

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01796543 5









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



10  
15455m

# MEDIEVAL EUROPE

From 395 to 1270

4

BY

CHARLES BÉMONT

*Associate Director of the École des Hautes-Études*

AND

G. MONOD

*Membre de L'Institut and President of the Historical Section of the  
École des Hautes-Études*

TRANSLATED BY MARY SLOAN

*Instructor in French in the Norwich Free Academy*

WITH NOTES AND REVISIONS BY

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS

*Professor of History in Yale University.*

pp. 191-194 missing

58263  
6 | 10 | 02



NEW YORK

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

1902

D

118

B453

COPYRIGHT, 1902

BY

HENRY HOLT & CO.

THE MERSHON COMPANY PRESS,  
RAHWAY, N. J.



## PREFACE.

The text-book which is here by permission presented in an English dress is by two of the most distinguished of the modern school of French historians. It is remarkable among text-books on this difficult period for its great simplicity of statement, and for the fulness with which it treats of topics not usually taken up in detail, notably of the medieval church. Of their purpose in the book the authors say in their introduction: "We have attempted to give to this volume a certain unity, not to make a simple chronological enumeration of events, but to group the details around the more important facts—the formation of the feudal system in succession to the Germanic invasions, the development of the Catholic Church, the strife of Christian Europe against the Mussulman Orient, the struggle between the Papacy and the Empire leading to the fall of the German power, the formation of strong monarchies in France and in England. We have in particular given a large place to the rôle and to the history of the Church which dominates all this period, and which has been ordinarily so neglected in our schoolbooks, and have sought to make clear how France obtained in the thirteenth century a sort of political and intellectual hegemony in Europe. We hope those who read will understand what were the great ideas and directive tendencies which determined the historical evolution of the Middle Ages. We have always kept in mind in writing the conclusion to which we were advancing."


The verdict of reader and student alike will be, I am

sure, that these purposes have been realised in an unusual degree.

A few slight revisions have been made in the text and a few notes have been added. Of the bibliographical notes at the beginning of the chapters, those which stood first, relating to the sources, have been left practically as in the original, as furnishing in that form a sufficient introduction to the original material for the purposes of this book. The second in order, dealing with the literature, have been in nearly all cases rewritten, with especial reference to the probable uses of this translation.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

*July 21, 1902.*



10

0

Longitude

10

East

50


45

40


35

30


25



**THE ROMAN EMPIRE**  
of the Fourth Century







## CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, . . . . .	1
II. THE BARBARIANS, . . . . .	21
III. THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE VANDALS, THE VISIGOTHS, AND THE HUNS, (376-476), . . . . .	33
IV. THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE OSTROGOTHS, . . . . .	54
V. THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE BARBARIANS IN GAUL—CLOVIS, . . . . .	63
VI. THE FRANKISH KINGDOM FROM 511-639, . . . . .	73
VII. INSTITUTIONS OF GAUL AFTER THE INVASIONS, . . . . .	86
VIII. THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE EAST IN THE SIXTH CENTURY, . . . . .	99
IX. THE LAST INVASIONS AND THE PAPACY—THE LOMBARDS AND GREGORY THE GREAT—THE ANGLO-SAXONS AND MONASTICISM, . . . . .	115
X. THE ARABS—MOHAMMED, . . . . .	135
XI. ARABIAN EMPIRE—CONQUEST AND CIVILISATION, . . . . .	148
XII. THE FAINÉANT KINGS—FOUNDATION OF THE CAROLINGIAN DYNASTY—CHARLEMAGNE, . . . . .	167
XIII. EMPIRE OF THE FRANKS—CAROLINGIAN CUSTOMS AND INSTITUTIONS, . . . . .	192
XIV. THE CAROLINGIAN DECADENCE, 814-888, . . . . .	211
XV. THE LAST CAROLINGIANS—INVASIONS OF THE SARACENS, HUNGARIANS, AND NORSEMEN—ORIGIN OF FEUDALISM, . . . . .	229
XVI. THE FEUDAL SYSTEM, . . . . .	246
XVII. GERMANY AND ITALY—888-1056, . . . . .	268
XVIII. EMPEROR AND POPE—CHURCH REFORM—GREGORY VII., . . . . .	286
XIX. THE GUELFs AND HOHENSTAUFEN—ALEXANDER III. AND FREDERICK I., BARBAROSSA, . . . . .	301
XX. END OF THE HOHENSTAUFEN—VICTORY OF THE PAPACY OVER THE EMPIRE, . . . . .	319

CHAPTER		PAGE
XXI.	THE CHRISTIAN AND MUSSULMAN ORIENT FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY, . . . . .	336 348
XXII.	THE CRUSADES, . . . . .	348
XXIII.	THE COUNTRY DISTRICTS AND CITIES OF FRANCE —EMANCIPATION OF PEASANTS AND BOURGEOIS, . . . . .	375 391
XXIV.	FRENCH ROYALTY—987-1154, . . . . .	391
XXV.	FRENCH ROYALTY—1154-1270, . . . . .	403
XXVI.	INSTITUTIONS OF CAPETIAN ROYALTY, . . . . .	421
XXVII.	ENGLAND FROM THE NINTH TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY, . . . . .	445 467
XXVIII.	CONTINENTAL EUROPE, . . . . .	467
XXIX.	THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY, . . . . .	488 506
XXX.	THE CHURCH AND HERESIES, . . . . .	506
XXXI.	CHRISTIAN AND FEUDAL CIVILISATION—INSTRUC- TION AND SCIENCES—LITERATURE AND ARTS— WORSHIP, . . . . .	515
GENERAL SUMMARY, . . . . .		545
INDEX, . . . . .		551



## LIST OF MAPS.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY, . . .	1
EUROPE IN THE REIGN OF THEODORIC, CIR. A. D. 500, . . .	57
EUROPE AT THE DEATH OF JUSTINIAN, A. D. 565, . . .	113
EUROPE, END OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY, A. D. 695, . . .	154
EUROPE IN THE TIME OF CHARLES THE GREAT, A. D. 814, . . .	191
THE WESTERN EMPIRE AS DIVIDED AT VERDUN, A. D. 843, . . .	217
THE WESTERN EMPIRE AS DIVIDED A. D. 870, . . . . .	226
CENTRAL EUROPE, CIR. 980, . . . . .	265
CENTRAL EUROPE, 1180, . . . . .	314
GREATEST EXTENT OF THE SARACENS' DOMINIONS, . . . . .	351



## CHAPTER I.

### THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT THE END OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.\*

**1. Extent of the Empire.**—At the end of the fourth century the Roman Empire still comprised the entire basin of the Mediterranean. In Europe its continental limits were the Rhine and the Danube; in Asia, an undefined frontier, modified constantly by wars with the Armenians and Persians, followed the eastern slope of the Pontus Euxinus (Black Sea) to the foot of the Caucasus

\* **SOURCES.**—“*Notitia dignitatum et administrationum Orientis et Occidentis.*” Edition Boecking (1839–1853), and O. Seeck (1877). (Translated by Fairley in “*Translations and Reprints,*” University of Pennsylvania.) This is a kind of “imperial almanac,” edited in its oldest form, in the first years of the fifth century. The “*Peutinger Table.*” This is a kind of road map of the Roman Empire made without doubt in the fourth century, and which belonged, in the sixteenth, to a rich burgher of Augsburg, Conrad Peutinger, whence its name. Unfinished edition by E. Desjardins (1869). The imperial laws drawn up by order of Theodosius II. and Justinian have often been published: “*Codices Gregorianus, Hermogenianus, Theodosianus,*” edition Haenel (1842); “*Codex Justinianus*” and “*Institutiones,*” edition Krueger (1877 and 1867); “*Digesta,*” edition Mommsen (1868).

**LITERATURE.**—Bloch, “*La Gaule Independante et la Gaule Romaine*”; vol. i. part ii. of Lavisse’s “*Histoire de France*”; Mommsen, “*The Provinces of the Roman Empire*”; Dill, “*Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire.*” Second edition.

Mountains and extended into Armenia around Lake Van, thence in an almost straight line to the Red Sea, crossing the Tigris below Tigranocerta, and the Euphrates at its junction with the Chaboras at Circesium. On the south, Egypt up to and beyond the first cataract, and the northern slope of Africa, with Cyrenaica, Tripolitania, and Mauritania, belonged to Rome, which possessed in the valley of the Nile and in the modern Tunis the wheat granaries that supplied the hungry people of the two capitals. On the west the Atlantic Ocean formed the horizon of the ancients, who imagined beyond it the mysterious land of the blessed ones. On the north the island of Britannia belonged to the Empire, with the exception of the mountainous region of Caledonia, which retained its independence, as did Hibernia, or Ireland.

**2. The Emperor. The Worship of the Emperors.**— Within these limits Rome held sway over the most diverse peoples. The imperial régime, organised little by little, reached its definite form under Diocletian (285-305) and Constantine the Great (312-337). The emperor, considered a divine personage, was the head of both Church and state. He lived like an Oriental prince in the midst of imposing splendour, surrounded by a world of courtiers and servants, all proud of their domestic functions. He governed, aided by a Council of State, the high dignitaries of his palace, and the ministers, who controlled a hierarchy of officials. In spite of the wretchedness of the third and fourth centuries, and the manifest incapacity or unworthiness of so many of the emperors, the prestige of the Roman name still exerted great influence over the minds of the enlightened citizens of the Empire and the simple imagination of the barbarian peoples. From the time of Augustus the imperial majesty and Rome, the capital of the world, were adored. This offi-

cial cult was not an evidence of abject servility; it was an expression, emphatic though doubtless sincere, of gratitude for Roman civilisation. Outside of the Empire there was nothing, in the eyes of the Romans, except barbarism.

**3. Administrative Divisions of the Empire.**—At the death of Theodosius the Great (395) the Empire was governed by two emperors—Arcadius in the Orient and Honorius in the Occident. It was considered, however, a single empire. It was divided into four prefectures—or six, if the prefectures of Rome and Constantinople are included; each prefecture was divided into dioceses, fourteen in number; each diocese into provinces, one hundred and nineteen in number; the provinces were subdivided into townships\* (*civitates*) and the townships into cantons.

A precise idea of provincial administration may be gained by noting what took place at that time in Gaul.

**4. Gaul. Administrative Divisions.**—Gaul, in the ordinary sense of the word, that is to say the country lying between the Pyrenees, the Rhine, the Alps, and the sea, formed at the end of the fourth century a diocese which was divided into seventeen provinces. Seven southern provinces, partly corresponding to the former Roman province, formed a separate body, with its own administration. In administrative terms the expression “Gauls” was reserved to the ten other provinces. The provinces were subdivided into townships (*civitates*) to the number of one hundred and twelve, and somewhat later to one

\* Not township in the English or American sense, but the district politically united with the Roman town or city. It corresponds more nearly, in reality, to our county, and is possibly the ancestor of the territorial division from which the name “county” comes to us.—ED.

hundred and fifteen. The cantons (*pagi*), the number of which is unknown, were the territorial divisions of the former Gallic tribes. These divisions had been respected by the conquerors, and incorporated into the new divisions.

**5. The Prætorian Prefect.**—The prætorian prefect was at the head of the civil administration in Gaul. His official residence was at Trèves; later, from the year 400, at Arles, far from the frontier, which was harassed by the barbarians. His powers were most extensive; he published the laws, superintended the collection of imposts, administered the public domains, the imperial posts, supervised the provincial governors, and with his assessors judged without appeal; he also had charge of recruiting and of army supplies. He had under his immediate orders a vice-prefect (*vicarius*), for the group of seven provinces, and a master of soldiers (*magister militum*).

**6. The Governors of the Seventeen Provinces.**—The seventeen governors (six *consulares* and eleven *præsides*) resided in the principal town or metropolis of the province. They had a numerous retinue of personal followers. The clerks were apportioned to bureaus (*officia, scrinia*); they had a life appointment, almost an hereditary one. They were expected to aid the governor, and were responsible for the errors which the latter might commit. Like the functions of the prefects, those of the governors were most varied; these officers were both administrators and judges. They were paid in money, and were given certain equipments, of which a writer of the third century furnishes the following details: "Twenty pounds of silver and one hundred pieces of gold, six jugs of wine, two mules and two horses, two ceremonial costumes, one simple costume, a bath, a cook, a muleteer." It was only

under Theodosius II. that the custom of providing equipments was discontinued.

**7. Municipal Government.**—Under the authority and protection of the governors the laws and customs of the municipal government were freely administered in the townships (*civitates*). These comprised a territory of moderate extent, which may be compared to the French departments; they contained, therefore, a certain number of cities, market towns, and villages ruled by a kind of general council. This was the Senate or curia (*curia*). The members of this Senate were taken from among the freemen or proprietors who owned at least twenty-five *jugera* \* of land in the township. They made up the class of curials (*curiales*) or decurions, which was named *ordo decurionum*. Their functions were obligatory and hereditary; every son of a curial became one himself at the age of eighteen. The curials bore in fact many burdens of state or city. They were responsible individually with their personal fortunes for the payment of taxes. On the other hand they enjoyed certain privileges; such as exemption from the bastinado and torture, and they received marked consideration from the governor. The Senate named the magistrates of the city, aided them in the maintenance of order, in the administration of food supplies (*annona*), charitable establishments, religion, and the communal finances. Above the curials in rank were the *senators*. They were the richest and most important men of the community, who had received from the emperor the right to sit in the Senate at Rome, and the rank of senator, although without the

\* The *jugerum* was a rectangular surface measuring 2518m. 88 (27,097.92 sq. ft. English); it was divided into one hundred equal parts called *perticæ* (perches).

functions appertaining to this office. They should not be confounded with the members of the municipal Senate.

**8. Municipal Magistrates.**—The magistrates were chosen from among the curials and according to a definite order. They were the quæstors, the ediles, the decemvirs, for judicial and financial matters; the priests, flamens, for the municipal worship; the *tribuni militum a populo*, for the maintenance of law and order; the *curatores*, for the administration of public property. These officers were appointed for a year, and were responsible for their administration. Added to these magistracies was a new office of *defensor*, created in Illyria in 364; this finally became general. Heretofore the municipalities had chosen some influential Roman to act as their patron and advocate. More than once he took advantage of the city which had profited by his services and made himself master of it. In order to regulate this abuse the emperor suppressed patronage and created the office of *defensor*. The *defensors* were at first named by the government, then elected by the people for five years. They were chosen not from among the curials, but from the notables of the community. They were not popular, for they had to protect the lower classes, defend them even against the curials, and also guard the interests of the treasury by preventing the curials from deserting the curia. It has often been said that the bishop was usually named for *defensor*; it would be more exact to say that he gradually replaced him.

**9. Towns and Villages.**—As time went on the municipal organisation was more and more extended to small places. Certain *pagi* had a local assembly and magistrates. Simple fortified camps (*castra*) were given a municipal constitution. Gaul is one of the countries where the dismemberment of the original municipalities



was the most frequent. It was as when, in the Middle Ages, the smallest town demanded its liberty, its charter, and its customs. The villages progressed more slowly. During the Roman epoch they had a local worship and their priests; when converted to Christianity they formed parishes, but had to wait until the eighteenth century to become communes.

Parcelling out the municipalities weakened them. Besides, the invasions ruined the curials, some of whom sank to the lower classes, while others entered the ranks of the clergy or withdrew into monasteries; the richer ones, eager to avoid municipal burdens, passed from the *ordo decurionum* into the superior rank of senators. Thus this class of the curials, on whom rested the financial and municipal organisation of the Empire, soon disappeared, and with it the régime whose instrument they were. In the greater part of Gaul, at least, this régime left but a faint trace in the Middle Ages.

**10. The Provincial Assemblies.**—Another institution suffered a like fate. This was the *Provincial Assemblies*, which the Empire, having created, did not know how to use or would not use intelligently. Those of Gaul are the best known to us. The most ancient met in Lyons, near the temple raised in honour of Rome and Augustus, which was decorated with statues of the Gallic cities. One was also held at Narbonne. These assemblies were composed of the municipal magistrates, consequently of the rich proprietors of Gaul. After deliberating in common, resolutions were carried by a majority vote, and delegates were instructed to present them to the emperor. An inscription of the year 238, found at Torigny (department of the Manche), gives the very instructive text of some resolutions of the assembly at Lyons. It is a complaint of the bad administration of a governor of Lyon-

naise Gaul, which brought, however, no satisfaction. In the fifth century the Emperor Honorius tried to systematise this institution, at least in the south of Gaul. An edict of 418 ordered that the Seven Provinces should hold, henceforth, their assembly at a specified time, in the city of Arles; it should be composed of ex-magistrates, important proprietors, and the judges of each province. "We wish," said the emperor, "that this reunion of influential citizens may express its opinion on the general interests of the country." But it was too late to revive provincial life, in the midst of the great invasions, and Honorius' edict remained a dead letter.

**11. Condition of Roman Gaul Compared with that of Barbarian Gaul.**—Compared with what it had been before the Roman conquest, Gaul may be a criterion of the progress accomplished by the barbarian tribes under the rule of Rome. Excessive partitioning and internal dissensions had brought about the loss of its independence. Its political divisions were not entirely ignored and abolished by the Romans, for the townships represented, to a certain point, the former tribal divisions, but internal peace was established by a severe administration. Well governed, Gaul had promptly become Romanised, and it was not long in assuming the leadership of the Eastern provinces. It watched at the gates of barbarism and led the vanguard of civilisation.

**12. Public Offices: Justice.**—Passing from the administration proper, the important public offices should be studied. The judicial organisation comprised several degrees. (1) In the cities the municipal magistrates (*duumviri juri dicundo*) judged civil suits of minor interest, but they were not competent for criminal trials. Wills, marriage contracts, and adoptions were drawn up in their presence. The defensor, in cities where this office

was instituted, assumed the duties of the *duumviri*. (2) The governor's powers were much more extended; he judged both criminal and civil suits. At certain times in the year he made the circuit of his province; he was then forbidden to stop with a rich private individual or in an attractive country. He was obliged to hold the assizes in the large centres of population. He judged sometimes alone, more often surrounded by the assessors named and paid by him, but always in a spot accessible to all. The parties in a suit might be represented by procurors and defended by advocates; the latter formed a close and privileged corporation. (3) There was the right of appeal to the *vicarius* from the governor, from the *vicar* to the prefect, and from the prefect to the emperor. The pontifical law of ancient Rome was no longer used in the courts; there was no distinction between the law of citizens and that of foreigners. The great jurisconsults of the second and third centuries—Papianus, Paulus, Gaius, Ulpianus, Modestinus—were especially guided by principles which they deduced from the very nature of things. In 426 Valentinus III. gave to their decisions the force of law. This was the foundation of Roman law, which has been called, and justly so, “written reason.”

**13. Finances: Division of the Subject.**—The financial administration was divided into three departments, according as the imposts were destined to the public exchequer (*ærarium sacrum*, or *sacræ largitiones*), the private exchequer of the emperor (*ærarium privatum*, or *privatæ largitiones*), or that of the prefects.

**14. Imposts.**—The public exchequer was administered by the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, who had many subordinates in the capitals and provinces. He levied the following taxes: (1) property taxes (*tributa*), paid in by the landed proprietors (*capitatio terrena*), by the merchants

(*chrysargyrium*), and by the *coloni*, who cultivated the land without owning it (*capitatio plebeia* or *humana*). The imperial nobility was exempt from these imposts, but paid a special contribution; the senators paid the *gleba senatoria*, the *oblatio votorum*, and the *aurum oblatitium*; the curials were subject to a special tax, the *aurum coronarium*, which was originally voluntary. (2) Indirect taxes (*vectigalia*). These were customs, duties, and tolls, farmed by companies of contractors, publicans, mostly freedmen, who employed many slaves in their offices. The market taxes of the Middle Ages were a continuation of these *portoria* of the Roman epoch. (3) The products of mines, marble quarries, salt works, imperial manufactures and minting. In manufacturing and mining the state employed workmen who were members of hereditary corporations. The private exchequer was administered by the *comes rerum privatarum*; he collected the revenues of the old domains of the state, of the crown, of the emperor's patrimony, and of land confiscated, escheated, or vacant. These revenues were usually set apart for expenses of a private nature, while the revenues of the "sacred" exchequer were for public expenses; however, the emperor had the right to dispose of both as he saw fit. Finally each prefect had a fund in particular supplied by the *annona*. This was a contribution paid in kind. For example, Egypt furnished wheat to Constantinople, and Africa to Rome. Here the prefect distributed it at a low price, or free, to the poor, who were all the more numerous since the state favoured their idleness; in the other prefectures the *annona* was used for paying the troops and civil servants.

**15. Unjust Levying of Taxes. Oppression of the Curials.**—It does not appear that these imposts weighed too heavily on the subjects of the Empire in ordinary

times; they were on the contrary moderate and equitably divided. But the system of tax collecting was bad. Here there were companies which farmed the taxes, and they did not fail to raise the customs, duties, and tolls, since, after turning in to the imperial exchequer the required amount, they appropriated the surplus; there, there were citizens who, in each community, in each corporation, levied the tax and were personally responsible for it. Hence arose injustice and tyranny. "So many curials, just so many tyrants," wrote Salvian, an author of the fifth century. The curials, on their side, were often ruined by these functions, whence there was no escape, since they were responsible with their own private fortunes for the sum total of the imposts required by the emperor, and their fortunes were ceaselessly diminished by the invasions. The laws preventing the curials from joining the barbarians increased in severity during the fifth century: a proof that the law was powerless and that their condition was growing worse.

**16. Monetary System.**—The payment of imposts was made in kind or in coin. The money of the Empire was coined, as in our day, from three metals: gold, silver, and copper. The principal gold coin was the *aureus*, or the gold penny, worth about two dollars and seventy cents of our money. The principal silver piece was the *argenteus*, ninety-six of which were struck from a pound of silver; twenty-five of these, or one hundred sesterces, equalled an *aureus*. Base metal, made of copper with an alloy of zinc, silver, and tin, was used for coins of ten and of two and five-tenths grammes, which passed for a sum far above their real value; but copper coins were only much depreciated small change.

