

Unit 3: Identifications and Study Questions

Section A: Two Aging Empires

Knights of the Empire, Electors of the Holy Roman Empire, *ius eundi in partes*, "perpetual diet" of Regensburg, Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs, *szlachta*, liberum veto, "exploding" the diet, janissaries, capitulations

1. What major differences may be noted between eastern and western Europe in the 17th and 18th Centuries?
2. Why may the Holy Roman Empire, the Republic of Poland, and the Ottoman Empire in the mid 17th century be characterized as "old fashioned" political organizations?
3. Describe the changes in the Holy Roman Empire brought about by (a) the Reformation, (b) the Thirty Years War, (c) the Peace of Westphalia. What can be said about the ambitions and activities of various individual rulers in the Empire?
4. What was distinctive about the political life of the Republic of Poland in the 17th Century?
5. How would you characterize the nature of Ottoman rule in Eastern Europe? What changes were taking place in this empire in the 17th Century?

Section B: The Formation of the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian Empires

Hapsburg "hereditary provinces", siege of Vienna of 1683, Prince Eugene of Savoy, Battle of Zenta, Peace of Karlowitz, Treaty of Rastadt, Peace of Belgrade, *ius reformandi*, Prince Francis Rakoczy, Magyars, Charles VI, Pragmatic Sanction, Charles XII, "mark" or "march" of Brandenburg, *Drang nach Osten*, Hohenzollerns, Frederick William, Brandenburg- Prussia, king *in* Prussia, Frederick I, crown domain, Junkers, Frederick William I, canton system, Frederick II, Silesia, Mongol invasions, Ivan the Terrible, Time of Troubles, Michael Romanov. Stephen Razin, Old Believers, Procurator of the Holy Synod, "windows on the West", Battle of Narva, Battle of Poltava, rebellion of the *streltsi*, St. Petersburg, *gubernii*, "state service", Alexis, War of the Polish Succession, Catherine the Great, Stanislas Poniatowski, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Edmund Burke

1. What were the major episodes and eventual results of the conflict between the Hapsburgs and the Turks from 1526 to 1739?
2. Describe the territorial boundaries of the Hapsburg empire about 1740. In what sense was the empire "international"?
3. How successful were the Hapsburgs in their efforts at consolidation and centralization? What effort did Charles VI undertake to guarantee the undivided inheritance of his territories?
4. Discuss the role of each of the Hohenzollern rulers from 1640 to 1740 in the formation of Prussia.
5. Describe the special characteristics of the Kingdom of Prussia as it was developing in the 17th and 18th Centuries. What observations may be made about (a) the army, (b) government and economic life, (c) the social development and economic structure of the country? What possible effects might Lutheranism have had on Prussian life?
6. Why did Frederick II's act of aggression seem somewhat of an exception to the policies of his predecessors? What did he accomplish by this act?
7. Describe Russia before Peter the Great's accession to the throne. Why had Russia not shared more fully in European developments after 1100? How was this fact reflected in prevailing social conditions?
8. In what ways did developments in Russia between the time of Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great resemble developments in other parts of Europe?
9. What was happening to the peasantry in 17th Century Russia? Describe peasant reactions to (a) economic changes and (b) religious changes.
10. Discuss the tempo, nature and results of Peter's internal reforms, with special attention to (a) the church, (b) the army, (c) a new capital, (d) economic policies, (e) administrative reforms.
11. How would you characterize Peter's foreign policy? What territories did he win for Russia?

12. How would you assess the significance of Peter in the history of Russia?
13. How did the Austrian and Prussian concern about Russian strength in eastern Europe, and about the balance of power, lead to the first partition of Poland? What did each of the three powers gain?
14. What effect did the partition have on the Poles? Why couldn't they create a more effective national resistance?

