continuing victory for good people and institutions over evil. They believed that progress was inevitable in countries where freedom existed. But this meant that the Vatican and despotic institutions must concede to the demands of liberty. The unconquerable spirit of the Netherlands and the corrupting effect of Spanish tyranny were always foremost in their eyes. Although both historians saw the Dutch struggle progressing well for humanity, they still pictured in detail the bitter and relentless campaign.
Dutch history offered both Schiller and Motley an opportunity to teach moral and political lessons. They had as the great theme the value of freedom to the society within which it was allowed. For them, the Dutch revolution, filled with the accomplishments of a liberated nation under the leadership of patricians, could be almost a school example of what they themselves believed and desired to impart to their readers.

We have noted numerous similar instances of competence and incompetence in Schiller's and Motley's presentation of history. One is unable to call them objective historians. Each joins with the cause of the rebels, and embraces their hero; at the same time each denounces the Spanish tyrants. We have seen that they delight in depicting the leading men of this struggle. But in each case, they treat the man in question with the same bias. They recognize Charles V as the first tyrant of the sixteenth century to usurp the rights and freedoms of the Netherlands. Charles despised everything that was for the cause of liberty. He defied the doctrines of the new religion, and introduced the Inquisition. Both writers recognized him, however, as a shrewd and skillful manager of men. But his policy was one of unmitigated oppression and his only concern was the preservation of his empire. It must be pointed out that Schiller is, in some cases, less harsh in his condemnation of Charles,
in that he recalls some of Charles achievements from which the Netherlands were able to benefit.

Both Schiller and Motley view Philip as an object of hatred and contempt, a repulsive tyrant whose sole purpose was to obliterate the ideas of the Protestant Reformation in the Netherlands. Unlike his father, Philip possessed no pleasing qualities which could have enhanced his existence. He revelled in slaughter and wholesale murder. He was as false as he was cruel, and as licentious as he was fanatical.

Both Schiller and Motley make William of Orange the hero of their "dramas." They regard him as a man who nobly struggled and suffered for the cause of liberty and whose life was the history of the revolution in the Netherlands. His personality was attractive, genial, human, and magnanimous. He commanded influence wherever he went and remained devoted to the cause of religious toleration and sincere patriotism. He appeared as the hard-working leader of a seemingly hopeless cause. At a time of extreme fanaticism, he preached moderation. He remained courageous in the face of every disaster. His initial efforts eventually led to the triumph of freedom over senseless and bloody tyranny.

Schiller and Motley saw in Egmont an easy dupe for the treachery of Philip II against the Netherlands. Although he was a wealthy and attractive noble who achieved brilliant
military success and the admiration of the people, he was, nevertheless, a vain, self-centered egotist who sought personal advancement at the expense of his nation. Although he detested the Inquisition and professed abhorrence for the severe religious edicts, he did not have the courage to stand up for his convictions. His vacillating position led to his death at the hands of the man he most admired, Philip II.

Schiller and Motley were both concerned with the generation in which they lived. They despised anything that debauched or degraded man or public life. They loved freedom for the sake of their neighbors as well as for themselves, without regard for nationality and, in the case of Motley, without regard for race or color. They were patriots of their respective countries because they served them in the very best way open to them; that is, by creating works of history and literature which would never cease to nurture the idealism of their countrymen. They were lovers of their own countries, but they believed in the brotherhood of men united in freedom.

Certainly Schiller's ideal of freedom, the recurrent leitmotiv throughout his works, stirred the impressionable mind of John Lothrop Motley just as the poet Goethe had stimulated him some years earlier. In the true Schillerian manner,
he too, became the standard-bearer for oppressed humanity and effaced justice. Thus Schiller's crusade for the rights and freedom of the individual was perpetuated by the persuasive pen of this famous nineteenth-century historian and champion of liberty.

It would seem only appropriate to conclude this study with the poetical tribute of William Cullen Bryant to Motley after the latter's death in 1877.

"Sleep, Motley, with the great of ancient days, Who wrote for all the years that yet shall be. Sleep with Herodotus, whose name and praise Have reached the isles of earth's remotest sea. Sleep, while defiant of the slow delays Of time, thy glorious writing speak for thee And in the answering heart of millions raise The generous zeal for Right and Liberty. And should the days o'ertake us, when, at last, The silence that - ere yet a human pen Had traced the slenderest record of the past - Hushed the primeval languages of men Upon our English tongue its spell shall cast, Thy memory shall perish only then."¹
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