From the time of Augustus coins bore the effigy of the emperor, with his names, titles, and dignities, as well as

devices intended to convey his praises. After Aurelian, who suppressed the Senate's mint at Rome, the imperial mint replaced all others. The staff of workmen was recruited from among organised bodies of slaves or freedmen, powerful enough to foment grave strikes when their privileges were threatened.

**17. Banking. The Argentarius.**—Money might be, like anything else, an object of trade. Under the name of *argentarius* Rome had what to-day would be termed a banker. He changed money, took it on deposit and at interest, opened accounts with the rich and with merchants, collected debts, lent money, etc.

**18. The Army.**—The army was made up of volunteers, or of recruits furnished by the landed proprietors according to their estate, or of sons of veterans who, on leaving the service, had obtained from the emperor a grant of land. The time of service was very long; the minimum was sixteen years, the maximum twenty-five. Hence a man was a soldier all his life, a wretched condition for the poor men who were forcibly enrolled in times of urgent need. The soldiers were citizens, or became so on entering or leaving the service. They were enrolled in the legions of infantry or cavalry. The auxiliaries, who were often bands of barbarians in the pay of the Empire, became more and more numerous. The *magistri militum* were at the head of the army; in the fifth century there were eight, five in the East and three in the West. One of these latter commanded the armed force in Gaul, with dukes and counts under him in command of the military divisions.

**19. The Fleet.**—These same officers directed the movements of the fleets, which had stations throughout the Empire. These were at Misenum, Ravenna, Egypt, Africa, Syria, the Black Sea, Britain, Fréjus, the Rhine,

with an arsenal at Mayence, the Danube, the Euphrates, the Rhone, with stations at Vienne and at Arles, the Saone at Chalons, and on Lakes Como and Neufchatel. There were many arsenals for the storage of weapons and ships' stores.

**20. Strength and Weakness of the Roman Army.**—Four hundred thousand soldiers and some thousands of sailors were a sufficient force to defend an empire of more than one hundred million inhabitants. Entrenched camps on the frontiers, and fortresses protected by thick stone walls, the whole bound together by a network of military roads, of which the Peutinger map gives us some idea, gave to Rome a great power of resistance, while a highly perfected military science assured her superiority over the barbarians. But the military virtues were lacking in an army which was no longer Roman except in name. Rome had grown great by her army, and was to perish by it.

**21. The Arts.**—Her share in the cultivation of the mind was great. Towns were beautified by arenas, theatres, colossal aqueducts, and hosts of statues. The arenas of Nîmes and Arles, the Maison-Carrée of Nîmes, the theatres of Arles and Orange, the Pont du Gard, the Thermes of Julian at Paris, the gateways of Autun and Trèves, without mentioning the statuary in our museums, bear witness to-day, on the soil of ancient Gaul, to the splendour of Roman civilisation.

**22. Public Instruction.**—Public instruction was not neglected. At school a child of good birth was taught grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic—that is to say the art of combining words, phrases, and numbers. The groundwork of the teaching was the elucidation of some famous author, Horace or Vergil, for example. The principal academic training was in oratory, for the worship of eloquence survived liberty—which had fostered it. No edu-

cation was complete without Greek. In the fourth century the school of Athens, with Proeresios and his most brilliant disciples, Saint Basil, Saint Gregory Nazianzen, and the Emperor Julian, shone brilliantly until the invasion of the barbarians. In Gaul famous schools were established at Marseilles and Autun in the first century, later at Bordeaux, Toulouse, Lyons, Trèves, etc., which taught philosophy, medicine, law, letters, grammar, astrology. The professors were paid by the state. The four professors of philosophy at Athens drew a salary of ten thousand drachmas (\$1750).

**23. Literature.**—Literature was declining, but Greece still brought forth famous professors of rhetoric; Alexandria, subtle philosophers; Gaul and Italy, elegant poets, such as Claudian, Ansonius of Bordeaux, or Rutilius Namatianus of Poitiers. The fourth century counted one more remarkable historian, Ammianus Marcellinus. The treasures of classic antiquity were scattered through many libraries. At Alexandria the library in the Museum was destroyed by fire at the time of Cæsar's expedition; the one in the Serapeum, still very valuable in the fourth century, was pillaged in 391 by the Christians in arms against the pagans. In Rome at this epoch there were not less than twenty-eight public libraries. Seven scribes were employed in the one at Constantinople in copying ancient works. Several large cities of the West had libraries also; that of Trèves was celebrated. This legacy from the past was not to reach modern times intact. As we have only the ruins of the ancient monuments, so we have nothing except detached fragments of this literature. By the middle of the fourth century Christianity began to take cognizance of this inheritance. It had been much depleted, and was to be more so by Christianity, although some portions of the wreck were saved.



**24. Christianity. Organisation of the Catholic Church.**

—From the time of Constantine, Christianity was the state religion, and soon became the only official religion. The Church governed herself, under the control of the emperor, her undisputed chief. A bishop was at the head of each important community. In the fifth century a bishop may be reckoned for each city (*civitas*). The one who lived in the capital city, or metropolis of the province, assumed the title of metropolitan or archbishop. The bishop was elected by the clergy and people; the election was confirmed by the metropolitan and the other bishops of the province. He administered his diocese according to the counsels of the priests who lived with him, and in joint action with either the archpriest who aided him in the accomplishment of his spiritual duties, or the archdeacon.

**25. The Secular Clergy.**—The priests were named by the bishop, who conferred the minor orders, corresponding to the functions of exorcist, porter, acolyte, reader, and assistant deacon, and the major orders. The clergy were supported by voluntary offerings and the fast increasing revenues accruing to the Church. In the West, from the fourth century on, celibacy was enjoined on the bishops and priests officiating at the altar. While with the pagans the temple was solely the home of the god, and religious worship was always celebrated outside of it, with the Christians religious life was centred in the church. At least once on Sunday mass was said at the altar, which was placed over the tomb of some martyr and contained relics.

The churches recalled by their primitive forms the chapels in the catacombs or the judicial basilicas of the Romans. They enjoyed some precious immunities; like pagan temples, they had the right of sanctuary.

**26. The Regular Clergy. The Monks.**—There grew up by the side of the secular clergy, which was already distinct from the mass of the faithful, although living with them in the *sæculum*, that is, the world (hence *secular clergy*), a strange population of ascetics, cenobites, anchorites, and monks. They lived far from the world, alone or in communities; poor, because they despised riches, torturing the body, which they considered the source of all sin, solely occupied in prayer and meditation. Monasticism penetrated the West from the East. In 360 Saint Martin established the first monastery of Gaul at Ligugé, and twelve years later one at Marmontiers, which became a nursery of bishops; in 401 Saint Honorat founded the celebrated abbey of Lerins. About the same epoch Saint Augustine introduced monasticism into Africa. In the fifth century there were monks everywhere. Sometimes ill-treated, more often honoured, they were the fiery propagators of the Christian faith throughout the land. Their order assumed more and more definite form. They were given statutes or rules; Saint Basil's, for example, in the East, Cassian's and Saint Benedict's of Nursia in the West. So, although the monks were not yet, as a rule, learned men, there grew up, little by little, a *regular* clergy alongside of the *secular* clergy.

**27. The Christian and the Citizen.**—A new society was therefore formed and contrasted with the old one. The ideas which the two stood for were very different. In the one the chief thing was the citizen—the state was organised to assure him the full exercise of his rights; in the other, it was the man corrupted by original sin, incessantly led astray by the Evil Spirit, the Devil, the Enemy, later so called. Man had to be regenerated through baptism and prepared during this life for the life eternal.

Christianity arose after the disappearance of the free citizen. Its interests were centred in the City of God. It preached to man love for his neighbour, indifference to worldly goods and submission to the law of the land, in so far as the law did not interfere with dogma or conscience. Hence the slaves, the poor, all the disinherited of the ancient city founded on privileges sought comfort in its teachings. The Church was therefore separated from the state, and soon aspired to its control.

**28. The Councils and the Pope.**—The general or ecumenical councils were assemblies of bishops, and later of heads of monasteries or abbots also. They were convoked to decide upon points of the creed. The doctors of the Church advised the separate churches to unite in one Church, catholic and universal; some among their number already thought that the bishop at Rome, successor to Saint Peter, should be primate, that is, Pope. From the fifth century on he was recognised as having a right to decide appeals from all the churches, and so a supreme jurisdiction.

**29. The Christian Church and Heresies.**—The religion of Christ, having finally conquered paganism, determined to destroy the last traces of it. On the 27th of February, 391, a formal edict forbade all rites of worship of the heathen gods; the temples were destroyed, or sometimes adapted to the celebration of the new religion. The Church had also to struggle with peculiar doctrines or heresies resulting from the speculations and teachings of philosophers and theologians, and from the latent influence of the old religions. The popes assumed to be the champions of the true doctrine or orthodoxy, and attempted in the councils to define the obscure points of dogma and the rules of ecclesiastical discipline, and to

condemn and punish the believers in heretical doctrines. Among the most persistent and troublesome heresies was *Arianism*, or the doctrine of Arius, who denied the dogma of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ. Several emperors favoured it, and through the influence of the apostle of the Goths, Ulfilas, it was embraced by almost all the Germanic people settled within the Empire. Religious quarrels may be added to the other causes which tended to enfeeble the Roman state.

**30. The Conditions of Persons.**—There were also important changes in the condition of persons and lands. On the lowest rung of the social ladder slavery still existed, in spite of pagan philosophy and Christianity. But the master had no longer right of life and death over his slave; he might sell him, provided he did not separate him from his family; from the time of Constantine he could free him by a simple declaration to that effect made in the church in the presence of the bishop and congregation. The plebs comprised several classes. In the country the *coloni* were free personally, but attached to the land which they tilled as tenants of the proprietor; in the towns the artisans were for the most part organised in corporations. There were many corporations in Gaul, such as that of the mariners of the Seine. The class of merchants and smaller proprietors was constantly decreasing in number. The curials, a higher class, formed a kind of municipal nobility; but the actual nobility was restricted to the senatorial order, made up of those who sat in the Senate at Rome, all the high functionaries, and some others. The members of this nobility bore the title of *clarissimi*; the ministers, like the members of the imperial family, were called, in addition, *illustres*. Those whom the emperor wished to honour signally were titled *patricians*. In the fourth century the

title of count was usually associated with judicial and administrative functions.

**31. Classes and Privileges.**—The rights of individuals varied according to the class in which they belonged. Pagans, Jews, and heretics were excluded, in the fifth century, from all public offices, *jus honorum*. Justice was not equally distributed. Nobles were exempt from personal chastisement and torture; trials of *clarissimi*, soldiers, and clergy were held before special tribunals, and the mass of office holders were relieved of certain compulsory labours and payments. The social status was almost hereditary; nobility was transmitted from father to son; the artisan was perpetually bound to his guild; the *colonus*, sold with the land which he cultivated, was a serf to all eternity. The freemen of the Empire who did not possess the rights of citizenship were mostly barbarians, living in the interior or on the frontier (*lati*). They retained their national customs, but were liable to military service; marriage between Romans and barbarians was forbidden.

**32. Condition of Lands. The Roman Villa.**—Wealth was the stamp and moving power of the aristocracy, and consisted chiefly of land. In fact, industry was considered debasing, trade was disdained, and business enterprises were forbidden to Senators. The latter must have at least a third of their fortunes invested in lands. The aristocrats had therefore extended domains (*villæ*), comprising their dwellings, farm buildings, and slave quarters, built in the midst of fields marked off by sacred boundary lines. As a rule they disliked the proximity and competition of smaller proprietors. Members of the Municipal Senate, they apportioned the taxes as they saw fit, and overburdened the smaller farmers, or even exempted themselves, from taxation. The smaller land owners once

ruined had no resource except to ask the "patronage" of their powerful neighbours. The latter would appropriate a part of their over-taxed land and leave them a life interest in the remainder. From freemen they became *coloni*, and when the new proprietors were also high functionaries of the state the dependence of this new kind of "clients" became more strict; they became almost subjects. The dwellings of these magnates gradually assumed the character and aspect of fortresses; the owners punished and judged their *coloni*, freedmen, and slaves; they protected them or else used them as soldiers, and with their aid repulsed the barbarians. Thus organised, the villa was already becoming a seignory.

**33. Forests.**—Beyond the cultivated fields, especially far from the towns, there were doubtless many waste lands and vast forests. In troublous times these served as places of refuge for fugitive slaves and *coloni*. In many localities they replaced the villages which had been destroyed by invasions. Later on the monks cleared and cultivated them.

**Summary.**—The Roman world seemed well ruled, but however skilfully organised it might have been, it was falling asunder. The Empire was not a unit. The provinces, although sincerely attached to the imperial régime, had little interest in its continuance; two languages were spoken in the East and West; two religions claimed man's conscience. Imperial despotism had stifled all initiative in men who had lost political rights and were immovably bound to their offices, their trades, or their lands. The state had no equilibrium. One hundred years of barbarian invasions sufficed to destroy it.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE BARBARIANS.\*

IN the first rank of the invaders of the Empire stood those whom Rome called the Germans.

**1. Customs and Personal Appearance of the Germans.**—According to Cæsar, and Tacitus, who wrote a century and a half later, the Germans were tall and fair; they had blue eyes and a fierce glance. Their training was severe. They bore arms at an early age, and from that time on never laid them aside, for they were buried with them. Cruel in war, they were hospitable among themselves, and respected their sworn faith; but they were proud and would neither obey nor pay tribute.

**2. Condition of Persons.**—There were several orders of rank among the Germans.

(1) *The Nobles.* The origin of the Germanic nobility is obscure, but its existence in the time of Tacitus is certain. At first it seems to have been the favoured position of several illustrious families which claimed a divine origin. It was hereditary, and carried with it various

\* SOURCES.—Cæsar, "Gallic War"; Tacitus, "Germania"; Amianus Marcellinus, "Rerum Gestarum," libri xxxi. In the barbarian codes, like the "Salic law," are to be found many indications of the social condition of ancient Germany.

LITERATURE.—G. Waitz, "Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte," vol. i. On the bibliography of German history reference should be made to Dahlemann-Waitz, "Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte," sixth edition by Steindorff, 1894. On the bibliography of this chapter see Gross, "Sources and Literature of English History," pp. 171-173.

privileges. The life of the nobles was considered more precious than that of simple freemen; they usually possessed more land; marriage with persons of another class was sometimes forbidden. The number of noble families does not seem to have been great; it was much reduced in Tacitus's time, and in some tribes nobility had even disappeared.

(2) *The Freemen.* Although distinguished from freemen, the nobles were not a separate caste. The two orders composed the people and the army, and they exercised together supreme authority in the assembly of the country. The quality of freeman was expressed in the right to bear arms and exercise personal vengeance. Each freeman had his share of the tribal lands, and the idea was early formed that the possession of lands was necessary to full liberty.

(3) *The Non-freemen.* The Germans had freedmen and slaves. As at Rome, slaves were treated as chattels, not persons; they could not bear arms, and were any found in their possession they were broken over their backs. They might have a dwelling of their own, however, on condition of paying the master a rent in wheat, flocks, or clothing; in this way they resembled the Roman *colonus*. The slaves were either prisoners of war, or criminals condemned to loss of liberty, or wretched creatures who had lost it through gaming. The master could free them, but a freedman (*libertus, letus*) held a subordinate position. He could not marry a free woman; he took no part in the affairs of state; and full liberty was only granted to members of the third generation.

**3. The Germanic Family.**—Individuals were grouped in families. Marriage, that is to say, the legitimate union of man and woman, constituted the family. Marriage was contracted in the presence of parents and relatives



under the symbol of a purchase; the husband bought, in fact, the right of possession and guardianship over his wife; the price was paid to the parents. The principle of dowry was not known to the Germans, but the wife gave presents to her husband, usually weapons. Tacitus writes: "The auspices at her wedding warned her that she should share in work and danger, and that the law, in peace and in combat, was to suffer and dare as much as her husband." On the other hand, it was not rare for the husband to make a gift to his wife the day after the wedding, the *Morgengabe*, which later became obligatory.

**4. The Authority of the Head of the Family. The Inheritance.**—A simple freeman must content himself with one wife. Polygamy was allowed to the nobles only. In certain tribes a widow could not marry again; "the woman has one husband as she has one body, one life, so that she may love her marriage and not her husband."\* The husband might put away his faithless wife; divorce was rare, but permitted. The father of a family had extended rights over his wife, whom he might sell in case of necessity; over his children, whom he might abandon; and over his freedmen and slaves. This authority did not extend over the son who was of age, or the married daughter. When the father grew old he no longer counted as an active member of society, but was replaced by his son. The Germans made no wills; the nearest blood relatives inherited full rights; women could not inherit land, but their masculine relatives could. Boys were therefore better provided for than girls, but in other ways the two sexes were equal. There is no certain trace of the right of primogeniture.

**5. The Family in the State.**—The family was not only

\* The quotations of this chapter are from Tacitus's "Germania."—ED.

a private association; it had its place and its part in the state. It was a fundamental principle among the Germans that every free man had the right to exact respect forcibly for his liberty, person, and property. If he were restrained in the exercise of his rights, injured in his property or person, he might avenge himself, arms in hand; his family was then expected to help him. The family received the fine paid for murder, or helped to pay it. In a lawsuit the relatives appeared before the judges to swear to the honour of the defendant and strengthen his oath with their own (*cojuratores*). Lastly the family was the constituent element of the army. The warriors were grouped by families into squadrons of cavalry or triangular battalions of infantry.

**6. The Tribe and its Subdivisions.**—A certain number of families living on the same territory comprised a village (*Dorf, vicus*). The territory occupied by the members of a same tribe is designated in Tacitus by the term *civitas*, and the *civitas* was divided into *pagi* (or cantons), which were made up of several *vici*. It is possible that originally these *pagi* were formed by the union of one hundred families; whence the name ("hundred" *hundert-schaft, centena*), which we find later used among various Germanic peoples to designate a territorial district of small extent. When the tribes were grouped into confederations and kingdoms, the term *pagus* (in German *gau*) was applied to the former *civitates*.

**7. The Popular Assemblies.**—Each of these groups had its own assembly. That of the *vici* controlled local affairs in particular; that of the *pagi*, judicial matters. The assembly of the *civitas* possessed supreme authority; it promulgated the laws, formed alliances, made peace and war, administered criminal justice, ratified enfranchisements and declarations of majority, and decreed the out-

lawing of individuals. It was variously named *ding* or *thing* among the Scandinavians; *gemot* among the Saxons, *mall* among the Franks. It was composed of all freemen who had attained their majority who were capable of bearing arms, and who were not excluded because of public crimes. Unless some sudden unforeseen event called them together, they met on fixed days, "when the moon was new or at the full; they believed that affairs could not be discussed under a more fortunate influence." The meeting was held on a hill, in a clearing, or near some locality consecrated to the gods.

To assert their personal independence the Germans took their time in gathering together: "instead of meeting at once, as if obeying an order, they lost two or three days in assembling. When the meeting seemed large enough they opened it, all bearing arms. The priests who maintained order commanded silence." The spokesman stood in the centre. The king, or the one among the chiefs the most noted for his nobility, exploits, age, or eloquence, presided. The freemen, seated around, expressed disapproval by cries, or approval by waving their lances. "This suffrage of arms was the most honourable expression of assent." At stated periods of the year the assembly had unusual import, as when celebrating religious ceremonies or presenting annual gifts to the king. But if a tribe comprised several districts, it is probable that the gathering of all its members was not as frequent; later when tribes were united and became nations, the meetings grew rarer and rarer, and finally disappeared completely.

**8. The Chiefs of the People: Kings and Dukes.**—Kings, dukes, and princes were the tribal leaders. Originally the most of Germanic peoples had no kings, but royalty spread little by little. In many cases it was instituted

when the tribes of one same people united under a common authority. The Salian Franks, on the contrary, who formed but one people, had several kings. The office was elective, but the people rarely chose a king outside of a privileged family, assumed to be of divine origin.

The usurpation of the crown was of rare occurrence, but it was not unusual for a dissatisfied people to dismiss their king. The newly elected king was presented to his subjects, raised on a shield, which was borne on the shoulders of the warriors. The king shared with the priests in the celebration of the worship of the gods. He was acknowledged the supreme judge of his people. Public peace was under his protection. He received and despatched ambassadors; he concluded alliances and treaties, subject to the assent of the people; in war time he led the army, unless superseded by elected chiefs. Among certain peoples, the Bavarians, for instance, who never had kings, hereditary dukes commanded; but the term duke signified ordinarily a military leader chosen by the warriors on the eve of an expedition. "Kings were chosen because of their birth, dukes because of their valour." These chiefs controlled through personal influence rather than through formal orders; the priests only, even in the army, had the right to inflict severe punishment.

**9. The "Principes."**—The important rôle in the administration of the tribe or pagus belonged to those whom Tacitus designated *principes*. The term, taken in its general sense, applied to the richest and most powerful warriors. These, united in an assembly, decided on the current affairs of the tribe; the weighty decisions, after being discussed by the *principes*, were voted on by the general assembly of the *civitas*. This assembly selected a *princeps* to govern the tribe as *princeps civitatis*, where there was no king; and it assigned a stated number of

*principes*, accompanied by one hundred assessors, to administer justice in the pagi. In the assembly of the people the *principes* proposed resolutions; in religious ceremonies they represented the people or the state. In war they commanded the soldiers from the pagus or the civitas, but subject to the ducal authority. In order to maintain their rank they received from freemen voluntary offerings, produce of the soil, flocks, etc.; in short, they were surrounded by companions who assured them honour in peace and protection in war.

**10. The Comitatus.**—The right to have a following of companions (*comitatus*) belonged also to dukes and kings. There was nothing servile in figuring among the companions, who were often young men of the best families. “Illustrious birth or the brilliant deeds of their fathers recommended even very young men for the service of the *princeps*; admitted to his companionship, they became the associates of more powerful young men who had already proved their ability.” There might be also men of inferior condition along with these sons of illustrious families. The engagement was voluntary; though it was of a lasting character, it might be dissolved; it was sealed by a vow of obedience and fidelity. The companions lived with the prince, in his house, at his table. Certain ones controlled the domestic affairs of the house, such as the stable and the kitchen. The prince instituted a ranking system, and hence stimulated them to perform good service. The companions were not numerous, and it is only by a faint analogy that one can compare this comitatus relationship to vassalage. It soon disappeared entirely, and left traces only in the courts of the kings.