Section C: Elite and Popular Cultures and the Global Economy of the 18th Century

elite, Hogarth, "carnival", mountebank, popular culture, "the world turned upside down", patios, nonconformists, the domestic system, mercantilism, East India Companies, plantation economy

1. How does one distinguish elite culture from popular culture?
2. Compare the way of life of the poor and of the well-to-do in the early eighteenth century in (a) material aspects, such as food and drink, shelter, and medical care; (b) less material aspects, such as religion, manners, and forms of entertainment. What elements were common to all classes in these years?
3. On what basis is it possible to reconstruct the mental outlook of the nonliterate and inarticulate classes?
4. What changes by the eighteenth century were sharpening the distinction between elite and popular culture?
5. What may be considered the most significant economic developments of the eighteenth century? What relationship do they bear to earlier economic developments?
6. Describe the role played by the British, the French, and the Dutch in the commerce of the eighteenth century. What important advantages did Britain and France enjoy over the other countries?
7. What role did Asia play as a market for European manufactures and as a source of goods for Europeans?
8. Explain the development in America of the Plantation economy. What role was played by the West Indies in the sugar trade? Of what importance was slave labor to the plantation system?
9. How would you assess the role played by western Europe and other parts of the world in the expanding world economy of the eighteenth century?
10. How did eighteenth-century economic developments affect the various social and economic classes of Europe? What was the political significance of the new wealth?
11. Why are the careers of Thomas Pitt and Jean-Joseph Laborde singled out for description?

Section D: Western Europe After the Peace of Utrecht, 1713 - 1740

Duke of Orleans, the Regency, Whigs, Tories, non-Jurors, "James III", John Law, "Mississippi Bubble", Jacobites, the "Fifteen", the "Forty Five", "South Sea Bubble", Cardinal Fleury, George I, Robert Walpole, "Bubble Act", War of Jenkins' Ear

1. Why may it be said that "parallel" developments were taking place in France and Britain in the years after Utrecht?
2. Describe the political developments in France under the regency of the Duke of Orleans. What role did French nobility play in the eighteenth century?
3. Analyze major political changes in Great Britain in the first half of the eighteenth century. Of what significance was the accession of George I? the ministry of Robert Walpole? Discuss the movements to "undo" the settlement of 1688 and their results.
4. Compare and contrast the history and the consequences of the "Mississippi bubble" episode in France and the "South Sea bubble" episode in England.

Section E: The Great War of the Mid-18th Century: The Peace of Paris, 1763

Frederick II, Maria Theresa, Count Kaunitz, Pragmatic Sanction, treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, Diplomatic Revolution of 1756, Peter III, William Pitt, Aurungzeb, Dupleix, "miracle of the house of Brandenburg", "Black Hole of Calcutta", Robert Clive, French and Indian Wars, battle of Plassey, treaty of Paris of 1763

1. What principle issues were involved in both the War of Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War?
2. How did warfare in the eighteenth century compare to earlier wars? to later wars?
3. In what sense was the War of Austrian Succession a civil struggle within the German States? a conflict between Bourbons and Hapsburgs? How did the fighting overseas affect the situation in Europe? What were the major terms of the peace settlement?
4. Why may the reversal of alliances of 1756 be called a Diplomatic Revolution?
5. Describe the nature and outcome of the seven Years' War (a) in Europe, (b) as a colonial and naval struggle between France and Britain, (c) in India. What were the stakes in this struggle?
6. Summarize and evaluate the major provisions of the treaty of Paris. In what sense was the year 1763 a "memorable turning point"?

Unit 3
Section D
Supplemental
Readings

Letter to Lady R., 1716:
Women and the Aristocracy

Lady Mary Wortley Montagu

During the eighteenth century women continued to remain limited in the economic and political roles they could play, but it was possible for aristocratic women to take up influential social and cultural roles. In particular, many women used letter writing as an art, and from these letters much insight about the position and attitudes of women can be gained. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1689-1762) was a well-known British literary figure, writing essays and poetry in addition to her volumes of letters. The following is a selection from a letter written in 1716 to Lady R.

Consider: The assumptions about marriage among the aristocracy; connections between marriage, love, and economic interests; the position of aristocratic women reflected by this letter.