**11. Justice. The Right of Personal Vengeance.**—Kings and princes defended the public peace, “a gift of the gods”; but besides public justice was private justice,

which was exercised by the family. The injured individual could wreak his vengeance, and call in his family to aid him; his adversary might do the same. The Corsicans have to-day like customs. Enmities were not irreconcilable. Vengeance might be compounded for in money, the sum being determined according to the *wergeld*, or the value of the individual in the eyes of the law. If adversaries preferred to appeal to the courts, the quarrel was laid before the assembly of the *pagus* or the *civitas* where the prince or king presided. The assessors of the prince and the members of the assembly were arbitrators rather than judges; their work was less that of punishing the crime than of reconciling the belligerents. Proof was made by the plaintiff's oath, whose good faith was supported by the oath of friends, or by the duel, or by various tests, called ordeals—in which God was supposed to denounce the culprit. The sentence, which was pronounced, not by the king or prince, but by all the members of the assembly, was final. Punishments varied according to the nature of the crime. Traitors and deserters were hanged; cowards were buried in a slough or drowned under a hurdle. In all cases the judges fixed the payment according to the nature of the crime and the rank of the victim; it was made in horses or cattle; the offender had to pay besides to the state the *fredum*, or peace money. Should the condemned man fail in payment, he lost the benefits of public protection, and was liable to be killed by anyone; that is, he was outlawed.

**12. Military Service. The Army.**—"No German," says Tacitus, "may bear arms until the *civitas* has recognised him as capable of so doing. Then one of the princes, or the young man's father, or one of his relatives, equips him, in the midst of the assembly, with shield and javelin." Henceforth he became a part of the army. In

battle each corps was arranged in the form of a triangle, and was joined to the other corps in such a way as to form a triangle or general "corner." The entire army was led by one chief, duke, or king; at times there were two; yet the army might express its will. There was little discipline; the priests judged offenders. Tactics were rarely used; each body charged as seemed fit, but with great impetuosity. The leaders inspired others by their own example. "On the field of battle it was shameful for the prince to be outdone in courage, shameful for the band of companions to be unequal in courage to their prince. But one shame which could never be effaced was to survive him and return alone from the combat."

**13. The Weapons.**—The arms varied according to the peoples. There was the sword, either the large iron or bronze sword of the Saxons and Cherusci, or the long knife, like the *scramasaxus*; the *framea*, a weapon with a long head and staff, a kind of javelin peculiar to the Germans; the axe, or among the Franks, the *francisca*; the bow, the javelin, etc. The somewhat short lance was a cavalry weapon. The shield was ornamented with colours and emblems. The helmet was for a long time rarely found. The art of besieging was but slightly developed, although engines of war were not unknown. The Germans had some fortified places, but they preferred to fight in the open country, to assume the offensive rather than the defensive.

**14. The Economic Condition of Germany. Property and Agricultural Riches.**—The Germans were not nomadic, although loving combats and distant expeditions. They had fixed habitations; each house was enclosed and separated from the neighbouring ones. They raised many flocks and herds, which constituted their riches and,

so to say, their currency; they cultivated also fields of cereals. These fields, in the time of Cæsar and Tacitus, did not actually belong to individuals. They seem to have been allotted to each village according to the number of labourers, then subdivided among the latter according to rank. Every year there was a reapportionment. The uncultivated lands were doubtless used for pasturage. Thus the German was owner of his house and enclosure and of the furnishings and implements therein. Hence individual property was recognised, but it was a long time before land became the mark and source of wealth. There were few towns and highways, but immense forests, and hence little or no industry or commerce.

**15. Religion. The Gods.**—Religion was that of the primitive peoples of the Indo-European race. The Germans worshipped the deified forces of nature. The three great gods which Tacitus calls Mercury, Mars, and Hercules were Wodan or Odin, Donar or Thor, Tyr or Zui. *Odin* was the sun, the mind of nature, which penetrates all, the powerful breath which roars in the tempest, which bursts forth in anger and passion, the god of combat and victory. He is represented wrapped in full blue mantle, bearing sword and lance, mounted on a steed with a golden mane, like the rays of the sun. At times he would dress in rags and come to earth to see if hospitality were always practised. He journeyed also through the sky; the Milky Way was the path of his army or wild chase; his chariot was the Great Bear. As the god of mind, he had discovered the *runes*, or letters of the alphabet, written on bits of wood, especially the beech (*Buchstaben*), by means of which the priests and nobles could question fate and divine the future; besides this he was the god of poetry and eloquence. *Thor*, or the thunder, was beneficial to man. With his hammer, the symbol



of the thunderbolt, he would cleave the rocks and fertilise the land. He was the god of agriculture, of marriage, of property, of commerce. His beard was red like the lightning, and animals with red fur, such as the squirrel and the fox, were sacred to him. All the other gods rode on horseback; he alone walked. *Ziu*, or the "brilliant," was both the god of the sky and of war; he commanded the winds and the tempests; he was armed with a sword. Besides these gods, Tacitus names *Isis* and the goddess *Nerthus*, Hertha, the goddess of earth who brought forth *Freya*, goddess of fecundity, joy, and abundance; and *Tuisco*, father of *Mann* (man), who was the ancestor of the race of *Teutsche*, or Germans.

**16. The Heroes and Immortality.**—These legends were kept in the memory and handed down in the form of epic song, which celebrated the exploits of gods, kings, and heroes. They tell especially of Woden, the supreme god, preëminently the god of war; in him was incarnate the "*furor teutonicus*"; he had taught men the art of fighting, and fought himself. Those who fell in battle, or who died of their wounds, were admitted to the sky, the home of the elect (*wahl-halle*); there dwelt the Valkyriæ and Frigga, the wife of Woden, who received the heroes and offered them the drinking horn. The shades here passed their days in war and their nights in feasting, and the German wished no worthier reward for his valour. But these gods were no more immortal than the world created by them. They might be corrupted, like men, by evil ways, and would be condemned and perish with the world. But as day succeeds the night, they would be born again, purified, and live forever. The elements of these primitive epics are found, mingled with old Christian traditions, in the *Eddas*, which are collections of Scandi-

navian traditions written in Iceland from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries.

**17. The Priests. Worship.**—In Tacitus's time this religion of nature and morals had scarcely begun to own temples. The priests performed the sacrifices. They sought to know the will of the gods by means of different signs; the flight of birds, the neighing of sacred horses, the combination of runes. They also maintained order in the army and the assembly, for peace and law were divine gifts. They enjoyed great moral authority, without, however, being a caste apart from the remainder of the people.

**18. Conclusion.**—Such were, briefly stated, the Germanic institutions, as far as they can be traced in Cæsar and Tacitus. The state of perpetual war in which these peoples lived from the end of the second century, modified, without effacing, many essential traits. The Germans took with them to Roman soil their taste for independence; the desire to be as little governed as possible; a social organisation wherein the power of the state was weak and the personal ties between man and man were strong. The Germans were both warlike and agricultural; equally suited to a military or a sedentary life; eager for riches and honours. They greatly modified Roman society, which they penetrated in all its parts, and were in turn transformed under its influence.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE VANDALS, THE VISIGOTHS, AND THE HUNS (376-476).\*

1. **The Romans in Germany.**—No sudden invasion cast the barbarian peoples of Germany on the provinces of the Empire at the end of the fourth century. One has only to recall the long exodus of the Cimbri and the Teutones, the destruction of the Suevi by Cæsar, the struggles of Drusus, of Germanicus, and of Tiberius against the Chatti, Cherusci, and the Marcomanni. At first the Romans had the advantage. The legions crossed the natural limits even of the Empire, and to control better

\* SOURCES.—Eusebius of Cæsarea, “*Historia ecclesiastica*”; translated into Latin and continued by Rufinus of Aquileia; edition Heinichen (1868). The “*Chronography*” of the same author; book i. has been kept in an Armenian translation, published by Maï (1833); book ii. in a Latin translation by Saint Jerome, who continued the work; edition Schoene (1866). It was still further carried on by Count Marcellinus, by Bishop Idatius, by Prosper, etc. Paul Orosius: “*Historiarum, libri vii. adversus paganos*”; edition Zangemeister (1882). Ammianus Marcellinus: “*Rerum gestarum,*” libri xxxi.; edition Gardthausen (1874). Jordanis: “*De Getarum origine et rebus gestis*”; edition Th. Mommsen in the “*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.*” Claudian: “*De bello getico; de consulatu Stilichonis,*” etc.; edition Jeep (1876). Works of Sidonius Apollinaris; edition Baret (1879); Ennodius; edition Hartel (1882).

LITERATURE.—Hodgkin, “*Italy and Her Invaders,*” 8 vols.; Bury, “*The Later Roman Empire,*” 2 vols.; Gibbon, “*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,*” edited by Bury, 7 vols.; Gwatkin, “*Arianism*”; Fustel de Coulanges, “*L’Invasion Germanique*” (1891).

the peoples whom they could not conquer they built an extended line of entrenchments. This was the *limes romanus*, or *Pfahlgraben*, doubtless begun by Domitian, continued by Trajan, and completed by Hadrian. It extended from the confluence of the Lippe with the Rhine to the confluence of the Altmühl with the Danube, and protected a vast territory called by the Romans the lands (*decumates*). This country became rapidly prosperous; it was dotted with rich villas and opulent towns; it adopted entirely the language and the arts of Rome. Roman influence penetrated beyond this strategic and administrative frontier, and would doubtless have ended by civilising the whole of Germany if fresh invasions had not swept away everything.

**2. The Germans in the Empire.**—The Germans, on their side, profiting by these almost peaceful conditions, penetrated the Empire as *coloni* and soldiers. Some embraced agriculture of their own free will; others were driven like herds into the provinces after each great victory and compelled to repeople the places laid waste by war; still others enjoyed the peace of the Romans under the condition of obeying the orders of the governors, paying taxes, and furnishing soldiers. The latter formed special bodies, called *federati*, or *leti*. They were often recruited in their own country and commanded by native chiefs. They were like colonies of barbarians in the Empire, with their own religion, language, and customs, in the same way as formerly colonies of Roman citizens had settled in the midst of conquered peoples. This slow infiltration of the Germans into the Empire was previous to the great invasions, and uninterrupted by them; but it left deeper traces than the latter, for the invaders passed away and the *coloni* remained.

**3. Beginning of the Great Invasions.**—The causes of

the great invasions are obscure, but their effects were disastrous. The Slavs, urged forward by the Mongols, set the Goths in movement, who from lower Germany, where they were in Tacitus's time, reached in the second century the borders of the Black Sea. This great tide of emigrants roused up other Germanic peoples not yet rooted to the soil. Then the Romans, who for one hundred and fifty years had always assumed the offensive, were attacked in their turn. The Marcomanni and the Quadi crossed the Danube in 162; this was the opening of the great invasions. In the third century, especially during the epoch of military anarchy and the thirty tyrants, the *limes romanus* was destroyed, the tithe lands were wasted, the frontiers pushed back to the Rhine and the Danube, which were no longer a sufficient barrier against an ever-renewed enemy.

**4. Germany in the Fourth Century.**—Germany now changed her aspect. Instead of the former tribes, which had only been able to form temporary leagues in the time of Marbod and Arminius, were now nations with their kings who marched to the assault of an empire. Along the Rhine lay first the Franks, divided into Ripuarian Franks near Cologne, and Salian, on the island of the Batavi and in Toxandria (Zeland, Holland, and Dutch Brabant); then the Alemanni in the valley of the Neckar and the upper courses of the Danube and the Rhine as far as Lake Constance; lastly, the Burgundians, between the Rhine and the Neckar. On the left bank of the Danube were the Vandals, who migrated from the Baltic; then to the east the former Marcomanni and the Quadi, the Bavarians, the Longobards or Lombards, on the lower Danube and the Carpathians, and last the Goths. In the interior and on the north the Angles extended as far as the Cimbric peninsula; the Frisians were spread from

the mouths of the Weser and the Elbe to the Rhine delta; the Saxons occupied all the territory between the Lippe and the Ems as far up as the Elbe and the Saale; they were enemies of years' standing of their neighbours on the West, the Franks. The Goths set in motion the great migration of peoples, which began in 375 with the eastern Germans, and out of which arose modern Europe.

**5. The Gothic Empire. Ulfilas.**—The Goths were established on the shores of the Black Sea, from the Danube to the Don; the Dniester separated them into two large states; on the east the *Ostrogoths*, on the west the *Visigoths*. The *Ostrogoths* were at first clients of Rome, who paid them an annual tribute to defend on their side the frontier of the Empire. Their kings of the noble house of the Amals subdued the Gepidæ, the Visigoths, the Heruli, kindred races who were soon to follow them across Europe. One among them, Hermanric, 350-374, extended his power so far that he could boast of having conquered "all Germany and Scythia." At the same time Christianity penetrated the land. A Gothic bishop had already sat in the Nicene Council (325). About this time was born (between 311 and 318) among the Visigoths of the Danube the man who was to become the apostle, the Moses, of the Goths, Ulfilas, or Wulfila. Consecrated bishop about 341, he converted his compatriots, and to forward his teachings he translated into Gothic the text of the Holy Scriptures. A part only of this translation remains. It is an important document for the history of the Germanic languages and literature; it is also to the initiated a precious mine of information regarding the institutions of the Gothic people. But Ulfilas was an Arian, and the spread of Arianism among the Goths led to serious consequences for the future of these peoples.

**6. The Huns Destroy the Gothic Empire.**—One of the nations subdued by the Ostrogoths, the Roxelani, having been harshly treated, by Hermanric, called in to aid them the Huns, a Finnish race which lived on the two slopes of the Ural and in the valley of the Volga. They were nomads and hunters; their customs were brutal and they had no religion; their dominant passion was love of gold. For the Goths these creatures with terrifying faces were scarcely men. They thought them the offspring of impure spirits and witches who, wandering over the steppes of Scythia, gave birth to them in the “marshes, small, frail frightful beings, having nothing human but the faculty of speech.” Led by their chief, or Khan Balamir, the Huns descended on the Ostrogoths. Hermanric, enfeebled by age (he was about one hundred and ten, it is said) and by recent wounds, was conquered. He killed himself to avoid surviving the disaster of his people. The Ostrogoths then submitted. They were obliged to furnish an annual tribute and military contingent, but allowed to keep their territory, while the people formerly subject to them recovered their independence.

**7. The Visigoths Admitted into Roman Territory, 376.**—The Visigoths were the first of the great barbarian peoples who established themselves in the territory of the Empire. Some among them had already crossed the Danube, after successful wars against the Romans, and forced the emperor Valens to take them into his pay. They had already been baptised with their chief Fritigern. The remainder, who were pagans, with their king, Athanaric, attempted to check the invading swarms of Huns, first behind the Dniester, then behind the Pruth; but overcome with terror, the mass of them fled, leaving their king to withdraw into Transylvania. About one million men, two hundred thousand fit to bear arms, went

to join Fritigern, and after long deliberation were allowed to establish themselves in Mesia.

**8. Uprising of the Visigoths. Theodosius the Great.**—These wretched emigrants were not long in revolting; they began to ravage Thrace. The emperor Valens hastened against them, but with insufficient forces, and met them at Hadrionople. There the two armies rushed upon each other like the collision of two ships. Numbers gained the victory for the barbarians, and the Romans, exhausted by a hot day full of fighting, fled in confusion; the emperor himself was slain (August 8, 378). Theodosius the Great stopped the conquerors, who even threatened Constantinople. He restored discipline in the legions and revived their confidence through successful battles. At the same time he cunningly sowed discord among the barbarians. The Visigoths thronged into the Roman army, and Athanaric came to Constantinople as a friend and an ally. From that time on, during fifteen years, the barbarians remained faithful to the emperor; they helped him in 394 to triumph over a pretender, and when Theodosius died (January 18, 395), they mourned “the friend of the Goths.”

**9. Alaric. The Visigoths in Greece and in Illyria.**—Theodosius left two sons: Arcadius, then aged eighteen, and Honorius, aged eleven. He had decided that both should be emperors, and that the elder should reign in the East, the younger in the West; the first counselled by Rufinus, the pretorian prefect, the second under the guardianship of the best general of the Empire, Flavius Stilico, son of a Vandal in the pay of the Empire, whom he recommended to watch over Arcadius as well. He hoped in this way to facilitate governing, without destroying Roman unity; but the jealousy of the two brothers and the hatred of the two ministers reopened



the period of civil discord and barbarian invasions. Indeed, when the Visigoth mercenaries saw on the Byzantine throne an incapable young man guided by a minister whom fanaticism, cruelties, and unheard-of luxuries made odious, they grew insolent again. One of their chiefs, Alaric, of the royal family of the Balti, aged about twenty-five, demanded an important military command. It was refused him, and he then invaded Macedonia and Thessaly. He passed Thermopylæ unopposed, entered Athens as a visitor, though she paid dearly for her immunity, pillaged the temple of Eleusis, whose hidden riches had been betrayed by the monks, forced the entrance to the isthmus, and destroyed Corinth. Thousands of Greeks fled into Italy, imploring the help of the West against these strange auxiliaries of Arcadius. Stilico crossed the Adriatic in midwinter, drove before him the hordes of Alaric, shut them up in the mountains to the north of Olympia, and waited in his trenches until famine should subdue the barbarians. However, the Roman soldiers, too confident of immediate success, were poor guards, and allowed Alaric to escape. Arcadius thought it would be an artful diplomatic move to give the fugitive king the government of Illyricum, a province which Honorius claimed for the Empire of the West. In that way he got rid of Alaric while attaching him to his service, and obliged Stilico to leave the East, which was pacified (396).

**10. Alaric in Italy, 402-403.**—Alaric remained in Illyria four years. He made use of his time to distribute among his troops weapons from the important arsenals of the country. Placed on the confines of the two empires, he waited until fortune might show him whether to take the road to Byzantium or to Rome. He decided on Italy, since Stilico was occupied in Rhætia. A victory

gained near Aquileia opened the doors of Italy to him; his light cavalry carried terror into Rome even. Stilico hastened back. After vainly trying to stop Alaric's course by an attack at Polenga near the confluence of the Tanaro and the Stura (March 19, 402), he finally gained a victory over him and obliged him to retire, but he again showed him the favour of admitting him with all his warriors into the pay of the Western Empire.

**11. Stilico and the Emperor Honorius.**—Stilico's victory was celebrated at Rome with the greatest pomp. Honorius, consul for the sixth time, deigned to show himself to the people of the capital. Splendid games were celebrated. While the pagan poet Claudian, the official singer of Stilico, applauded this rare sight, the Christian poet Prudentius protested eloquently against the cruel custom of gladiatorial fights, which were never again held. The hero of these festivities, Stilico, was at the height of his power. He had married Serena, niece and adopted daughter of Theodosius; his oldest daughter, Maria, was the wife of Honorius; he himself was a patrician, and had been raised to the consulship; his military successes led him to be considered the pillar of the state. He had, moreover, a cultivated mind and was a friend of letters; this Vandal's son affected an admiration for the ancient heroes of republican Rome. But his greatness brought him many enemies, and the one most to be feared was the emperor, who suffered his presence, but did not love him, and felt himself effaced and mortified before his genius. Learning that numberless barbarians were approaching Italy, Honorius fled from the eternal city and took refuge behind the marshes and the walls of Ravenna, which became henceforth the true capital of the West.

**12. Stilico Victorious over Radagaisus, 405.**—The new armed emigration, which aroused such cowardly

alarm, was doubtless caused by the progress of the Huns down the valley of the Danube. It was made up of a confused mass of men, women, and children. There were said to be four hundred thousand of them, led by Radagaisus, a Goth by birth, and fierce pagan, who penetrated easily into Italy. Radagaisus had sworn to sacrifice to his gods all the Roman blood. Stilico, surprised, could not defend the passes of the Apennines, but after reinforcing his army with barbarian contingents, he followed him, forced him to raise the siege of Florence and withdraw to the neighbouring heights of Fiesole. There he shut up the enemy by a series of entrenchments, which he did not allow to be forced as in the Peloponnesus. Radagaisus, impelled by hunger, attempted to force his way through the Romans. He was taken, cast into prison, and decapitated shortly after. Those of his partisans who survived laid down their arms, and were sold into slavery.

**13. Stilico Assassinated, 408.**—Scarcely had Radagaisus succumbed in Italy when Gaul was invaded by the Suevi, the Alani, and the Vandals, and ravaged from the Rhine to the Pyrenees. The legions of Brittany chose an emperor, Constantine, whom Gaul and Spain were not slow to recognise. These ominous events aroused the indignation of those who still dared to call themselves old Romans. They saw barbarism triumphant everywhere. They accused the Vandal, Stilico, of favouring them. Forgetting his services to the state, they suspected him of wishing to raise to the imperial throne his own son in place of the pitiable Honorius. The Christians imputed to him the design of reëstablishing paganism; the pagans reproached him for his toleration of the Christian religion; the Senate, revived by him, was jealous of his power. Therefore, on the death of Arcadius, when a

**child** of seven years Theodosius II. mounted to the throne of the East, Stilico thought he might go to Constantinople and assume an easier rôle. With this in view he allied himself with Alaric; by promising him four thousand pounds of gold and the prefecture of Illyria, he made sure of his neutrality, at least. "That is not a peace," exclaimed Lampodius in the Senate, "it is a compact of servitude." Honorius, deceived by the enemies of Stilico, authorised a plot against the life of his father-in-law, the saviour of Rome. Stilico, lured to Ravenna, was declared a traitor and public robber, then massacred. Later his son suffered the same fate. His wife, who had sought refuge in Rome, was about to be strangled there by order of the Senate, when Alaric laid siege to the city. An order was finally issued to kill all barbarians throughout Italy suspected of complicity with Stilico. Honorius decreed that henceforth all civil and military offices should be given exclusively to Christians and Romans. Such was the Empire's revenge on the barbarian; the barbarian was avenged by Alaric.

**14. Alaric Disposes of the Empire. Rome Taken, 410.**—Alaric did in fact demand fulfilment of the treaty made with Stilico, and, as this was refused, he set out to invest Rome. Envoys from the Senate sought to intimidate him. "The population is large," they said, "and determined on defence." "So much the better," answered the barbarian; "the thicker the hay the easier it is mowed."

His conditions had to be accepted. The city promised to pay him five thousand pounds of gold, thirty thousand pounds of silver, four thousand silken tunics, three thousand fleeces dyed purple, and three thousand pounds of pepper. In order to pay the amount the Senate ordered the statues in the temples to be melted, and that

of Military Courage even was not spared! When the first payment was made Alaric withdrew into Etruria. ✓

The emperor, who had done nothing to prevent this capitulation, refused to ratify it. Alaric then turned back towards Rome, seized the port of Ostia, and forced the trembling Senate to proclaim emperor a certain Attalus, a Greek and a wit. He overthrew him later, when Honorius signified his willingness to treat with Alaric. But soon after, angered by the violation of the promises made him, he marched upon Rome for the third time. The city resisted valiantly, and was taken only by treason. During three days it was given up to pillage; Honorius's sister, the beautiful Galla Placidia, fell into the hands of the conqueror.

**15. Death of Alaric, 411.**—Later historians have painted in darkest colours the destruction wreaked on Rome in these sad days. The contagion of terror was said to strike the king with superstitious fear, and he fled suddenly from the ruined city. In reality he sought other adventures; Campania and Lucania were ravaged. He gathered together a large fleet at Reggio and prepared to conquer Sicily, and doubtless Africa, the two granaries of Rome; the fleet was scattered by a tempest in the strait of Messina. Alaric died shortly after in a small villa of Lucania, at Cosenza. Sick and disappointment had overcome him. His warriors buried him, with his weapons and a treasure, in the Busento, which was diverted from its course for that purpose. When the work was accomplished the slaves who had dug the grave were killed, when the river was turned back into its old channel. Thus died in the flower of life the ravisher of Rome, the first of the mighty barbarian chiefs who shook the Roman Empire. ✓

Contemporaries, amazed at these tragic events, asked

their learned doctors to account for them. The illustrious bishop of Hippo, Saint Augustine, gave this explanation: Alaric entered Rome only to make war on idols—he was the instrument of God to chastise the pagans; as for the Christians who suffered, it was God's will!

**16. The Visigoths in the Service of the Empire, which Establishes them in Aquitania, 418.**—Athaulf, Alaric's brother-in-law, was elected king and his successor. He was a brave, skilful, and prudent man. He hastened to evacuate southern Italy and secure a line of retreat by the north, whence he passed into Gaul. There he married his prisoner Honorius's sister, Galla Placidia, and again bestowed the purple on Alaric's former figure-head, Attalus. In the name of this puppet emperor he undertook to regain Spain from the Suevi, the Alani, and the Vandals who had invaded it in 406; but he barely reached the country when he fell under the dagger of an assassin. His death changed everything. Walia succeeded him after a short and bloody interregnum, and treated with Honorius. He gave up to him the wretched Attalus; liberated Placidia, who married a general of Honorius, Constantinus; attacked the Alani, whom he easily overcame, and pushed on into Bætica. Suddenly, in 418, he recrossed the Pyrenees and proceeded to establish himself in Aquitania, "the pearl of Gaul," which the Romans yielded to him. The kingdom of Toulouse was founded, and the Visigoths finally settled after forty years of constant wanderings, which from the shores of the Dniester had brought them to the fertile banks of the Garonne.

Ten years later the Vandals began the conquest of Africa.

**17. The Vandals Called into Africa, 427.**—Honorius, twice married, died childless. His nephew, Valentinian

III., succeeded him; he was the son of Constantinus and Placidia, and being but six years old, was placed under the guardianship of his mother. This intriguing, incapable woman was soon circumvented by two ambitious men: Count Boniface, ruler of Africa, and General Aëtius, of barbarian descent, who had made his way rapidly because of his military talents and unscrupulous ambition. Instead of holding the balance between the two rivals, the empress listened to the perfidious tales of Aëtius: and Boniface, instead of trying to clear himself, revolted. He routed three successive armies sent against him. The Vandals profited by this civil war to go over into Africa. Eighty thousand warriors, commanded by Gaiseric, attempted the conquest of the province. This king, small and lame, was deep and taciturn. He scorned luxury, but was avaricious and high-tempered; he “knew how to win hearts, cast the seeds of discord, and stir up hatred” (Jordanis). Like his people, he was an Arian, and fanatically so. He is especially accountable for the excesses committed by his warriors in Africa.

**18. They Conquer the Province, 429-439.**—Boniface, who has been accused of favouring the invasion of the Vandals in the hope of finding in them willing tools, was horrified when he saw Africa invaded. He hastily organised resistance; beaten in the open country, he intrenched himself in the fortress of Hippo. The inhabitants and the garrison, animated by the courage of the bishop, Saint Augustine, repulsed the enemy, who was obliged to raise the siege after a blockade of fourteen months. During this time Saint Augustine had died (August 28, 430); Boniface had gone to seek aid, which did not prevent his being beaten again; a Byzantine army came, only to treat with Gaiseric. The fall of Carthage, the “African Rome,” which was sacked in 439, assured the triumph of

the Vandals. Master of the seaboard, Gaiseric took possession of the sea; his vessels seized Lilybæum in Sicily and menaced the coast of southern Italy. The emperor only succeeded in stopping him by yielding up all the province, less western Numidia, whose capital, Cirta, kept its Roman garrison. The Arian king pursued the catholic clergy with extreme rigour; priests and bishops were forced to escape or else be sold as slaves. Many took refuge in Rome, where Gaiseric was to find them later.

**19. Aëtius in Gaul.**—The imperial authority, ruined in Africa, was much shaken in Gaul. But Aëtius was vigilant there. After being delivered from his rival Boniface by a lucky stroke of fortune, he obtained the favour of the empress. He had been named patrician, raised three times to the consulate, and given the command of all the military forces of the Empire. He used them skilfully at first, for the defence of the state; the Ripuarians were held in check, the Burgundians hemmed within the mountains of Savoy, the Goths beaten under the walls of Arles and near Narbonne, and forced to adhere to the terms of their alliance with Rome; he even led them out to meet a new enemy, the Huns.

**20. The Huns. Attila.**—After having overthrown the Gothic Empire, the Huns advanced as far as the Danube. They lingered there for half a century. Like all the other barbarians established at the doors or on the lands of the Empire, they were in the pay of the Romans. There were Huns under Stilico at Fiesole, under Aëtius before Arles and Narbonne; Rouas, one of Attila's uncles, the guest, friend, and ally of Aëtius, was brevetted Roman general, with annual pay of three hundred and fifty pounds in gold. The Romans called this pay; Rouas, tribute—and both were right.

Attila himself passed many years in his youth as a



hostage at Byzantium and in the imperial armies. He was a son of Mundzuk. When Rouas died, in 434 or 435, he appropriated his heritage by means of crime, and succeeded through cunning and force in establishing his authority, not only over the Hunnic tribes, but over most of the Germanic peoples. Master of all the barbarian tribes swarming outside of the Roman frontiers, he directed them against the Empire.

**21. Attila and the Empire of the East.**—The Orient attracted him at first, and as long as Theodosius II. lived, whose one talent was beautiful penmanship, he dared everything; but in 450 a brave soldier, Marcian, assumed the purple, and as Attila demanded the tribute formerly yielded by Theodosius, he answered: "If Attila kept the peace he would send him presents; if he threatened war he would send out soldiers and arms" (Priscus). This firm tone, backed up by skilful defensive measures, stopped short the king of the Huns. Attila was called, besides, to the West. The emperor's sister, Honoria, thrown into prison for misconduct, sent him her ring and urged him to come to her assistance; the leader in some revolts, whom Aëtius had just driven out of Gaul, promised to deliver up to him the country; finally Gaiseric, who had deeply injured the king of the Visigoths, and who feared retaliation, urged him to punish that people, who had formerly escaped the domination of the Huns. Attila soon made up his mind and prepared for an expedition beyond the Rhine. He concentrated his force at the edge of the Black Forest, increased by Slavic and Frankish contingents, Ostrogoths, and Gepidæ, Rugii, Suevi, and Thuringians; it crossed the river on bridges of boats.

**22. Attila Invades Gaul, 451.**—His troops were divided into two bodies. One, after harassing the Burgundians, who were allies of the Romans, pushed on through Basel

to Besançon. The other, led by Attila in person, went up the Moselle, took and sacked Trèves; then Metz, whose inhabitants were put to the sword. At Rheims the people fled. The barbarians found only a few priests with their bishop, Nicasius, who were massacred. This devastating scourge did not pause in its work. Attila, eager to overwhelm the Visigoths before succour arrived, marched directly on Orleans by way of Châlons, Troyes, Sens, and reached the Loire early in May. The bishop Anianus hurried to Aëtius, who was slowly gathering an army in the south, assured him that Orleans would hold out five weeks, but that he must hasten, then returned to shut himself within the walls of the besieged city. Aëtius's promise, and his own ardent faith, which he communicated to others, sustained for some time the morale of the garrison, but the city was at the very point of yielding when the Roman army came up.

**23. Aëtius Stops Attila.**—Aëtius had induced Theodoric to join his Visigoths to the allies and legionaries whom he himself was leading. He had thus united, around a solid nucleus of Roman and Gallic troops, all the Germans established on the soil of the Empire—Goths, Franks, and Burgundians. A sudden attack on the disordered Huns was successful. Orleans was relieved and the prisoners delivered. Attila effected a retreat in good order, and tried to secure his booty. Aëtius overtook him again, five miles from Troyes, on the way to Sens,\* in the place called Mauriacus campus. A hill, which rises in the midst of the plain occupied by the two armies, was hotly contested, but Aëtius and Thorismund, son of Theodoric, carried it. Then Attila hurled all his troops on the

\* Such is at least the most probable opinion. When a battle is said to have been fought in the Catalaunian fields the expression is not definite, for it may be used to cover the whole of Champagne.

enemy; a hand to hand struggle took place, "a battle obstinate, furious, horrible, such as was never seen in memory of man; a little stream flowing through the middle of the plain was so swollen by the blood shed that it became a roaring torrent" (Jordanis). Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, was killed in the onslaught. His son tried to avenge him, and the fury of his men broke all resistance. Attila was almost killed. He fled to his camp, where his vanquished men sheltered themselves behind a rampart of chariots. Night separated the combatants. The following morning the Huns maintained such a bold front that Aëtius did not dare begin the fight. The new king of the Visigoths, Thorismund, was anxious to return to his kingdom so as to prevent his brothers from seizing the throne during his absence, and he withdrew his troops. Aëtius, weakened by their retreat, contented himself with blockading Attila in his camp. The king of the Huns remained there some time, then fell back with his booty and crossed the Rhine unmolested. Aëtius's victory was a momentous event. It saved what could be saved of the Empire; but it was less the victory of Rome than of the Germanic nations, half civilised and half Christian, united under the Roman eagles in a struggle against pagan barbarism. This battle of *Chalons*, won by a Romanised barbarian, Aëtius, with Roman and Germanic troops, presaged the future of Western Europe.

**24. Attila in Italy, 452.**—During the winter Attila reorganised his army. In the spring he invaded Italy by way of the Julian Alps and besieged Aquileia, which was carried by assault after three months' resistance, and completely destroyed. He then massed his troops between Mantua and the Po, intending to cross the river and march upon Rome. Nothing could stop his approach. Aëtius could gather in Italy no army such as

had won the victory in Gaul; no fortress barred the way to the capital. The emperor preferred to treat with him. An embassy, made up of two senators and the bishop of Rome, Leo I., called the Great or the Wise, bore to the leader of the Huns peace propositions, which he accepted willingly. The siege of Aquileia had cost him many lives; the soldiers who remained to him, laden with booty from the Italian cities, wished to ensure its safety; finally the emperor of the East, Marcian, threatened to invade Pannonia. Attila accepted an annual tribute, and withdrew from Italy, but threatened to return if Honoria and her treasures were not sent after him.

**25. Death of Attila, 453.**—While waiting he introduced into his harem a young barbarian girl of great beauty, named Hildegund. He was very attentive to this new wife, and drank more than usual at the banquet given in her honour. The day after the festivities he was found dead in his bed. Many refused to believe that this extraordinary man had died in a natural way. Hildegund was accused of assassination, Aëtius of instigating her to murder. The Huns gave their chief a burial worthy of him. His body was enclosed in a triple casket, “the first of gold, the second of silver, and the third of iron, to signify that this powerful monarch had possessed all: iron, with which he conquered other nations; gold and silver, with which he enriched his own.”

**26. Attila in Christian and Germanic Legend.**—Attila did not completely pass away. His name and the invasion of the Huns left deep traces in the imagination of the terrified inhabitants. Most of the barbarians established up to that time in the Empire had felt at least some influence from Roman civilisation—they were Christians. The Huns were furious pagans. People were not content to enlarge upon the horrors of this invasion, too

real indeed; they were made incredible. At Rheims a supernatural voice was said to have frightened the barbarians; at Orleans the prayers of the bishop and the faithful evoked an army; at Paris, a woman, a virgin, Saint Genevieve, turned aside the invaders; in Italy, if Attila listened to the bishop of Rome, it was because at the Pope's side rose a superhuman figure clad in pontifical robes, which threatened with his drawn sword the barbarian king if he did not yield to the exhortations of Christ's vicar. The Latin chroniclers, mostly priests, saw in Attila, as they had in Alaric, a scourge raised up by God to punish the sins of the world; blind justice, all the more fearful for being blind! The Germanic legends, on the contrary, have idealised the great figure of Attila. In the old poem of the *Nibelungen* he becomes the good king Etzel, protector of nations and benefactor of mankind. But if Attila's name survived, his empire disappeared with him. He left numerous sons. Born of different women, they fought for his great treasures. The Germanic nations who had been chained to his fortunes by force, profited by these quarrels to regain their liberty, and the wave of Hunnic invasion receded.

### 27. Revolutions in the Palace in the Western Empire.

—This respite for the Romans was of short duration. Valentinian III., jealous of Aëtius's success and alarmed at his ambitious designs, killed him with his own hand at Ravenna in 454. He in turn perished, struck down in full day on the Campus Martius by the soldiers of his escort, former servants of Aëtius. With him died out the male line of Theodosius the Great. A senator, Petronius Maximus, who was perhaps an accomplice of the murderers, assumed the purple. Gaiseric judged this an opportune time for descending upon Italy.

### 28. Sack of Rome by the Vandals, 455.—Two months

had scarcely passed since the death of Valentinian when he landed at the mouth of the Tiber and marched towards Rome. Leo I. was again sent out to meet the invaders, but Saint Peter probably did not appear, since the Pope was obliged to capitulate. The Vandals entered the city three days after the death of Maximus, who was stoned by the people while trying to flee. Rome was systematically pillaged for a fortnight. The imperial palace, the temple of Jupiter, many other buildings were stripped of everything. The spoils brought back by Titus from Jerusalem were put in chariots destined for Carthage; thousands of prisoners followed the baggage. Then the brigands took the way to their caves. When returned to his kingdom, Gaiseric took from the Romans what remained of their African possessions. This was the most important gain which he derived from the expedition.

**29. End of the Western Empire, 476.**—The twenty years which followed this bold stroke were years of extreme confusion for Italy. The real master of the Empire was first the Sueve, Ricimer, who amused himself in making and unmaking emperors; then Orestes, a former secretary of Attila. The latter bore the title of patrician and commanded the numerous barbarian auxiliaries quartered in Italy. He had a son from his marriage with the daughter of Count Romulus. The child was beautiful, and won the hearts of the soldiers, who gave him the purple in 473; but the "little Augustus," Romulus Augustulus, did not wear it long. Orestes, the son-in-law of a Roman count and father of the emperor, aspired to govern in the Roman way. He refused to reward his soldiers by distributing to them a share of the Italian lands. A chief of the Rugii, Odoacer, roused his companions stationed in Liguria, besieged Orestes in

Pavia, took the city, and had his rival put to death; then he marched upon and forcibly entered Ravenna. Although cruel towards the father, he spared the child. He sent him into Campania, with the rest of his family, gave him as a home the splendid villa which Lucullus and Marius had possessed on the shores of Cape Misene, and a pension of six thousand solidi. There, obscure and unknown, lived the last emperor of the West, who bore, by strange irony, the combined names of the founder of Rome and of the Empire.

**30. Imperial Unity Reëstablished. Odoacer.**—Odoacer had the title of king, but he would not govern Italy except as an officer of the Empire. The Senate accepted the formal abdication of Augustulus, then decreed unanimously to send an embassy and a letter to the emperor, Zeno. It declared useless to continue in Rome the imperial succession, “the dignity of one monarch was sufficient to protect both the West and the East”; it consented in its own name, and that of the Roman people, to the removal of the seat of the Empire to Constantinople; as for Odoacer, “the republic had confidence in his civil and military virtues,” and the Senate humbly requested the emperor to give him the title of “patrician, and the government of the diocese of Italy.” Imperial unity was thus reëstablished, but at what a price! The diocese of Italy was in fact one more barbarian kingdom. Africa belonged to Gaiseric, who, having forced upon the Greeks an advantageous treaty, died all powerful in 477; the Visigoths controlled part of Gaul, and even Spain; the Burgundians in the Rhone valley and the Saône; the Franks to the north of the Somme; and between the Loire and the Seine the Roman governor Syagrius assumed the royal title. The Empire of the West was in truth ended.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE OSTROGOTHS.\*

**1. Illegal Position of Odoacer in Italy.**—Odoacer had assumed the titles of king and patrician. He wished to satisfy his soldiers without angering the Italians, but in spite of his talents and moderation he failed in both aims. In the eyes of the conquered he was never anything more than a tyrant. The emperor refused to recognise him, and only awaited a favourable opportunity to overthrow him. It soon appeared.

**2. Odoacer Defeats the Rugii of Noricum, 488.**—Odoacer had been reigning for ten years when he was led to make war on the Rugii established in Noricum. In that province there was still a small remnant of catholic Romans grouped around a holy man, one of high character, Severinus. As long as he lived the Rugii dared not attack them, but on his death, in 482, they pillaged his monastery and ill-treated his disciples. Odoacer then interfered. Severinus had foretold to him his brilliant destiny. The master of Rome wished to save what remained of the saint's work. He fought the Rugii with an army of Italians and barbarians, drove them beyond the Danube with great carnage, and then brought back the Romans from Noricum with him. The emigrants did

\* **SOURCES.**—Jordanis (*v.* preceding chapter). Cassiodorus: Works; edition Garet (1879). Ennodius: "Panegyric of Theodoric" (in his Works). Eugippius: "Vita S. Severini."

**LITERATURE.**—Hodgkin, Gibbon, and Bury, as above. Hodgkin, "Theodoric the Great"; Hodgkin, "The Letters of Cassiodorus."



not forget the body of the saint who had protected them during his life. They bore it in great pomp to Feltria, then to Lucullanum, near the charming gulf of Baïa, as far as possible from the barbarians.

**3. Theodoric. The Emperor Sends him to Conquer Italy.**—In the meanwhile the remainder of the Rugii had sought shelter with the Ostrogoths. Since Attila's death these latter lived in Pannonia. Theodoric, born in 454, their king, had been brought up at Constantinople, where he passed ten years as a hostage. He had acquired a taste for art, politics, and Roman civilisation, without, however, casting off the barbarian, for he never learned to read, or form the letters of his name. He had rendered important services to the emperor Zeno, who, in return, loaded him with presents. He was made senator, patrician, master of the militia, and consul. But meantime his people were dying of hunger in the lands assigned to them on the lower Danube. They forced him to lead them on to the gates of Constantinople, destroying everything on their way. Theodoric demanded to be sent against Italy. "If I am victorious," he said to the emperor, "I shall gain Italy through your kindness; if I am conquered, you will lose nothing, you will gain the money which I cost you." Is it to be wondered at that Zeno consented? He handed over to him, therefore, this province by a solemn act called "Pragmatic,"\* and dismissed him, confiding the Senate and the Roman people to his care.


**4. Theodoric Wrests Italy from Odoacer, 488-493.**—Invited by the Rugii, authorised by the emperor, Theodoric soon finished his preparations. In the autumn of 488

\* This term, which has been occasionally used in modern times in the same sense, signified in the Greek Empire a particularly important and solemn ordinance or decree.—ED.

his people moved; women and children followed the warriors, and long files of wagons retarded the march. The mountains were crossed in midwinter. The Gepidae stopped them on the shores of the Save; Theodoric forced its passage by a bloody battle, in which he displayed heroic courage. Reaching the banks of the Isonzo, he there gave his people time to rest in the warm plains of Italy, which he had come, he said, to deliver from Odoacer's yoke. The task was long and difficult. At the price of much blood and struggle Theodoric crossed the Adigi, then the Adda. When Odoacer, beaten, took refuge in Ravenna, the officer of the Eastern Empire besieged it vainly for three years. The two adversaries, tired at last of the futile struggle, consented to treat. They agreed to divide between them the government of Italy, and Theodoric was received with great pomp within the walls of Ravenna. A few days later Odoacer was assassinated by Theodoric himself at a feast, and his partisans were massacred. Perfidy gained Italy for the Goths, whose brilliant victories had been unable to effect a conquest.

**5. The Policy of Theodoric. Division of the Subject.**—The conqueror indeed deserved the favours of fortune, for he was not only a fortunate soldier, but a statesman. Peace alone could preserve for him what he had conquered by force and cunning. With this in view, he had to discipline the Goths, restore the spirit of the Italians, and secure the frontiers against the attacks of other barbarians or, if necessary, of the emperor. The double training which he had received in the Gothic camp and at the Byzantine court fitted him admirably for this complex work.

**6. Theodoric and the Emperor. He Serves the Empire, but with Independence.**—In regard to the Empire of the East, his position was never clearly defined. Legally he



20

10

0

10

50

40

30



# EUROPE

in the reign of  
THEODORIC  
C.A.D. 500.