No woman dares appear coquette enough to encourage two lovers at a time. And I have not seen any such prudes as to pretend fidelity to their husbands, who are certainly the best natured set of people in the world, and look upon their wives' gallants as favourably as men do upon their deputies, that take the troublesome part of their business off their hands. They have not however the less to do on that account; for they are generally deputies in another place themselves; in one word, 'tis the established custom for every lady to have two husbands, one that bears the name, and another that performs the duties. And these engagements are so well known, that it would be a downright affront, and publicly resented, if you invited a woman of quality to dinner, without, at the same time, inviting her two attendants of lover and husband, between whom she sits in state with great gravity. The sub-marriages generally last twenty years together, and the lady often commands the poor lover's estate, even to the utter ruin of his family.

These connections, indeed, are as seldom begun by any real passion as other matches; for a man makes but an ill figure that is not in some commerce of this nature; and a woman looks out for a lover as soon as she's married, as part of her equipage, without which she could not be genteel; and the first article of the treaty is establishing the pension, which remains to the lady, in case the gallant should prove inconstant. This chargeable point of honour I look upon as the real foundation of so many wonderful instances of constancy. I really know some women of the first quality, whose pensions are as well known as their annual rents, and yet nobody esteems them the less; on the contrary, their discretion would be called in question, if they should be suspected to be mistresses for nothing. A great part of their emulation consists in trying who shall get most. . . .

Women of the Third Estate

The vast majority of eighteenth-century Europeans were not members of the aristocracy. Over 90 percent were peasants, artisans, domestics, and laborers—often referred to in France as members of the Third Estate. While both men and women of the Third Estate shared much, women's positions and grievances often differed from those of men. Articulate records of these women's grievances are difficult to find, but the flood of formal petitions preceding the French Revolution of 1789 provides us with some rich sources. The following is a "Petition of the Women of the Third Estate to the King," dated several months prior to the outbreak of the French Revolution.

Consider: *What options seem available to women; the problems identified and solutions proposed; ways in which men's interests and women's interests might clash.*

1 January 1789. Almost all women of the Third Estate are born poor. Their education is either neglected or misconceived, for it consists in sending them to learn from teachers who do not themselves know the first word of the language they are supposed to be teaching... At the age of fifteen or sixteen, girls can earn five or six sous a day. If nature has not granted them good looks, they get married, without a dowry, to unfortunate artisans and drag out a grueling existence in the depths of the provinces, producing children whom they are unable to bring up. If, on the other hand, they are born pretty, being without culture, principles, or any notion of morality, they fall prey to the first seducer, make one slip, come to Paris to conceal it, go totally to the bad here, and end up dying as victims of debauchery.

Today, when the difficulty of earning a living forces thousands of women to offer themselves to the highest bidder and men prefer buying them for a spell to winning them for good, any woman drawn to virtue, eager to educate herself, and with natural taste... is faced with the choice either of casting herself into a cloister which will accept a modest dowry or of going into domestic service....

If old age overtakes unmarried women, they spend it in tears and as objects of contempt for their nearest relatives.

To counter such misfortunes, Sire, we ask that men be excluded from practicing those crafts that are women's prerogative, such as dressmaking, embroidery, millinery, etc. Let them leave us the needle and the spindle and we pledge our word never to handle the compass or the set-square.

We ask, Sire... to be instructed and given jobs, not that we may usurp men's authority but so that we may have a means of livelihood, and so that the weaker among us who are dazzled by luxury and led astray by example should not be forced to join the ranks of the wretched who encumber the streets and whose lewd audacity disgraces both our sex and *the men who frequent them.*

Act of Humanity

Jean Defraigne

In Act of Humanity (circa 1783), painter Jean Defraigne shows that the old tradition of aristocratic responsibility for social welfare is still upheld in the eighteenth century. Here, an aristocrat is visiting a family stricken by both illness and poverty. The realistic depiction of poverty is accompanied by the comforting suggestion that its effects can be alleviated through charitable gestures. Such humanitarian acts on the part of the aristocracy were considered one of the few appropriate cures for social problems of the poor.