- Roman Empire
- Teutonic Settlements
- Celts

0

10



60  
60  
67  
3787  
62

was a lieutenant of the emperor, actually he was independent. He bore the title of king of the Italians as well as king of the Goths. He asked of Zeno's successor, Anastasius, and received, the purple; but the emperor kept for himself the title, Basileus, whilst Theodoric must be content with Rex; this fiction maintained the imperial dignity. Warned by Odoacer's example, he respected it. It was necessary to appear, to the eyes of the Roman populace, subordinate to the emperor; his letters were most humble, his money bore the imperial stamp, the emperor's name was placed beside his on public monuments, but he would not endure the slightest infringement by the emperor of his royal independence. He refused to recognise the annual consul chosen by the emperor for the West; he supported a barbarian chief Mundo, who was attacked by the Byzantine army; and later he forcibly repulsed an imperial fleet, which appeared off the coast of Calabria.

### 7. Theodoric Protects and Dominates Rome and Italy.

—Theodoric had greater interest in conciliating Rome than Byzantium, the Senate than the emperor. His letters to the Roman senators are drawn up in the pompous style affected by the old emperors. He allowed them to choose the high officers of the state, merely recommending to them his candidates. In 500, when he first came to Rome, the Senate, the people, and the clergy, led by the bishop, came out to meet him. The Gothic king made a triumphal entry into the city; the Arian knelt in the basilica of Saint Peter at the apostle's tomb; the barbarian harangued the Senate in the curia of Domitian. He declared in a voice energetic and clear that "with the aid of God he would maintain the institutions established by his predecessors, and as a guaranty of his promise he would engrave his words on bronze." He

kept with him the Romans who had served faithfully Odoacer, and changed nothing of the former administration; justice was rendered by the ordinary tribunals; the taxes were divided and levied as in the past. The military functions only were in the hands of the Goths, who formed an army of military colonists quartered on Roman soil, with their counts, who commanded and judged them. He distributed to his soldiers, as Odoacer had done, a third of the Italian lands, but this division was effected in an administrative way, by Roman functionaries. His minister Cassiodorus wrote on this subject: "We notice with joy that Liberius, by means of the *Tertia*, has united the goods and the hearts of Goths and Romans; no conflicts arise from the coöperation of the two peoples; on the contrary, common possession of lands causes the two to have regard for each other; what has been taken from the Roman gives him a defender in the person of the Goth." This official fiction was partly true, and indicates Theodoric's political intentions. It was important to have it thought that he was mingling into one people conquerors and conquered. His army was made up of barbarians alone, but elsewhere the two peoples had apparently the same rights and offices; the Goths were forced to respect the laws and pay taxes. Lawsuits between Romans and barbarians were tried by "Gothic counts" sitting with Roman judges. In the midst of universal fanaticism he was tolerant. The Arians were persecuted by the emperors, the Catholics by the Vandals, the Jews by everyone. Theodoric protected Catholics and Jews; he forced the Christians who had burned synagogues to rebuild them at their own expense; if he interfered in episcopal elections at Rome it was to establish order, disturbed by factions, and to compel the recognition of those elected by the majority.



**8. Beneficent Reign of Theodoric.**—Whilst calming the passions of his subjects, he tried to revive material prosperity—particularly fostering agriculture. The frequent partitions of land had done away with the great estates of later Roman times and restored the small rural proprietor. Theodoric had the marshes drained to give more lands for farming, repaired the highways, cleaned the canals to facilitate transportation, deepened the harbors to assure the arrival of grain at Ravenna and Rome. The old monuments were restored. There was a police in Rome to protect the statues in marble and bronzes which adorned the city. The fourteen aqueducts which supplied the city with pure water were carefully kept in repair. In Titus's amphitheatre (the Coliseum) games and chariot races were held, and Theodoric took up also the old custom of distributing food to the populace. *Panem et circenses!* Superb edifices were built at Ravenna, the usual residence of the sovereign; one is still in existence, the church of Saint Apollinaris the New; erected about 500.

**9. Letters and Arts.**—Theodoric had a taste for letters as well as art. The two finest ornaments of his realm were two Christians, Boëthius and Cassiodorus. Boëthius was born at Rome about 480; was a son-in-law of Symmachus, and consul in 510. Eloquent and learned, he became a favourite of the Gothic king. He entrusted him with the regulation of the monetary system, with the choice of a clepsydra and of a sun-dial to send to the Burgundian king, and of skilful singers for the king of the Franks. His works transmitted to the Middle Ages the science of the Greeks; he translated or commented on the writings of Aristotle on logic, of Nicomachus on arithmetic, of Euclid on geometry, of Ptolemy on astronomy; his last work, "Consolation of Philosophy" enjoyed for

ten centuries extraordinary popularity. Boëthius is the interpreter of the past, a scholar and a philosopher. Cassiodorus, son of a minister of Odoacer, was above everything a practical man. At twenty he became Theodoric's private secretary, and during almost half a century he was the principal minister of the Gothic kings. He used, in their service, all the resources of his comprehensive science, all his talents as a writer. The twelve books of "Letters," which contain the acts of his administration, are a precious fund of information about Roman institutions of the fifth century, and in his "History of the Goths," unfortunately lost, he collected the historic traditions of the new masters of Italy. Jordanis preserved an abridgment of it. In the monastery of Vivarius, where he lived after the fall of the Gothic empire, he wrote his "Institutes of Divine and Human Letters," in which he taught Christian theology and the seven fundamental branches of science, the so-called seven liberal arts; it was the groundwork of studies during the first centuries of the Middle Ages. The "Tripartite History," a Latin abridgment of the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoretus, which is supposed to have been compiled under Cassiodorus's direction, was for a long time, with that of Eusebius, the principal manual of ecclesiastical history. He incited the monks to intellectual work, and started a tradition which the most celebrated religious orders of the Middle Ages passed on. Christian civilisation gained much from his example.

10. **Theodoric, "Prince of Peace."**—Italy, prosperous, pacified, and embellished, left Theodoric at liberty to extend his influence over the barbarian world. One of his daughters married a Burgundian king, Sigismund; another, Alaric II., king of the Visigoths; his sister, a king of the Vandals, Trasamund; he himself married a sister

of Clovis, king of the Franks. He treated with Gaiseric's son, who yielded Sicily to him; obliged another Burgundian king, Gundobad, to give up the Italian prisoners he had taken under pretext of helping Odoacer; and gave refuge to the Alemanni defeated by Clovis, and settled them in Rhætia. This resolute, helpful conduct gave him a renown which no barbarian chief acquired down to Charlemagne. Several times he settled by his arbitration incipient quarrels; "in the western part of the Empire there was no people who refused him homage" (Jordanis). Legend, which had softened the terrible figure of Attila, exalted the great "Theodoric of Verona" (Dietrich of Bern), a hero by his moral qualities as well as by his courage.

**11. Last Years and Death of Theodoric.**—The last years of Theodoric made an evil ending to so great a reign. The Arian Goths and the Roman Christians, conquerors and conquered, had not been able to form one people. When the orthodox emperor, Justin I., began to persecute the Arians, Theodoric was angered. Several senators who were said to be in secret correspondence with the emperor were denounced to him as trying to overthrow the "tyrant." He punished severely these tardy friends of Roman liberty. Boëthius, who had arrogantly assumed the defence of his colleagues, was arrested, tortured, and put to death by means of an irregular trial. His father-in-law Symmachus, the most illustrious Roman of his time, suffered later the same fate. These bloody executions ruined Theodoric's work, by rendering impossible any reconciliation between Goths and Romans. The old king did not long survive his victims; he died August 30, 526. The Germans related that Woden's black horse came for him in the midst of a feast at Ravenna, to carry him off to the celestial palace; the Catholics said that he

was carried off by the devil mounted on a black charger. Party faction rent the memory of him who had been the prince of peace. The king's body was placed in a mausoleum, which is still in existence at Ravenna, but the tomb has been long empty.

**12. Odoacer and Theodoric. Powerlessness of their Rule.**—Odoacer and Theodoric were both remarkable characters. Brave in battle, wise in council, they tried to found, on the same basis, a regular government. Two things were lacking to Odoacer; he did not command one united nation devoted to him through the prestige of national royalty, and he never had a legal title to govern the Italians. That is why he failed. Theodoric had this double advantage; that is why he succeeded. But he, too, built on sand. The Italians endured, but did not love, his reign. His empire survived him scarcely twenty years.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE GERMANIC INVASIONS—THE BARBARIANS IN GAUL—CLOVIS.\*

DURING the fifth century a great number of Germanic peoples crossed through Gaul. Three settled there; the Visigoths, the Burgundians, and the Franks.

**1. The Visigoths in Gaul.**—The Visigoths were established in Aquitania by the Emperor Honorius (418). Their faithfulness to the Empire depended on circumstances. Theodoric I., successor to Wialia, was killed while fighting the Huns at the battle of Chalons. Theodoric II., as an ally of Rome, led several victorious expeditions into Spain. On the other hand, the Visigoths sold their alliance to Ricimer, who gave them Narbonne. They then turned against Aegidius, defender of Gaul after Aëtius; the Roman general, seconded by the Franks of Chilperic I., inflicted a bloody defeat upon them near Orleans (463). Euric, brother and murderer of Theodoric II., definitely abjured the Roman alliance; he subdued Spain, extended his dominion in Gaul to the Loire, which he crossed, and transmitted to his son, Alaric II., a vast empire on the two slopes of the Pyrenees, with Toulouse as its capital. The government of these kings, however,

\* **SOURCES.**—Gregory of Tours: "Historia Francorum"; editions Arndt and Krusch ("Monumenta Germaniæ Historica," 1881-1884), Omont and Collon (1888-1893). G. Monod: "Études critiques sur les sources de l'histoire mérovingienne." Two parts.

**LITERATURE.**—Kurth: "Clovis," 2d edition (1901); Kaufmann: "Deutsche Geschichte," vol. ii.

was the more often gentle and wise. To gain the Romans, Alaric II. had drawn up, in 506, a summary (*Breviarium*), of the laws included in the code of the emperor Theodosius II. These princes, however, were Arians; Euric persecuted the orthodox bishops, who did not forget it, even under the more moderate reign of his son.

**2. The Burgundians in Gaul.**—The Burgundians passed the Rhine about 413. They first occupied the country of Worms and Speyer. Gunther, the hero of the *Nibelungen*, reigned there. They were driven out by Aëtius, who transplanted them to Savoy, in 443. They had no longer their old sacerdotal constitution; their irremovable high-priest disappeared when they adopted Christianity; their chief, whom they removed if he were conquered, or if the year were bad, gave place to an hereditary king. After the death of Aëtius and Valentinian III., the Burgundians left the lands on which they had been settled and spread over into the Rhone valley, supported by the Visigoths and the Gallo-Romans themselves. “The senators shared their lands with them.” The period of their greatest power was the reign of Gundobad, who seems to have had friendly relations with the Romans. He had a summary of the Roman laws drawn up, as well as the customs of his people, but he was Arian, and could not count on the fidelity of the Catholics any more than could the Visigoths.

**3. The Franks before Clovis. Their Progress.**—In the fourth century the Franks had been divided into two large groups; one, remaining in Germany, passed over the Main and settled on the banks of the Regnitz, the Werra, and the Fulda; these were the ancestors of the Franconians and of the Hessians. The others crossed the Rhine; the Salians settled to the north of the Somme; the Ripuarians on the left bank of the Rhine up to the

Moselle and the Meuse. They were at first members of a federation. One of them, Arbogast, served brilliantly under the orders of Theodosius before revolting against him at the end of the fourth century. The first king of the Salian Franks known to history was Clodion, or Chlogion (428-448), and his successor, Merovius, fought the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Huns. Childeric I., son of Merovius (457-481), helped Ægidius in a battle fought near Orleans against the Visigoths; he was an ally of Count Paulus in an expedition against the Saxons, masters of Angers. The Franks were also the auxiliaries of the Romans in the north of Gaul, as the Burgundians were in the southeast. Childeric chose Tournai as the capital of his realm; his tomb was found there in 1653. He appears to have lived on good terms with the Catholic clergy, and Saint Genevieve induced him to pardon some criminals condemned to death. He remained a pagan himself, and had his son brought up in the same faith; but the Church preferred pagans to heretics.

**4. Organisation of the Franks at the Date of the Salic Law.**—The condition of the Franks can be known by studying the Salic law, the customary law of the Salian Franks. The institutions of primitive Germany are already much changed. Nobility and general assemblies of the people are no longer in question. The assembly of the district, the *mallus*, has been modified: all freemen have the right, as before, to be present, but a certain number of them, the *rachimburgi*, prepare the decisions of the tribunal. When it is necessary to execute a sentence by force, the count, or *graf*, a functionary named by the king, carries it out. The kingly authority has increased, the counts represent him in various districts and command the army. In order to control these agents, he sometimes takes them from the lowest classes of

society, from freedmen, or even slaves. Certain criminal cases which were formerly judged in popular assembly are reserved for his personal tribunal. The king wears his hair long, a distinctive mark of the Merovingians. The kingly office is hereditary; the principle of election reappears when there is no legitimate heir of the throne. Although he may be dispossessed for his crimes or his vices, according to the legend of Chilperic I., he cannot be replaced by a prince of another family, still less by a foreigner. Yet he is far from being all powerful. His troops obey him only on condition of doing as they will. The troops are few and would affiliate easily with the Gallo-Roman population. This transformation was to be the work of one man, Clovis.

**5. Clovis, 481-486.**—The birth of Clovis in 466 is shrouded in fable; his early years are unknown, and no chronicler has left us his portrait. The confusion in Gaul afforded him opportunities for personal aggrandisement, which he put to profit. In the fifth year of his reign he marched against his nearest neighbour, Syagrius, son of Ægidius, who since the fall of the Western Empire had taken the title of king; he conquered him, seized his kingdom, and had him secretly put to death in 486.

**6. The Soissons Vase, 486.**—The Frankish army pilaged many churches in this campaign. At Rheims they carried off a sacred vase of wonderful size and beauty. The bishop sent to claim it. On the distribution of the booty, which occurred at Soissons, Clovis demanded the vase to be put in his share, but a jealous, violent soldier struck the vase, exclaiming: "You shall have nothing but what comes to your share." The king hid his resentment, and gave the vase to the bishop's messenger. The next year, at a review of the troops, he approached the soldier



who had insulted him and said: "No one's weapons are as badly cared for as yours," and seized them and threw them on the ground. As the man bent over to pick them up he <sup>CLOVIS</sup> cleft his head with his axe, saying: "Thus you did to the vase at Soissons"; he then dismissed the others, having intimidated them in this way. Clovis's ferocity, his haughtiness as a chief who will be obeyed, his intention of conciliating the Catholic clergy, are clearly shown in this story, recorded by the bishop, Gregory of Tours.

**7. Clovis Master of the Country North of the Loire.**—Master of Soissons, Clovis advanced to the Seine; Paris, blockaded for five years, finally opened her doors and became the capital of the new Frankish state. Nantes, on the Loire, was taken after a long siege. Clovis now possessed all the Roman country which could accept him as a chief and furnish him useful military contingents. He used them against his barbarians neighbours.

**8. Baptism of Clovis, 496.**—The first of these expeditions appears to have been directed against the inhabitants of the left bank of the lower Rhine. They were subdued in 491. Five years later he attacked the Alemanni. The latter had repeatedly tried to settle on the left shore of the Rhine. They gave battle, near the modern Zülpich, to the king of Cologne, Siegbert, a relative of Clovis, who was seriously wounded. Clovis pursued and overtook them near the Rhine. At first his warriors were defeated. Now Clovis had married, three years before, a Catholic princess, Clotilda, niece of Gundebad, the Burgundian king; she had vainly tried to convert her husband to her religion. As long as Clovis was fortunate he believed in his gods; but now that Woden seemed to have abandoned him he called upon Christ. "If you will make me victorious, and show this power of which the Christians say they have so many proofs, I will

believe in you and be baptised." Shortly after the fortune of the battle changed; the king of the Alemanni being killed, his troops disbanded and submitted to the conqueror. Clovis returned to his kingdom, and with the consent of his people was baptised at Rheims by the Bishop Remigius, Saint Rémi. "Bow thy head," said the bishop, "adore what thou hast burned and burn what thou hast adored." His sister and three thousand Frankish warriors followed his example.

### 9. Advantages which Clovis Gained from his Baptism.

—Without suspecting it, Clovis had just completed an action of the greatest importance politically. He was the first among the barbarian kings to embrace the Catholic faith, and he was the only one in Gaul. Tired of Arian domination, the orthodox, that is to say, the majority of the inhabitants, looked henceforth to the Frankish king; they became in advance his allies and facilitated his conquest of the country.\* They were eager to express their feelings. All the bishops of the cities then subject to the Franks were present at the baptism of Clovis. The bishop of Vienne, Avitus, who passed his life in preaching Catholicism to the Burgundians, excused himself for not being able to be there and congratulated him thus: "All celebrate the triumph of Clovis; the Church herself is interested in his fortune; each battle which he wins is a victory for her." The way for the alliance between Church and Royalty, so advantageous for both powers, was thus opened at the beginning of the Merovingian dynasty!

### 10. Clovis Attacks the Burgundian King. He Fails.

If Clovis had renounced his gods, he had not given

\* The evidence which we have indicates that this was rather the attitude of the Gallic clergy than that of the mass of the people.—  
ED.

up his habits; Christian or pagan, he was always a barbarian. Clotilda was also barbarian. By marrying Clovis she had wished to escape the guardianship of her Uncle Gundobad, murderer of her father Chilperic, and assure her vengeance. She had no trouble in rousing a like passion in her husband, who soon began a campaign (500). Gundobad and his brother Godegisel tried to stop him near Dojin; but when the combat had begun, Godegisel, who had a secret understanding with Clovis, deserted to his side. The two united armies routed Gundobad and pursued him to the walls of Avignon. Then Gundobad treated; he offered an annual tribute, which Clovis fixed himself. When the Franks had withdrawn and Gundobad had reconstructed his forces, he marched suddenly against his brother, seized him in Vienne, which he entered through an aqueduct, and put him to death. The Frankish garrison was sent "into exile" in Toulouse with Alaric.

**11. Clovis Subdues the Visigoths, 507.**—Instead of trying to avenge this affront, Clovis turned against the Visigoths. The two peoples had been at enmity for a long time. Childeric had fought them; Alaric II. had given refuge to Syagrius before delivering him to the conqueror of Soissons; he retained the Franks, who were taken at Vienne; finally, he was Arian. Theodoric the Great, brother-in-law of Clovis and father-in-law of Alaric, vainly interposed; in 507 the war broke out. Clovis said to his warriors: "It pains me to see Arians in possession of a part of Gaul; let us march against them, with God's aid, and gain their country for ourselves." This harangue pleased them and they set forth. Cloderic, son of Sigibert of Cologne, led a Ripuarian contingent, and Gundobad the Burgundian king promised Clovis his assistance. The enemies met in the plain of *Vouillé*, ten

miles to the west of Poitiers. The Goths fought with javelins, but the Franks charged lance in hand and put them to flight. Clovis had killed their king Alaric, when suddenly two warriors attacked him on both sides at once. He escaped death, thanks to the excellence of his armour and the lightness of his horse. Many Arverni who had come with Apollinaris, son of Sidonius, the bishop and senator, perished in this battle. Theodoric, Clovis's son, was sent to conquer Auvergne and subdue all the cities "from the frontier of the Goths to the Burgundian," whilst Gundobad destroyed, near Marbonne, the remains of the vanquished army. Clovis took Bordeaux, where he passed the winter, carried off from Toulouse the treasures of Alaric, marched upon Angoulême, "whose ramparts fell of themselves," and returned victorious to Tours, where he offered presents in the basilica of Saint Martin. The armed intervention of the Ostrogoths prevented the total extinction of the Visigothic kingdom on the north of the Pyrenees. Septimania, the country between the Cevennes, the Rhone, and the sea, was preserved; but the capital was transported to Toledo, and the Ostrogoths remained masters for some time of Provence.

**12. Clovis Subdues the Frankish Kingdoms.**—Clovis had subdued three-quarters of Gaul by force; stratagem and cruelty reduced the Ripuarian states and those of the Salian kings, his kinsmen.\* In the war against Syagrius, Chararic, king of T rouanne, had served the Franks badly. "Clovis marched against him, entrapped and imprisoned him and his sons, had them shorn, and commanded that he should be ordained priest and his son

\* Before Clovis the Franks had had no common government, but were divided into a number of very small, but independent states, each with its own king, all of whom claimed a descent from Merovius.—ED.

deacon"; then for greater security he had them killed. Ragnachar reigned at Cambrai, a king of evil reputation. Clovis instigated his men to revolt, imprisoned him, and killed him with his two brothers. He dispossessed in the same way other members of the royal family among the Salian Franks, then took their treasures and kingdoms as being nearest heir. He was more cautious with the Ripuarians. He instigated Cloderic to kill his father, Sigibert the Lamé, then had Cloderic traitorously assassinated. After this he went to Cologne and spoke thus to the people: "I am not implicated in this affair, for I cannot shed the blood of my relatives, that would be a crime; but since such events have taken place I counsel you to have recourse to me and place yourselves under my protection." The soldiers applauded his words, raised him on a rich shield, and proclaimed him king. Gregory of Tours coldly relates these facts. "Each day," he adds, "God struck down the enemies of Clovis under his hand, and enlarged his kingdom, because he went with an upright heart before the Lord and did the things that were pleasing in his sight." Yet Gregory was a pious and good man. What must have been the harshness of manners when a saintly bishop excused such crimes committed by a king who favoured the Church!

**13. Clovis's Death.**—Clovis died in Paris in the second half of the year 511. He was buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles, which he, with his queen, Clotilda, had built. He was but forty-five years old.

**14. His Government.**—His reign had entirely changed the destinies of the Frankish nation. Royalty had still its Germanic stamp, but royal authority had greatly increased; this may be seen by studying the relations of Clovis with the Gallo-Romans, the Church, and the Franks. From the emperor Anastasius he received the

title, and perhaps the insignia, of the Consulate. In the basilica of Saint Martin he donned the purple tunic and the chlamys; then mounting his horse he scattered gold and silver among the populace. Although his name is not found on any consular list, he had henceforth a legal title to command the Gallo-Romans; for them he represented the emperor. In this respect Clovis's authority was the more absolute, because political life was dead, and the Gallo-Romans, harassed by frequent invasions, asked only to be governed. In his intercourse with his own people Clovis was obliged to show them more consideration. When the army was on the march his authority was boundless, but he must consult his soldiers in order to undertake a campaign, and in the distribution of booty the king, like the soldiers, had his share fixed by lot. Conquests augmented Clovis's treasures and increased the number of barbarians living under his protection. For this reason his person assumed in their eyes a character more worthy of respect. Among the laity he had only devoted subjects. Lastly, his baptism made of him the temporal chief among the orthodox; the Church provided him with counsellors. The bishop addressed him reverently, for to them he was "the master." He it was in reality who appointed them, and, although the clergy and the people must ratify his choice, neither people nor clergy opposed it. In 511 he convoked at Orleans a great synod composed of thirty-two bishops of Gaul, and by approving their decisions he made them effective. He loaded with gifts the faithful clergy; he built churches, repaired ancient ones, and founded monasteries. This barbarian royalty, recent as it was, made itself constitutional from the first, by insisting on the ecclesiastical and Roman principle of authority.

MAR 3.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE FRANKISH KINGDOM FROM 511 TO 639.\*

1. **Division of Clovis's Kingdom.**—Clovis had no comprehension of the great things that he had done; he took no measures to ensure the survival of his work. Geneseric, with more foresight, forbade his sons to divide the kingdom; Clovis did nothing of the kind. His sons treated the inheritance as a private property, according to the customary law of the Salian Franks. The oldest, Theodoric, son of a first wife, had the kingdom of Rheims, with the upper valley of the Meuse, all the course of the Moselle and the lower Rhine, as well as Auvergne, which he had conquered in 508. Clotilda's sons inherited the remainder. Clodomir received the valley of the Loire from Nevers, with Orleans as the capital; Childebert the kingdom of Paris with the coast of the channel and a part of Gothia; Lothaire had the small kingdom of Soissons with Laon, Cambrai, Tournai, and Boulogne. He was the youngest and the least favoured. The shares were unequal and arbitrary, the new kings cruel and greedy. They had but one preoccupation: their own aggrandisement, whether by uniting against their neighbours or rending one another.

\* SOURCES.—Gregory of Tours, as above. "Compilation dite de Frédégaire," G. Monod (1885); also Krusch ("Monumenta Germ." 1889). "Gesta regum Francorum" ("Monum. Germ.," 1889).

LITERATURE.—A. Longnon, "Géographie de la Gaule au VI<sup>e</sup> Siècle," and "Atlas Historique de la France."; Kaufman as above.

**2. The Kingdom of Rheims. Theodoric.**—Being master of eastern France and Auvergne, Theodoric wished to unite these two possessions, which were separated by Burgundy. He joined his brothers in an expedition against that country, and seized the entire north: Langres, Nevers, and Châlon-sur-Saône, with Viviers at the west. To punish the instigators of a plot to deliver Auvergne to Chilbert, he ravaged that territory in 530, then conquered le Velay, le Gévaudan, the surrounding country of Limoges and Cahors. In Germany, after having repulsed an invasion of Danish pirates and exacted tribute from the Frisians, Saxons, and Bavarians, he invaded Thuringia jointly with Lothaire. There was great carnage among their enemies. In Lothaire's share of the booty was Radegonda, the niece of the Thuringian king, whom he married; but the queen's brother having been killed by her husband, she abandoned a world where crime was triumphant, and built a monastery at Poitiers. Her virtues made her celebrated, and the Church canonised her.

**3. Theodoric's Successors: Theodebert and Theodebald.**—Theodebert, who inherited all the possessions of Theodoric (534), in spite of his uncles, enlarged his kingdom still more. He went to the assistance of the Goths in Italy, attacked by the imperial troops, and received a part of Provence as the price of his services; moreover, he brought back such quantities of precious metal that, first among the Frankish kings, he had new coins struck, stamped with his name and image in the costume of the emperors. Times had changed since Clovis was proud to receive from Constantinople the insignia of the Consulate. Theodebald, son and successor of Theodebert (547-555), again despatched troops beyond the Alps, but they were beaten, and for two centuries the Franks left



Italy unmolested. One year after this repulse he died, childless, and his great dominions were united to those of Lothaire.

**4. The Orleans Kingdom. Clodomir.**—Clodomir began the conquest of Burgundy conjointly with Theodoric. He was defeated and killed at Vezeronce in 524, leaving three sons, whom their grandmother, Clotilda, took to bring up. Childebert and Lothaire obtained possession of them and killed two, compelling the third to become a monk; then they shared the kingdom of Orleans. They paid their dispossessed nephew an indemnity in lands, in the neighbourhood of Rheims, in Berry, and near Paris. He founded a monastery in this latter district in the village of Novigentum, and later the Church canonised him as Saint Cloud, for his good deeds. Shortly after, the war began again in Burgundy, which was conquered and partitioned after three years of struggle.

**5. Conquest of Septimania.**—Septimania alone remained to be conquered, and all Gaul would belong to the Frankish kings. Pretexts were not lacking for this undertaking. In the same way that Clotilda's sons had avenged their mother, by attacking the Burgundian kings, Childebert avenged his sister, maltreated by her Arian husband, by invading Septimania in 531. Amalaric, beaten near Narbonne, fled to Barcelona, where he was killed. Childebert took back his sister, with rich treasures, among them many precious objects used in church ceremonies: chalices, patens, and coffers intended to hold the Gospels. "He would not allow anything to be broken; he divided all among the churches and the basilicas of the saints." In 542 he retraced his way to the Pyrenees, this time with Lothaire. The two brothers were unsuccessful at the siege of Saragossa, but they conquered a large part of Spain, and returned to Gaul laden with spoils. They

brought back with them the relics of Saint Vincent, to whom they built near Paris a church, which was later known as Saint Germain-des-Prés. The spasms of devotion which seized these bloody, thieving warriors are not to be wondered at; they had crimes enough to expiate!

**6. Childebert and Lothaire. Lothaire Sole King, 560.**—Until Lothaire seized Theodebald's inheritance, Childebert and Lothaire seem to have lived together amicably. Childebert, considering himself, and not unreasonably, so defrauded, entered into a secret understanding with one of his brother's sons, who revolted, but he died without male issue, and Lothaire appropriated his states. His son, in the meanwhile, had found partisans in Brittany, but he was overtaken by his father's army, and the latter condemned him to death. Imprisoned with his family in a poor man's cabin, he was strangled, the house was set on fire, and his wife and children perished in the flames.

**7. Lothaire's Death, 561.**—Lothaire triumphed. Gaul almost entirely belonged to him, and he considered himself a great king. But he was old, and began a little late to repent of his crimes. His groanings before Saint Martin's tomb did not avert a malignant fever. Tortured by the disease, he exclaimed: "Alas! what must this king of heaven be who can let so powerful a monarch die thus!" With such feelings of simple-minded pride he passed away. His four sons bore him in honour to Soissons and buried him under the basilica of Saint Medard.

**8. Division of Lothaire's Kingdom.**—Gaul was divided again, as it had been at Clovis's death, but less arbitrarily. Caribert, king of Paris, was allotted all western Gaul, from Breslé on the northeast to the Pyrenees; Gunthram, king of Mâcon, had Burgundy, with the addition of Troyes, Auxerre, Orleans, and Bourges, and a large part

of Provence; Sigibert, king of Metz, drew eastern France, or Austrasia, with Auvergne, Rouergue, Vivarais, and a share of Provence. Chilperic, son of another wife, fared ill, as Lothaire had done; he was given the kingdom of Soissons. These partitions conformed more to the natural grouping of peoples than had the divisions of 511, but civil war was once more to spread confusion.

**9. Chilperic and Sigibert.**—This was begun by Chilperic, who, discontented with his share, took advantage of Sigibert's absence on an expedition against the Hunnic tribe of the Avars to invade his kingdom and seize several cities. The war was embittered by the hostility of the two queens, Brunhilda and Fredegonda.

**10. Brunhilda.**—Brunhilda, daughter of Athanagild, king of the Goths in Spain, had married Sigibert in 566. Her beauty, the dignity of her life, the prudence and charm of her conversation contrasted favourably with the odiousness of the wives of the other Frankish kings. Her wedding had been celebrated at Metz with great pomp. The poet Venantius Fortunatus celebrated it in verses both curious and barbaric. The brilliancy of the feasts and the prestige of Sigibert's alliance with the Goths in Spain aroused Chilperic's jealousy.

**11. Division of Caribert's Kingdom.**—In the midst of all this Caribert died, without sons, and his inheritance was dismembered by his three brothers. Each of them wished a third of the territories of Paris, Beauvais, Chartres, and Seulis; they coveted Paris also, but it was decided that this city should be neutral, and that no one should enter it without the consent of the others, under penalty of incurring divine wrath and losing his share in Caribert's kingdom. Thus the states of each king were surrounded by those of the others; there were frontiers everywhere, and nowhere the slightest security.

**12. Chilperic I., Husband and Murderer of Gaileswintha, 567.**—Chilperic had rounded out his territory with a part of western France, or Neustria, and of Aquitaine; henceforth he was established at the foot of the Pyrenees. To checkmate Sigibert, he asked and obtained readily the hand of Gaileswintha, Brunhilda's oldest sister. He displayed more magnificence in his marriage than Sigibert, and the day after the wedding he presented his wife with five Aquitanian cities which he had just acquired by Caribert's death. They were Bordeaux, Limoges, Cahors, Béarn, and Bigorre. This marriage, concluded under sad auspices, was not happy. To marry this new wife he had set aside Fredegonda, a woman of obscure birth, whose striking beauty had won Chilperic's love. She was not long in regaining her influence over him, and to get rid of the legitimate wife Fredegonda had her strangled in bed.

**13. He is Condemned in the Frankish Mallus.**—Chilperic's two brothers accused him of murder, took up arms against him, and drove him from the kingdom. The further pursuit of vengeance was stopped by a judgment pronounced by Gunthram and the Franks. The *mallus* decided that Brunhilda should receive as *wergeld* the five cities which Gaileswintha had been given as *Morgengabe*.

**14. Sigibert's Murder and Chilperic's Triumph, 575.**—For some time the hostile brothers seemed to live amicably, but in 574 Chilperic opened hostilities against Sigibert. The latter, commanding the nations which lived beyond the Rhine, delayed not to carry war into his rival's lands, and he soon had him shut up in Tournai, with Fredegonda. He then had himself proclaimed king by Childebert's former subjects, at Vitry on the Scarpe; but he had scarcely been raised on the shield when he and

several of his officers were assassinated by two emissaries of Fredegonda. He was forty years old. The crime remained unpunished, and those who had done the deed profited by it. Chilperic not only recovered what he had lost, but in despite of prior agreement he came to Paris, seized Brunhilda, exiled her to Rouen, and took her treasures. Sigibert's son, the little Childebert, aged five, barely escaped certain death, through the devotion of Duke Gondebad, who carried him off and had him proclaimed king.

**15. Fredegonda All Powerful.**—Chilperic's family as well as Sigibert's was afflicted. A wife whom he had married before Gaileswintha bore him three sons. One of them, Merovius, fell in love with Brunhilda, the captive, and married her. The bishop of Rouen, Pretextatus, was not afraid to consecrate this union, which aroused Chilperic's and Fredegonda's anger. Merovius, pursued by his father, had himself killed by one of his followers rather than fall into his hands; Pretextatus was exiled, then put to death by Fredegonda. A brother of Merovius, Clovis, insulted his step-mother; she had him stabbed and thrown into the Marne. In the sixth century men's consciences were not sensitive, yet they were indignant at Fredegonda's crimes. She tried to silence her accusers by dint of audacity and violence. The son of a freedman, who by means of boldness and cunning had made his way at court, stated that Gregory, the bishop of Tours, had calumniated the queen. He was commanded to appear before a tribunal of bishops. Bertram, bishop of Bordeaux, stated the case; Gregory denied everything. The king presided in the midst of the bishops. "The accusation against my wife," he said, "is a shame upon me. If you see fit to produce witnesses against the bishop they are

here; if it seems preferable to leave it to his good faith, say so, and I will abide by your decision." The latter method was adopted. After having said three masses, Gregory purged himself by oath of the words imputed to him. As to his accuser, he was denounced by the king himself, and condemned to exclusion from all churches "as a sower of lies, calumniator of the queen, and accuser of a bishop." Fredegonda had him assassinated.

**16. Chilperic a Wit and Debauchee. His Death, 584.—**

Chilperic trembled before the bishops, the only moral force which held its own before the barbarians. He "hated the churches," but he loved to converse with priests. He prided himself on his knowledge of theology and literature; he made verses, proposed to add to the alphabet new letters to represent the new sounds of the Teutonic language, discoursed on the mystery of the Trinity, tried to convert the Jews. He liked spectacles, and had games for the populace in circuses built at Paris and Soissons. He was a dilettante and a debauchee, but he governed none the less skilfully. The Nero, the Herod of his time, as Gregory of Tours calls him, died, assassinated at his villa of Chelles. Fredegonda was accused of his death, although she was the first to lose by it; but no one regretted the man. A small part of the kingdom which he had built up by his successful crimes passed to his son, Lothaire II., a child of four months, who was under the guardianship of his uncle Gunthram, king of Burgundy. The remainder was usurped by Gunthram and by Sigibert's son, Childebert II.

**17. Gunthram's Pacific Rôle.—**Gunthram, the only surviving son of Lothaire I., was not a warlike chief, as Sigibert, nor a greedy, dissolute wit like Chilperic. His life was not much more peaceful and chaste than that of

his brothers, but he had a sense of justice; he loved his family, and suffered to see it violently extinguished. He took his two nephews under his protection, Childebert II., son of Brunhilda, and Lothaire II., son of Fredegonda. His vanity was doubtless flattered at being the chief of all the Franks, yet his reign is not deplorable. His task was a heavy one. Childebert was about fifteen, and eager to be free. Brunhilda, having a strong ascendancy over him, had regained her power, and was still seeking vengeance for Sigibert's murder. Gunthram, on his side, was looking for Chilperic's assassins, but in vain. Finally uprisings burst out in Gaul. An Austrasian duke, Rauching, conspired with other nobles of Lothaire's kingdom to seize the power in Austrasia. The plot was discovered and promptly frustrated by the death of the conspirators; but it showed that kings should take precautions to keep their subjects, and especially their agents, in the line of duty. For this reason Childebert and Gunthram strengthened their alliance by the treaty of Andelot.

**18. Treaty of Andelot, 587.**—They decided at first certain questions of inheritance, then fixed the condition of their subjects, or *leudes*. The *leudes* who on the death of Lothaire I. had first vowed allegiance to Gunthram or Sigibert, and who afterwards were convicted of adopting another party, should be returned to their allegiance; the others might circulate freely in both kingdoms, but each one of the kings agreed to refrain from enlisting in his services his ally's *leudes*. Finally, gifts made by the kings to the Church or to the *leudes* should not be revoked. It would be inaccurate to consider this treaty a victory of the aristocracy over the royal power; it was simply a compact for personal safety between the two kings. There is also in it no question of the heredity of

benefices; benefices in the sense in which the word was understood during the eighth and ninth centuries did not yet exist; the kings guaranteed the *leudes* possession of the lands which had been given them by the kings. In a society which was not based on obedience to law, but on personal relations, peace was alone possible at this price.

**19. Gunthram Protects and Restrains Childebert II. and Lothaire II.**—Allied to Childebert, Gunthram remained, after, as before the treaty of Andelot, Lothaire's protector; and when the Austrasian king complained he replied: "Provided Childebert keeps all the promises he made me, what I possess is his. Let him not be scandalised if I receive Lothaire's envoys. Am I devoid of sense if I try to prevent discord between my nephews?" Some years later, when young Lothaire was baptised, Gunthram, at Fredegonda's request, held him at the font and treated him as a son. His beneficent rôle ceased only on his death in 593.

**20. Torture of Brunhilda and Triumph of Lothaire II., 613.**—This was the signal for the outbreak of fresh troubles. Lothaire II., left unprotected at the age of fourteen by the death of his mother, Fredegonda, was beaten several times by the sons of Childebert II., who had died in 597; these sons then made war on one another, and both were killed. In 613 Brunhilda was left alone with her grandsons; she assumed the sovereignty in Austrasia and Burgundy; but the nobles detested her and gave her over to Lothaire II. When she was brought before the Neustrian king, Fredegonda's son accused her of causing the death of ten Frankish kings. She was tortured for three days, then paraded through the army on a camel; finally, tied by the hair and an arm and foot to a wild horse, she was dashed to death. Fredegonda, who



was worse than she, died peacefully in her bed, and was honourably buried in the church of Saint Vincent! But posterity, condemning the memory of Fredegonda, has been more indulgent to Brunhilda. Some have gone so far as to represent her as defending Roman civilisation against barbarism; important public works have been attributed to her, and Roman roads in Burgundy and elsewhere long bore the name of Brunhilda's roads. Her tragic end, by inspiring sympathy, caused intentions to be attributed to her which she did not have; she played an odious part with her grandchildren, through love of power. But the praises which Gregory of Tours accords her, the affectionate relations of the Pope, Saint Gregory the Great, with her, imply that her intellectual culture was superior to the barbarian princes who surrounded her. She wished to rule, and she knew how to do so, with the aid of the Gallo-Romans. The *leudes*, impatient of all authority, and especially of the yoke of a woman, hated her, and she was their victim.

**21. Lothaire II. Abandons the Government to Bishops and Nobles.**—Lothaire II. profited by the crimes of his mother and aunt; he remained sole king of all the Franks. To keep himself in power he allowed others to govern. He owed his victory to his nobles, and he allowed them to have greater influence in the government. In Paris he convoked a general council, in which were assembled seventy-nine bishops; eight days later, the nobles having joined themselves to the prelates, an edict was promulgated which secured, within certain limits, freedom of episcopal elections, and defined the duties of royal functionaries and the rights of the king in matters of justice and imposts. This Perpetual Constitution, which was intended to secure lasting peace in the kingdom, has been judged a victory for the aristocracy. It is certain, how-

ever, that the king could govern only with the help of the nobles, and that Lothaire allowed the Burgundians to choose the mayor of the palace Warnachair. The Austrasians soon wished to have a king for themselves, and demanded one of Lothaire's sons, Dagobert, who began to reign in 623. This demand occasioned fresh discords, which almost embroiled eastern and western France; finally the bishops and the more temperate nobles succeeded in appeasing them, and Lothaire II. was able to die in peace in 629.

**22. Reign of Dagobert I., 629-639.**—Dagobert succeeded him without opposition. He had a spirit of order and justice. Among his counsellors were some of the most honoured members of the clergy: Audoenus (Saint Ouen), bishop of Rouen; Eligius, the celebrated goldsmith, who is so popular as Saint Eloi; among the laity were the mayor of the palace of Neustria, Aega, and especially the Austrasian mayor, Pippin, the ablest of the *leudes*, wise in council, fully trustworthy, dear to the people, "because he inspired Dagobert with a love of justice." Dagobert was active and brave. His wars and diplomacy were most often successful, whether with the Empire of the East and the Lombards, who had just conquered the greater part of Italy; or with the Wends or Slovans, a Slavonic tribe which was commanded by a merchant of Frankish extraction named Samo; or with the Bulgarians; or with the Bretons and the Basques. Dagobert died January 19, 639, after having extended on every side the frontiers of the Frankish dominion. The Merovingian state reached its zenith with him, but its decadence was near at hand. He, the "Solomon of the Franks," was tempted to idleness and debauchery by the intoxication of power. He attempted, it is true, to buy pardon for his disordered habits by charities and pious endowments, especially by

his gifts to the Abbey of Saint Denis, which became pre-eminently the royal abbey, and where he was the first king to be buried. Dagobert's sons reigned only under the guardianship of the mayors of the palace, and after them followed the epoch of the *fainéant* kings. We have now to survey the political, social, and administrative condition of Gaul after the invasions.

## CHAPTER VII.

### INSTITUTIONS OF GAUL AFTER THE INVASIONS.\*

1. **The Frankish Kingship and Royal Insignia.**—The king was at the head of the state. Royalty was hereditary in the Merovingian family; women were excluded from it. The age of majority was not determined,—the Ripuarian law fixed it at fourteen years, the Salic law at twelve,—nor the persons to whom should be confided the guardianship of a minor king. Thus Gunthram governed in the name of his two nephews, and Dagobert's widow, in the name of her son, Clovis II. Long hair was the outer sign of royal race. When Childebart and Lothaire wished to know if Clotilda preferred to see her grandchildren, Clodomir's children, dead or disinherited, they asked her to choose between the sword for killing or the scissors for shearing; but the Merovingian recov-

\* **SOURCES.**—The historians previously named. They are collected in volumes ii. and iii. of "Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France," begun by dom Bouquet, continued by the Benedictines of the Congregation of Saint-Maur, and carried on to-day by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres. For the Barbarian laws and the collection of formulas, the "Précis de l'histoire du droit français," by P. Viollet (book i., "Sources") furnishes all useful information (1884). See also the bibliography of Dahlmann-Waitz named above, and Monod, "Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France."

**LITERATURE.**—Viollet: "Histoire des Institutions politiques et administratives de la France." Vol. i., with full bibliographies. Gasson, "Histoire du droit et des Institutions de la France," vol. ii. Fustel de Couloges, "Histoire des Institutions politiques de l'ancienne France." Waitz, "Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte," vol. ii.

ered his rights to the throne with the growth of his hair. The kings assumed imperial insignia in great public ceremonials: the golden crown, the sceptre, the chlamys, and the purple tunic; did they not pretend to be the official representatives of the emperors? On the king's death, the kingdom was divided between his sons; the daughters, and sometimes the widow, of the deceased had their share of the treasure; illegitimate children were not debarred from the succession.

**2. Character and Extent of the Royal Power.**—The Merovingians aimed to establish absolute authority, and from Lothaire I. to Dagobert they succeeded in this. All freemen, Romans or Germans, took the oath of fidelity to the king. Among these *leudes* there were some, more powerful, enjoying greater freedom and favour at court, who were preëminently the king's *leudes*. He had the right to convoke the freemen for war where and when he wished; he levied the Roman tax according to the old registers of property. Chilperic I. had them revised in 579, and increased essentially the amount of the tax. After the sudden death of two of his children, Fredegonda cast the registers into the fire and revived the old ones. The Franks always felt great repugnance to the land tax. The Merovingians revised the old Germanic customs, and added certain new dispositions favourable to their authority. Like the emperors, they promulgated edicts—named variously, constitutions, decrees, precepts, etc., without counting numberless charters made out by their chancellor's office in favour of individuals, churches, or monasteries.