Consider: *How this picture compares with the Hanway document.*

Photo 3-2



Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Lords and Peasants

Jerome Blum

The aristocracy made up a small percentage of Europe's population. Some 80 to 90 percent of the people were still peasants. While peasants lived in a variety of different circumstances, most lived at not much more than a subsistence level. They were usually thought of as at the bottom of society. In the following selection, Jerome Blum analyzes attitudes held toward the peasants by seigniors (lords) and by peasants themselves.

Consider: *How lords viewed peasants in relation to themselves; how the lords' attitudes reflected actual social conditions; possible consequences of the negative attitudes held about peasants.*

With the ownership of land went power and authority over the peasants who lived on the land. There were a multitude of variations in the nature of that authority and in the nature of the peasants' subservience to their seigniors, in the compass of the seigniors' supervision and control, and in the obligations that the peasants had to pay their lords. The peasants themselves were known by many different names, and so, too, were the obligations they owed the seigniors. But, whatever the differences, the status of the peasant everywhere in the servile lands was associated with unfreedom and constraint. In the hierarchical ladder of the traditional order he stood on the bottom rung. He was "the stepchild of the age, the broad, patient back who bore the weight of the entire social pyramid... the clumsy lout who was deprived and mocked by court, noble and city."...

The subservience of the peasant and his dependence upon his lord were mirrored in the attitudes and opinions of the seigniors of east and west alike. They believed that the natural order of things had divided humankind into masters and servants, those who commanded and those who obeyed. They believed themselves to be naturally superior beings and looked upon those who they believed were destined to serve them as their natural inferiors. At best their attitude toward the peasantry was the condescension of paternalism. More often it was disdain and contempt. Contemporary expressions of opinion repeatedly stressed the ignorance, irresponsibility, laziness, and general worthlessness of the peasantry, and in the eastern lands the free use of the whip was recommended as the only way to get things done. The peasant was considered some lesser and sub-human form of life; "a hybrid between animal and human" was the way a Bavarian official put it in 1737. An eyewitness of a rural rising in Provence in 1752 described the peasant as "an evil animal, cunning, a ferocious half-civilized beast; he has neither heart nor honesty...." The Moldavian Basil Balsch reported that the peasants of his land were "strangers to any discipline, order, economy or cleanliness...; a thoroughly lazy, mendacious... people who are accustomed to do the little work that they do only under invectives or blows." A counselor of the duke of Mecklenburg in an official statement in 1750 described the peasant there as a "head of cattle" and declared that he must be treated accordingly....

The conviction of their own superiority harbored by the seigniors was often compounded by ethnic and religious differences between lord and peasant. In many parts of central and eastern Europe the masters belonged to a conquering people who had established their domination over the native population. German seigniors ruled over Slavic peasants in

Bohemia, Galicia, East Prussia and Silesia, and over Letts and Estonians in the Baltic lands; Polish lords were the masters of Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and White Russian peasants; Great Russians owned manors peopled by Ukrainians and Lithuanians and Poles; Magyars lorded it over Slovaks and Romanians and Slovenes—to list only some of the macroethnic differences. Few peoples of the rest of the world can match Europeans in their awareness of and, generally, contempt for or at least disdain for other ethnic and religious groups.... The dominant group, though greatly outnumbered, successfully maintained its cultural identity precisely because it considered the peasants over whom it ruled as lesser breeds of mankind, even pariahs....

Schooling for most peasants was, at best, pitifully inadequate and usually entirely absent, even where laws declared elementary education compulsory.... [B]y far the greatest part of Europe's peasantry lived out their lives in darkest ignorance.

The peasants themselves, oppressed, contemned, and kept in ignorance by their social betters, accepted the stamp of inferiority pressed upon them. "I am only a serf" the peasant would reply when asked to identify himself. They seemed without pride or self-respect, dirty, lazy, crafty, and always suspicious of their masters and of the world that lay outside their village. Even friendly observers were put off by the way they looked and by their behavior. One commentator complained in the 1760's that "one would have more pity for them if their wild and brutish appearance did not seem to justify their hard lot."