**3. The Popular Assemblies.**—The popular assemblies could not exist in their old form under these absolute kings. The Franks met, armed, in the month of March; but these gatherings were merely military reviews. The

kings still called together general assemblies to draw up statements of law, decide important political affairs, or judge differences between the kingdoms; but only the royal functionaries and the nobles seem to have been summoned and to have played an active part in these assemblies. An aristocracy of men powerful through their riches grew up little by little around royalty, while awaiting the moment for controlling and supplanting it.

**4. The Merovingian Palace. The Antrustiones.**—Each Frankish kingdom had its capital, but the king preferred to live at one of his *villæ*, which were vast domains comprising, besides the houses for the king, his officers and servants, cultivated land, meadows, hunting forests, workshops, etc. There was the *palatium*, which signified the residence of the king, and the centre of the administration of the state. The persons who lived in the palace and ate at the king's table were peculiarly favoured by law; Romans or Germans, they had a triple *wergeld*. It was not necessary to be noble. One could rise from menial offices to high position, and even to be the count of important cities. Those who took a special oath of service and fidelity to the king were called *antrustiones*, and enjoyed numerous favours; they were the same as the *comitatus* of the prince in earlier days.

**5. Officers of the Merovingian Palace. The Mayor and the Counts of the Palace.**—The officers of the palace bore, as during the Roman epoch, the titles of *ministri* or *ministeriales*; in time humble domestic duties became important political offices. The mayor of the palace (*major domus*) was first a simple steward. His power increased rapidly during the sixth and seventh centuries, when the aristocracy appropriated the offices of the palace as a source of favour and power. He became then a viceroy,—and he presided, during the king's ab-

sence, at his tribunal. The counts of the palace performed judicial functions in the king's tribunal; they might also command the troops and share with the mayor and the referendary in the supreme control of public affairs. The referendary directed the royal chancery, which issued edicts and charters, its seal being necessary to make an act authentic. A host of lower officers were enrolled under these three important personages: the seneschal, who directed the servants in the personal service of the king; the marshal, chief of the stables; the chamberlains, the servants of the bed-chambers; the treasurers, who had charge of the furniture and treasure; the physicians, and all those who were employed in the service of the table.

**6. Royal Officers in the Civitas, or the Pagus.**—The patricians, the dukes, and the counts with their delegates were at the head of the local administration. The counts were named by the king and held office during his pleasure. Their duties, at once political, military, administrative, and judicial, were exercised in the territory of the former *civitas*, then called *pagus*. The dukes' powers were also general, but the rank was higher than that of count; they were, above everything, military chiefs in the frontier countries. The dividing of the empire by frequent partitions created frontiers everywhere, and thus multiplied the number of dukes. In Provence and in Burgundy the patrician had the same powers as the duke: he was preëminently a military chief, but his title was higher. These agents were instructed to treat all inhabitants of the *pagus* kindly, defend widows and orphans, rigidly suppress thieving and crime, pay in exactly, each year, to the treasury the money due the state. These obligations were too often neglected; the chronicles of the time are filled with the pitiable tales of

official violence. The counts received no salary, but as they were given a share of the fines, there was a natural temptation to increase them. They often bought their offices, and to reimburse themselves they would multiply exactions. Moreover, they rose sometimes from low condition, and retained the manners of the lower classes. In the seventh century they were drawn more often from the great landed proprietors of the province. From this arose another evil, for they usurped public power and appropriated the fiscal revenue; they tended to make their office hereditary and consequently independent. They were heads of a provincial aristocracy.

**7. The Remains of the Municipal Régime.**—There were some traces of the old municipal organisation in certain parts of the country where the Roman civilisation had taken strong root. The large cities of the centre and the south had a Senate and curia presided over by a defensor; but these officers seem to have been purely judicial, and no longer administrative or financial. The administrative power belonged to the count, and with him the bishop, who became more and more the representative of urban interests and the head of the population. With a single king for all Gaul there was one administration, comprising justice, collection of taxes, and levying and commanding of troops.

**8. Military Service. The Heriban.**—All freemen bore their own expenses during their military service. Those who were not rich enough became dependents of more powerful men, who gave them equipments and food and secured them a share in the booty. The great proprietors brought with them, moreover, troops made up of clients and *liti*, who fought with them, and slaves, who, without joining in the combat, bore the master's arms, cared for the wounded, or buried the dead. An army could not be



levied except by order of the king. He ordered, through the counts, the convocation, or *heriban*, the violation of which resulted in severe penalties. The army was commanded by the king, the dukes, or other high officers.

**9. The Finances.**—Before their settlement in Gaul the Frankish kings had no other regular revenues than voluntary gifts, fines, and tributes paid by conquered nations. After taking the place of the imperial power they appropriated the fiscal revenues, and continued to levy the old imposts, while conquests enlarged their domains. Everyone was legally subject to the payment of taxes; but exemptions were frequent, and little by little impoverished the kings.

**10. Monetary System.**—The monetary system was closely linked with the finances. The Franks had gold and silver coins. Each *solidus* in gold was worth intrinsically about thirteen francs, but in values of the present day it was worth at least one hundred francs. One-half and one-third *solidi* were made. Silver was more rare; the principal coin was the *denarius*, or penny; it took forty of these to make a gold *solidus*, and twelve for a silver one. It does not appear that the Merovingians made coins of an alloy, but they doubtless continued to use the money struck off in profusion by the last emperors. The right of minting money belonged to the king. The money, coarsely made by coiners, scattered through the country, offered a variety of types, but of types more and more barbarian.

**11. Justice. The Mallus.**—Justice was administered in the *pagi* by the *mallus* of freemen. The count presided and judged, assisted by the *rachimburgi*. Criminal trials were mostly terminated by an agreement to pay according to the provisions of Germanic law, but the Merovingian kings attempted to introduce into legislation corporal

punishment. The courts, also as guardians of the public welfare and representatives of the king, often inflicted bodily penalties both on evil-doers, after a summary trial, and on those who disturbed the peace. The king had his tribunal also, to which were called the nobles, secular and ecclesiastical, living at his court, accused of high treason, *lèse-majesté*, and conspiracies against the life of the king and his family; appeals from the sentences of the counts were also heard there. Many matters, those pertaining to the nobles in particular, were judged there from the beginning. The Merovingian kings tried to prevent wars and private vengeance; a decree of Childebert II. forbade the relatives of a culprit to pay the fine in his stead. The solidarity of the family led to the assumption of payment by all, and this solidarity made of individual quarrels feuds between two families. Slowly the modern principle was evolved, that the crime should be expiated by the one who committed the deed.

**12. Barbarian Laws and Formulas.**—The laws in force in the tribunals were not the same for all. The Gallo-Romans were judged according to Roman law, the barbarians according to the customs of their nation. The Franks had the Salic law and the Ripuarian law, the former drawn up at the latest under Clovis, the latter under Dagobert. Among the subjects of the Franks, the Burgundians had the law which had been compiled by order of King Gundobad, who died in 516; the Alemanni, the *Lex Alamannorum*, compiled without doubt during the reign of Lothaire IV., between 717 and 719. There are also the law of the Visigoths in Spain, of the Bavarians, of the Lombards, after their settlement in Italy, and of the many people of lower Germany unconquered by the Merovingians: the Saxons, the Frisians, the Angles, and the Thuringians. To these laws are attached collections

of judicial formulas, or blank forms for documents, which there might be occasion to draw up in order to authenticate the rights of the individual; these are very valuable to the historian. The oldest was written by the monk Marculf in the middle of the seventh century.

### 13. Character of the Merovingian Government. Resemblances with and Differences from the Roman System.

—On the whole, if one is content with the appearance of things, the political and administrative organisation of Merovingian Gaul resembles on many sides the Roman organisation. The Frankish kings aped as much as they could the Roman emperors; they tried to keep the financial and administrative outlines of old Gaul; they borrowed from the imperial chancery a great part of its terminology. Except for the larger amount of *wergeld* allowed to Franks by their laws (the Frankish *wergeld* was double the Roman), nothing distinguishes in the mass of freemen and subjects the Germans from the Gallo-Romans. The latter often filled, at the court of barbarian kings, the highest places, for which their intellectual superiority fitted them. The clergy, brought up among Roman ideas, furnished the king with scribes for his chancery and some of his ablest counsellors. Latin was the official language. The German conquerors assimilated it so well that modern French, derived from the Latin, contains scarcely one-tenth part of German words. However, although the form of political and administrative life remained in great part Roman, the substance of the institutions was profoundly modified by the influence of Germanic customs on one hand and by new conditions, born of the invasions of the barbarians, on the other. Deprived of a regular army, incapable of organising an intricate system of taxes, the Frankish kings could not maintain a body of merely civil functionaries, who were

salaries and dependent on the central authority. Their counts, uniting all functions in their hands, soon became local chiefs, and the kings could not govern except in accord with their *leudes* and counts. Justice, rendered by the *rachimburgi* according to precedent and in forms purely Germanic, resembled Roman justice but little. But the spirit which animated the political institutions of Rome on one side and those of the Franks on the other, is what constitutes the great difference. The Roman Empire rested entirely on an abstract idea of the state and the law, equal for all and independent of those who represented it. One was a citizen of the Empire rather than a subject of the emperor. In the Frankish kingdom the personal relationship of man to man took the place of this abstraction of the state. Oaths of allegiance bound subjects to king; analagous ties of protection and recommendation formed, everywhere, among freemen spontaneous groups of voluntary associations. The family ties were strong, and in court the accused appears surrounded by his relatives, who, as conjurators, lent their assistance. Royalty, despite the forms of popular approbation which accompanied the elevation to the throne, was none the less hereditary, and an institution entirely Germanic. The kings considered the territory and the resources of the state as a private property, which their heirs shared after their death. Their authority was "a force confronted by other forces, not a magistracy in the midst of society"; subject to the fortune of one man, it appears "variable and unbridled, to-day immense, to-morrow nothing, strong or weak, according as the fortune of war was for or against them."

**14. Origin of the Aristocracy.**—When royal authority is uncertain, law has no sanction; the individual must de-

fend himself. This can only be done effectually by associating with others. The weakest therefore placed themselves under the protection and in the dependence of the strongest. Hence arose new relations among men, the slow disappearance of the ancient personal liberty as it was understood among the Germans, and the formation of a new nobility. The Germanic nobility of which Tacitus speaks had already disappeared at the time of the invasions; the senatorial nobility, still rich and powerful in Clovis's time, expired during the intestine warfare of the sixth century, or sought refuge in the Church, there to die out. To replace them the nobles of the Frankish kingdoms, with many Gallo-Romans, constituted an aristocracy of functionaries and proprietors, largely in the pay of the kings. The repeated partitions of the Frankish kingdom, by creating, at two different times, four kingdoms and four royal courts, multiplied these officers; the numerous minorities of the kings of the seventh century expanded their power; they usurped the crown lands and weakened in so far the royalty which they had created.

**15. The Merovingian Villa.**—The nobles drew their subsistence and power from the possession of land, as the Gallo-Roman proprietors had done. The Merovingian villa remained what it had been during the preceding epoch. “Within a large farm surrounded by stockades and moats the master with his immediate family made his dwelling. The cabins of the domestic and farming serfs were built around; beyond stretched the fields of the low class freeholders, the clients; they farmed these fields on their own account, paying rent and rendering a fixed amount of service. Adjoining the villa were the lands conceded to the companions of the master, to the soldiers who fought with him, and were ready on any occa-

sion to respond to his call. They had a right to support as long as they were faithful and serviceable."

**16. Immunity.**—The kings often granted to the large proprietors, secular and ecclesiastical, the privilege of the immunity, which released them from administrative authority. In such a case the king's agent was officially commanded, on each new reign, not to trespass on the property of the holder of an immunity in order to render justice, maintain police surveillance, or levy an impost. The king hoped to gain a double advantage from these concessions; he would enfeeble the power of his own agents, whose insubordination he feared, and secure, as he thought, the fidelity of those thus favoured. He counted more on the faithfulness of personal followers than on the devotion of subjects to the state. He abdicated, in fact, and public authority passed little by little into the hands of the nobles.

**17. The Merovingian Church.**—The Church alone stood firm in the midst of a society which was developing and changing in the midst of ruins. It had favoured Clovis, the convert, and remained faithful to his dynasty. The bishops were the principal counsellors of the kings during the sixth and seventh centuries, and they sometimes exerted authority in their diocese which neutralised that of the counts. They were regularly elected by the clergy and inhabitants of the city, with the approbation of the metropolitan and provincial bishops; however, the king reserved the right of confirming the election, often nominated his own candidates, by agreement or forcibly, and converted his intervention into a right of appointment. The bishops gained in favour what they lost in independence. They acquired immunity for church lands, at times exemption from imposts for their city. The monasteries increased rapidly during the sixth and

seventh centuries; protected by kings and nobles who granted them lands and immunities, they grew in riches and power. Subject to severe rules, particularly that of Saint Benedict of Nursia, which was introduced from Italy into Gaul in the seventh century, dwelling together in vast convents under the dominion of their abbots, the monks taught the ignorant, superstitious population of the country, gave themselves to study, or went out to preach Christianity to the pagan barbarians. They formed a separate clerical body, the regular clergy, contrasted with the secular clergy, who were the priests living in cities and villages. Abbots and bishops met in diocesan councils held in each diocese under the presidency of the bishop; in provincial councils, under the metropolitans; in national councils in each kingdom. Kings and their high functionaries sat later in these national councils, which before long made decisions which became laws of the state. The Christian Church, thus strongly organised, exerted a great influence over barbarian society, in which it alone stood for order, justice, and charity.

**18. Saint Gregory of Tours, and Saint Leger.**—The most violent of Merovingian kings felt the ascendancy of the virtue and intellectual superiority of the noted Gallo-Roman bishops in the sixth century; they trembled before the supernatural power attributed to them. The last representatives of important senatorial families sought refuge in the Church and in episcopal functions; in this way they exercised a magistracy which worked for peace in the midst of a society where the most brutal passions were let loose. Gregory, bishop of Tours (573-593), played the part of counsellor to the kings Sigibert, Gunthram, and Childebert, and awed fierce Chilperic into respectful terror. He not only combated his fantastic theology, and told him that only fools would accept his

doctrines on the Trinity, but he defended in open council Pretextatus, bishop of Rouen, accused of high treason. As the king threatened to stir up Tours against him, he answered proudly: "You do not know whether I am unjust or not. He alone who penetrates the secret heart knows my conscience. Let the people cry out falsely against me, it matters little; it is known that you incite them, and on you, not on me, will rest the blame." Gregory's resolution awed Chilperic, who received him later as a friend, showed him his treasures, and only let him depart after receiving his benediction. In the episcopal city Gregory was the protector and father of his flock. He defended them from Count Leudast's violence; caused the fugitives to be respected who sought the right of asylum in the cathedral or the monastery of Saint Martin; fed with his own hands the children who flocked round him, and bore them in his arms when they were ill. He intervened in the bloody quarrels of the Franks in his diocese, presiding at court with the count, and sacrificing Church treasure in order to terminate the crimes which the right of vengeance perpetuated between hostile families. Similar characters were not rare in the sixth century. They were more so a century later. With the introduction of Franks into episcopal dignities the surrounding barbarism penetrated the Church. The bishop of Autun, Leger (659-678), whose partisans canonised him after he had been tortured to death, a victim to his rival Ebroin, was merely a chief of the Burgundian and Austrasian aristocracy combating the Neustrian kings. He was a pure barbarian, cruel and greedy of power. The contrast between these two men tells much of the progress of barbarism in the sixth and seventh centuries.



## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE ROMAN EMPIRE OF THE EAST IN THE SIXTH CENTURY.\*

**1. The Successors of Theodosius the Great, 395-518.**—While the successors of Theodosius in the West had thus let Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Italy almost entirely fall into the hands of the barbarians, the Greek Empire, after a period of insignificance and weakness, found in the

\* **SOURCES.**—Most of the Greek historians of the Eastern Empire are gathered into the two principal collections of Byzantine historians: the so-called collection of the Louvre, “*Byzantinæ historiæ Scriptores*,” published at Paris from 1644 to 1711, in 39 volumes in folio, and that of Bonn, “*Corpus historiæ Byzantinæ*,” commenced by Niebuhr (1826), the latter was mostly continued by Ern. Bekker, but it is still unfinished. Many of these historians are translated in the “*Histoire de Constantinople*” by President Cousin. Paris, 1672, 8 volumes in 4. “*L’Essai de Chronographie byzantine*,” by E. de Muralt (1857-75) gives year for year a statement of facts with reference to the sources. For Justinian’s time the principal historians are Procopius of Cesarea, Agathias, and Corippus. The latter is a Latin poet, author of a poem in four cantos, giving circumstantial details of the court of Constantinople. Procopius’ works have been collected by Dindorf, 3 volumes (1833-1838). The “*Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infirmæ græcitatæ*,” by Du Cange, is an important work for the explanation of Greek authors.

**LITERATURE.**—Hertzberg, “*Geschichte der byzantiner und des osmanischen Reiches*,” in Oncken’s “*Allgemeine Geschichte*”; Bury, “*The Later Roman Empire*”; Drapeyron, “*L’Empereur Héraclius et l’Empire Byzantin au VII<sup>e</sup>*”; Diehl, “*L’Administration Byzantine dans l’Exarchat de Ravenne*”; “*L’Africa Byzantine*”; and “*Justinien et la Civilisation Byzantine*.”

sixth century enough vigour to undertake to reconstruct the old Roman power in the Mediterranean basin.

Arcadius, the oldest son of Theodosius the Great, died in 408, leaving a child of seven years, Theodosius II. The new reign was never anything more than a long minority. Under the guardianship of his sister Pulcheria, who lived in the imperial palace, as in a monastery, Theodosius failed to learn how to govern. He lacked the character of a leader of the state; he only succeeded in assuming the attitude of one. He went through official ceremonies with dignity; in private he passed his time painting, sculpturing, making exquisite copies of manuscripts; hence his title, "The Calligrapher." But he should be accorded the merit of having codified all the imperial constitutions promulgated since Constantine's time, and this Theodosian Code, so precious to history, sufficed to immortalise his name. His brother-in-law, the brave Marcian, Pulcheria's husband, only occupied the throne for a brief space (450-457); the family of the great Theodosius died out with him. His successors, Leo I., Zeno, and Anastasius, deserve respect for their efforts to construct an army recruited from among their subjects, and not from among the barbarians, but they could not prevent the Ostrogoths from mastering Italy. With Justin I. and his nephew Justinian the Empire assumed a vigorous offensive.

**2. Justin I., 518-527.**—Justin I. (518-527), peasant of Illyria, was first shepherd, then soldier. His courage gradually raised him to the highest ranks in the army. On the throne, which he seized at Anastasius's death, he preserved the habits of his early station; he was untutored and lacked the talents of a statesman. He had his nephew Upravda, a peasant like himself, carefully taught; then he adopted him, named him Justinian, and

associated him with him in the Empire. Some months later Justinian succeeded him without dispute; he was then forty-five years old.

**3. Justinian. Character and Policy.**—He was then a mature man. Without having a creative mind, he had a clear conception of his duties, and knew how to fulfil them. His task was arduous. It was to restore order in minds torn by political and religious passions, reconstruct imperial dominion in the Mediterranean world, strengthen the frontiers, and perfect the system of political and administrative institutions. Seconded by good generals and able ministers he accomplished this programme with unquestionable success.

**4. The Empress Theodora.**—One of his first acts was to associate with him in his power his wife Theodora. If Procopius, a writer of the time, is to be believed in his secret "History," a collection, made with perfidious care, of all the scandalous rumours at the court, Theodora was the daughter of a wild beast-tamer, Akakios, whose office was to feed the bears at the circus in Constantinople; she led the life of a boisterous wandering actress, until, fallen into deep poverty, she won by magic charms Justinian's heart. There are two facts in all this: Theodora was of obscure birth, like Justinian, and she was poor when he married her; two unpardonable defects in the eyes of the sceptical and keen aristocrats of Constantinople. She was small, somewhat pale, with brilliant, alert eyes, which lent charm to her features. According to the secret "History" even, her bearing on the throne was always dignified. She loved display, but had a strong mind, and counselled wisely; more than once in the preamble to his laws, Justinian repeated that he had consulted "his revered wife." She bore the title of Augusta, and was truly an empress.

**5. The Games and Factions at Constantinople. The Nika Sedition.**—The Empire's capital was torn by factions; political passions, banished from the arena of the state, found a refuge in the hippodrome. There each political and religious party had its favourites and its distinctive colours, borrowed from paganism; the Blues, who had taken the colours of Poseidon, the Greens, who wore Aphrodite's. Under the emperor Anastasius the Greens had been in favour; they sat nearest the prince at the theatre. Under Justin, who had despoiled Anastasius's nephews, Hypatius and Pompeius, of the purple, the Blues regained the advantage, and displayed throughout the city that insolence which the assurance of impunity lent them. In the circus one day, in 532, the Greens complained violently to the emperor, and, not obtaining justice, they rose in arms. Their war-cry, *Nika* ("Be victorious!"), was heard on all sides. The prefect's mansion was burned; Hypatius was proclaimed emperor. Justinian planned flight, but Theodora restored his courage. By a successful disposal of troops they enclosed the insurgents and their emperor in the circus; the soldiers then entered and killed all. Thirty thousand persons are said to have been massacred. This harsh lesson smothered, but did not extinguish, the passions. Fourteen years later blood was again shed for a like reason.

On the establishment of quiet in the capital Justinian began his foreign wars. The rapid decadence of the barbarian kingdoms of Africa, Italy, and Spain facilitated his plans.

**6. Conquest of Africa. End of the Vandal Kingdom, 534.**—He appeared in Africa as the defender of the orthodox faith against the usurper Gelimer, an Arian. A small army of not more than ten thousand infantry and five thousand horse, commanded, however, by an able general,

Belisarius, had but to appear to overthrow Gaiseric's work. Gelimer, beaten near Tricameron, not far from Carthage, was surrounded in his retreat on Mount Pappua and forced to surrender. Belisarius carried him prisoner to Constantinople, where Justinian awarded a triumph to his general, an honour which for five centuries had been reserved for emperors alone. Among the precious objects which passed in review before the crowd of Byzantium was the treasure from the temple of Jerusalem, which Titus had brought to Rome and Gaiseric had removed to Carthage. Justinian returned it to Jerusalem. He crowned Belisarius's glory by naming him sole consul for the following year.

**7. Conquest of Italy. End of the Ostrogothic Kingdom, 555.**—The Goths' turn came after the Vandals'. The grandson and successor of the great Theodoric, Athalaric, died from excesses in 534. Justinian then intervened, under pretext of avenging morals and religion, but he found a less easy task in Italy than in Africa (535). It required not less than nineteen campaigns to conquer the Goths. Belisarius failed in the undertaking. Narses, victor at Taginæ, at the foot of the Apennines, between Perouse and Ancona, followed the last Gothic king, Teias, to Vesuvius, killed him and destroyed his army (554). In the meanwhile Narses's success was threatened by a Frankish invasion led by two of Theodebald's lieutenants. But this was destroyed by the climate and the sword of Byzantine soldiers. At the end of 555 Narses remained unquestioned master of the Peninsula.

**8. Italy Profits Little by the Fall of the Ostrogoths.**—Thus ended the Gothic dominion. Among all the barbarian peoples who had occupied Italy, the Goths had distinguished themselves by gentleness, toleration, and an aptitude to receive Roman civilisation. Later their

merits were forgotten. They were spoken of as a people without laws and without taste; the architecture and the writing of the Middle Ages was condemned in the one word, Gothic. To them was imputed the destruction of the antique monuments of Rome, which were lost, in reality, by gross carelessness, which left them the prey of builders of churches and fortresses. The Byzantine conquest was as harmful to Italy as the Gothic domination. Narses, given the most comprehensive powers, attempted to revive the old administration; behind him reappeared the Roman extortioners. After twenty years of furious wars the country was drained to fill the coffers of the fiscal agents, or to satisfy the general's greed.

**9. The Greeks Seize a Part of Spain from the Visigoths, 554.**—The troops, left free by the termination of the wars in Italy, were mostly sent into Spain. There also, anarchy invited and favoured foreign intervention. After the family of the Balti had died out with Amalaric (531), the Visigoths had kings of no one dynasty. These generally usurped the throne; many were assassinated; the crown seldom remained more than three generations in the same family. Moreover, this insecure royalty had a formidable enemy in Catholicism. Subdued and persecuted by the Arian Goths, the Catholics hated their masters. They supported the uprising of a noble, Athanagild, who demanded the support of the Byzantines in order to dethrone Agila. The patrician Liberius, who was immediately sent by Justinian, helped the usurper to seize the power, but took possession, for the benefit of the Empire, of the principal fortresses of the southern coast. Master of Ceuta and the lower valley of the Guadalquivir, he held the pillars of Hercules; Justinian might now boast with some truth that the Mediterranean belonged to him. *Mare nostrum!*

In Spain, Italy, and Africa Justinian had profited by his enemies' faults in religious and political matters; in the East and North he was less fortunate, because circumstances were less favourable.

**10. The Greeks Held in Check on the Eastern Frontier.**—The eastern frontier of the Empire, from Trebizond on the Black Sea to Circesium on the Euphrates, was constantly menaced by the Persians. To hold them in check Theodosius and his successors had erected fortresses and acquired the good-will of small tribes, more or less independent, which were settled between the two empires: the Christian Lazi, dwelling in ancient Colchis in the basin of the Phasis, who commanded the principal defile of the Caucasus; the tribe of the Ghassanides, of Arabian race, masters of the extensive oases scattered through the desert between Syria and the Euphrates; and the Bedouin tribes of Arabia Petræa, etc. The Persian Sassanides coveted Syria, so as to have an outlet to the Mediterranean, and treated with the Lazi to obtain an opening to the Black Sea, the highway to Constantinople. The faithful Christians and the fire-worshippers kept each other at bay, alternating in successes and reverses. Justinian, absorbed in his Mediterranean wars, had twice to pay tribute to Chosroes Nushirvan. A treaty was concluded with the Christian negus of Abyssinia in hopes of stirring up an unexpected enemy, but nothing came of it.

**11. Chosroes the Great.**—In Chosroes Justinian had a formidable rival. He was one of the greatest sovereigns Iran ever had. An unscrupulous politician, he made sure of his power through the death of two of his brothers. This crime, readily condoned by Orientals, did not affect his title of Just; and he affected justice, leniency, and humanity. He shed tears over the sacking of

Antioch, which was done by his orders. As a literary prince he founded an academy near his capital, Ctesiphon; he had translated into Persian the works of Aristotle and the Hindu fables of Bidpaï, imitated by Phædrus and La Fontaine. He is supposed to have borrowed from the Hindus the game of chess, invented "to warn kings that their strength lies in the strength of their subjects." Although fighting the Empire, he imitated it. After the surrender of Antioch he took pleasure in the games of the circus, and learning that Justinian favoured the Blues, he espoused the party of the Greens. He was an able commander, and measured himself several times, and to his own credit, with Justinian's best general, Belisarius.

**12. The Greeks Checked on the Frontier of the Danube. Slavs, Bulgarians, and Avars.**—The departure of Theodoric with the Goths for Italy had left a vacant place on the Danube, and opened one of the doors of the Empire. The Slavs passed through, after the Germans. In the sixth century these people had just begun to renounce their nomadic life; they had begun to cultivate wheat. As pagans, they adored the forces of nature, chiefly the god of thunder and lightning. They raised to him wooden statues, with silver heads and golden beards, on a hill at Kieff and at Novgorod near a river; they sacrificed animals and human victims to him. They were bold and impetuous in battle, humane to their prisoners of war, and hospitable in times of peace. Later came the Bulgarians, of Finnish origin, who crossed the Danube on the ice, in 539. They found the passes in the Balkans unkept, the wall of Anastasius, which shut off the peninsula of Constantinople, overthrown by an earthquake; they approached even the walls of the capital. Belisarius stopped them, and Justinian opposed to them the Avars.



They were also Finnish, allied to the Huns of the fifth century and the Hungarians of the tenth. Their encampment was near the Caucasus. An embassy which they sent to Constantinople returned so filled with admiration for the capital of the Empire that they eagerly offered their services to Justinian. The latter was far from refusing them; it was to his interest to wear the barbarians out with wars among themselves. The Avars fell upon the Bulgarians and the Slavs; they found their way to the Elbe, and then returned to the Danube, where they remained until Charlemagne's time.

**13. Importance of Justinian's Reign from a Military and Diplomatic Point of View.**—Taking Justinian's wars together and looking at them from a distance, it is impossible to misconstrue their importance. There had been no period so brilliant since the death of Theodosius. Since 476, when there was a sole emperor for the two parts of the Roman state, the Cæsars of Byzantium had been obliged to content themselves with the semblance of the office, so far as the West is concerned. The emperor was by right supreme master (Basileus), in reality the barbarian kings were independent. Justinian subdued some, and frightened others; by means of diplomacy, and of his armies and fleet, he controlled effectively the Mediterranean world. He is reproached for not reserving all his forces to meet the Persians and the Bulgarians; it is forgotten that he was not the emperor of Constantinople solely, but that he belonged to the whole Empire pitted against barbarism.

**14. Interior Government. Division of the Subject.**—The interior government of the Empire was equally effective. His policy, quite in conformity with imperial traditions, may be comprised under the short formula: one state, one Church, one law.

**15. Religious Character of the Imperial Despotism. Political Unity.**—Justinian maintained, to the highest degree, the loftiness of his rank. All which emanated from the emperor being divine, the laws were his “divine oracles,” the subjects invoked his “eternity.” The port of Byzantium, the imperial palace, the diadem, the letter J, more than twelve majestracies, his books of law, all were called Justinian. He brooked no other authority in the state than his own. Under pretext of economy he suppressed in 541 the consulate in the East; that in the West had not existed since Belisarius’s time, in 535. He conferred on the bishops weighty administrative and judicial privileges, but he did not relax his hold upon them; the bishop of Rome, before entering on his functions, must, like others, await the consent of the emperor or of the governor of Ravenna.

**16. Religious Unity. Dissenters are Punished.**—As philosopher and theologian he took part in the religious quarrels which divided men’s minds. The Greeks had always liked to dispute on the idea of God, the origin of the world, and the nature of man. The Byzantines discussed the recent doctrine of the Trinity. A priest of Alexander, Arius (280-336), having maintained that the son of God was neither eternal nor equal to the Father (*homoiousios*), the Nicene council, the first one of the ecumenical councils (325), decreed, to the contrary, that the Son was of the same substance (*homousios*) as the Father. Arianism was persecuted throughout the Empire, from Theodosius the Great on; the more so since it was adopted by the barbarians. A bishop of Constantinople, Nestorius, taught that the divine person in Jesus Christ should be separated from the human person; the council of Ephesus (431) decided that Christ was both man and God. Nestorius was exiled. His partisans,

driven out by Theodosius II., took refuge in Persia, where the sect has persisted down to our days. Eutyches, abbot of a convent at Constantinople, going to the other extreme, preached the doctrine of the unity of nature in Christ; the Monophysites, who accepted it, were condemned in 451. They then separated from the Catholic Church and formed a body which spread throughout Egypt, Armenia, Syria, and Mesopotamia; an important move, which prepared the way for the political separation of these peoples at the time of the Arabian invasion. Justinian is accused of having persecuted all these heretics. Was he wrong to try to silence quarrels so inimical to the unity of the Empire? Heraclius did the same; but wishing to conciliate all, he declared that if there were two natures in Jesus, there could be but one will; and gave rise thus to the heresy of the Monothelites, who were condemned by the council of Constantinople (680). The Maronites on Mount Lebanon professed this belief until their union with the Roman Church in the twelfth century.

**17. Pagan Philosophy Interdicted.**—Compared with these furious disputes, the antique pagan philosophy was henceforth treated with indifference. It was still publicly taught, especially at Athens; but the later official professors of paganism, Proclus among others, who was the most illustrious, had almost no followers. After Theodosius II. they were not paid; Justinian forbade them to teach. The last of the Greek philosophers sought refuge with Chosroes, but finally they were allowed to return to their fatherland, where they died in obscurity, leaving no successors or followers. Thus the same sovereign who officially suppressed the Roman consulate stamped out Greek philosophy. The ancient Græco-Latin world was giving place to the Byzantine. Justinian

obtained religious unity with difficulty, and it was but temporary. To offset this he realised unity of legislation, and this is his greatest glory.

### 18. Legislative Unity. The Corpus Juris Civilis.—


Down to the sixth century the sources of Roman law were scattered. They comprised the laws made in the public assemblies of ancient Rome, the decrees of the Senate, the edicts of the prætors, the books of the great juriconsults of the Empire, and the private collections of imperial rescripts which Gregory and Hermogenes had compiled in the fourth century. Theodosius II. had already tried to bring order into this chaotic mass; the Theodosian Code, promulgated in 438, is made up of the Constitutions of the Christian emperors. Justinian enlarged on the idea. 1. He directed ten juriconsults, among whom were the patrician, John of Cappadocia, Tribonian, quæstor of the palace, and Theophilus, professor of law at Constantinople, to unite in one code the laws enacted by his predecessors. To this *Codex justinianeus* (529) he added successively fifty new constitutions. He had a new edition made, the only one which we possess, named the *Codex repetitæ prælectionis*, which was completed in 534. The edicts rendered by Justinian in the second part of his reign were added to the Code under the division *Novellæ*, and were considered “authentic additions” (*Authenticæ*). 2. A second commission of sixteen scholars, presided over by Tribonian, undertook the *Digest*, or *Pandects*, a collection of decisions or opinions taken from the books of the forty principal Roman juriconsults who had been “patented,” that is to say, authorised by the emperors to give opinions which should have the force of law in the tribunals. 3. As the Code and the Pandects presented many difficulties to students, Tribonian, with two auxiliaries, drew up a manual of jurisprudence in

four books, composed on the plan of the Institutes of Gaius; it was the celebrated treatise, the Institutes, which is studied to-day in all the law schools of the Christian world. Justinian attributed the accomplishment of this work "to the aid and grace of God," wished it to be considered sacred, as an "eternal oracle," and forbade the addition to it of any commentary.

**19. Importance of Justinian's Legislation.**—These three collections, the Code, the Digest, and the Institutes, form the *Corpus juris civilis*, which transmitted to the societies sprung from the ruins of the Roman state the principles of Roman jurisprudence, that is to say, the idea that the free man is a part of a society founded on respect for law; that the defence of persons and property rests with the state, and not with the individual; that the state is a trained hierarchy of functionaries obeying one chief, absolute and uncontrolled. These fundamental principles endured in the East as long as the Empire. Revised under Basil the Macedonian and his son Leo the Philosopher, Justinian legislation was in force when the Turks seized Constantinople (1453); but its influence was not confined to the East. Justinian established the authority of these books as law for Italy by a "pragmatic" edict of the year 559. The revolutions which convulsed the peninsula after the emperor's death did not destroy his work. The study of Roman jurisprudence, carried on feebly during the first centuries of the Middle Ages, revived in the eleventh century with amazing vigour, and revealed to the barbarian nations the modern idea of the state founded on law. Justinian's will and the science of Tribonian thus accomplished one of the most fruitful works for the benefit of mankind.


**20. Public Works Ordered by Justinian.**—Justinian was a great builder as well as legislator. The official

historian of his reign, Procopius, described in eight books, with a superabundance of detail, the edifices, civil, religious, and military, which this tireless builder raised throughout the Empire. In Constantinople and its suburbs not less than twenty-five churches were built and dedicated to the Virgin and the saints; the most celebrated is Saint Sophia (*Haghia Sophia*, that is, Jesus Christ, the Divine Word), which to-day, near the Golden Horn, still rears aloft its bold and massive towers. The pagan temples were despoiled to adorn this marvel of Byzantine art, by the architects Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletas. Justinian boasted of having surpassed Solomon's temple. Saint Vitalis's at Ravenna was begun in 547 by the archbishop Ecclesius on the model of Saint Sophia. Marbles, precious metals, and all the resources of mosaics were expended on these buildings, which are monuments of the emperor's ostentatious piety. Travellers, pilgrims and mendicants appreciated more perhaps the inns and hospitals built for them, the convents which received them and sent them forward on their way. The emperor rebuilt, in part, his palace, destroyed by the Nika insurrection. The riches heaped up within it were surpassed by Theodora, in the superb palace, the Heraion, on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus. Justinian multiplied fortifications for the defence of the Empire, as had been done before him in Dacia, beyond the Rhine, and in Brittany. From Belgrade to the Black Sea, all along the Danube, extended a chain of more than eighty strongholds; six hundred were repaired or built in Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia, and Thrace; the pass of Thermopylæ, the isthmus of Corinth, the Chersonesus of Thrace, were enclosed by intrenchments, and the wall of Anastasius completed. In Asia the passes of the Caucasus were guarded, the cities of Armenia











and Mesopotamia provided with towers, and a line of communication kept open between them by means of detached forts. Justinian is reproached with having buried vast sums in these excavations, stones, and heaps of bricks; but what nation does differently in the Europe of to-day? However, other works were more productive; the highways kept in repair, the bridges thrown over the rivers, favoured commerce; silk, introduced into the Empire, was a new source of wealth, the monopoly of which Justinian reserved for himself, it is true. Provinces were better protected and paid their taxes more easily, even after the accumulated disasters of pest, famine, and earthquake.

**21. Calamities of the Empire.**—Justinian's last years were disturbed by uprisings and a conspiracy against his life. The former were quelled and the latter was forestalled. Belisarius was suspected of being in the plot, and the illustrious general was arrested and his property confiscated. Doubtless he was innocent, for later he was set at liberty. He was reinstated in his dignities and a part of his property, but his enjoyment of them was short-lived; he died in 561. Justinian soon followed him; he died in 565, aged eighty-four.

**22. Justinian Deserves the Surname of Great.**—Justinian was an unusual man. The qualities his historians have praised in him—his noble bearing, affable speech, purity and abstemiousness of habits, zeal for work, taste for architecture and music, poetry, and philosophy, theology and law, love of order and discipline—reveal a gifted nature, capable of accomplishing great works, with good auxiliaries. With generals like Belisarius and Narses, ministers like John of Cappadocia and Tribonian, he revived the tradition of the emperors of the second and fourth centuries; but the Empire had too many enemies

to remain long at the point to which he raised it. He tried to bring back its ancient splendour, but only succeeded in casting a last ray of glory over its downfall.

**23. The Greek Empire after Justinian Contracts its Frontiers.**—Between the deaths of Justinian and Heraclius (565-641) the frontiers were repeatedly contracted. Heraclius checked, it is true, the advance of the Persians and forced them to accept a burdensome treaty, but he was in turn vanquished by the Mussulmans, who seized the fairest Oriental provinces. The Avar auxiliaries besieged Constantinople on the north, bringing with them a horde of Bulgarians. They were repulsed, but the Bulgarians returned to the charge and established themselves definitely (679) in the Balkan peninsula, where they have remained to this day. One century after Justinian the Danube had ceased to be the northern boundary of the Empire. In the west the retreat of the Byzantines was more rapid. The Visigoths, in Spain, rescued from anarchy by Leovigild (568-586), assumed the offensive; in 582 Seville was taken by assault and Cordova capitulated. Reccared (586-601) took a decided step when he embraced Catholicism; the orthodox Spaniards had henceforth no need of the Byzantines. Swinthila seized their last possessions (628), and, first of the Gothic kings, he reigned alone in the Iberian peninsula. And finally Italy was invaded by the Lombards not long after Justinian's death.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE LAST INVASIONS AND THE PAPACY—THE LOMBARDS AND GREGORY THE GREAT—THE ANGLO-SAXONS AND MONASTICISM.\*

**1. The Last Invasions, and the Papacy. Division of the Subject.**—At the time that Justinian's efforts to reconstruct the ancient imperial unity failed, a development of greatest consequence was going on in the West. The bishop of Rome, the Pope, was becoming a power to be reckoned with henceforth. Various causes led up to this result. In the first place, the reverence which Christian devotion paid to the successors of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, placed the popes in a commanding situation, even in the eyes of the Orientals. The necessity for a supreme judicial authority in the Church gave them a preëminence in jurisdiction, which was in time to become a universal headship. The misfortunes of the Empire favoured this development. The Pope reaped the fruits of

\* **SOURCES.**—The historian of the Lombards was a priest of Lombard origin, Paul, son of Warnefried, who lived in the eighth century. His "*Historia Langobardorum*" is published by G. Waitz in the "*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*." To these should be added the critical studies of Bethmann (1851), Dahn (1876), Mommsen, etc., which are analyzed in "*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*," by W. Wattenbach (sixth edition, 1894). For the Anglo-Saxons, the principal source is "*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*," by Bede the Venerable, in the eighth century. The best edition is that of Ch. Plummer (2 vols., Oxford, 1896). Add the "*Chronica minora*," published by Th. Mommsen ("*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, 1894) and the texts collected in volume i. of "*Monumenta historica britannica*." The letters of Gregory the

a double invasion: that of the Lombards in Italy, which, by separating Rome from the Greek empire, made way for the political freedom of the Papacy; and that of the Anglo-Saxons in Britain, which made possible its moral ascendancy in the West through the development which monasticism there underwent, and the fidelity of the Anglo-Saxon Church to the Holy See.

**2. The Lombards Before their Settlement in Italy.**—The Lombards, Langobardi, had settled in Pannonia after the Goths left; later, allied with the Gepidæ, they had spread through the valley of the Theiss. They offered their services to Justinian in his wars in Italy against the Goths. Many were enlisted by Narses, whilst others pillaged independently the Italian slope of the Adriatic. The remainder, the bulk of the nation, were induced by Justinian to attack the Gepidæ. The war lasted fifteen years. In the end the Lombards made a treaty with the Avars which assured their success. King Kunimund was killed by the hand of the Lombard chief, Alboin (566). The Byzantines applauded loudly a victory which relieved them of an embarrassing neighbour; they did not foresee that the Lombards, inspired by success, and attracted by the mildness of a climate in a country where many had already served under Narses, would Great and the other Popes, from Saint Peter to Innocent III., in part published in the “*Patrologia Latina*” of Migne, have been analysed by Ph. Jaffé: “*Regesta pontificum romanorum*”; new edition much enlarged by Wattenbach, Kaltenbrunner, and Ewald (2 vols., 1885–1888). For Gregory’s writings see A. Ebert: “*Allgemeine Geschichte des Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*”; also translated into French (3 vols.).

LITERATURE.—J. R. Green, “*The Making of England*”; Winkelmann, “*Geschichte der Angelsachsen*” in Oncken; Hodgkin, “*Italy and Her Invaders*”; Bury and Diehl, as above; Loth, “*L’Émigration Bretonne en Armorique*”; Pingaud, “*La Politique de Saint Grégoire le Grand.*”

soon invade Italy. The barbarians had feared this general, but after his disgrace they moved onward, led by Alboin.

**3. The Lombards Invade Italy.**—The entire nation emigrated, as the Goths had done. Reinforced by thirty thousand Saxons, they invaded Friuli; terror excited by their ravages paralysed all courage. The Patriarch of Aquileia fled to a wretched fishing village, at Grado. Tuscany and Samnium were easily conquered; but Pavia held out for three years, until forced to yield by famine. Alboin spared the city, to make of it his capital. He died the following year at Verona, assassinated by one of his suite, doubtless at the instigation of his wife, Rosamund, daughter of Kunimund, whom he had married by force. His death was almost fatal to the Lombards. The principal chiefs asserted their independence; the conquered land was partitioned into duchies, and for a time there was no king. The Byzantines tried to profit by this anarchy; they called in to Italy Childebert II., king of Austrasia. The Lombards then realised the necessity for union, and chose a king. Autharis, elected in 584, repulsed the Franks and obliged the Greeks to shut themselves up in Ravenna. At his death the Lombards occupied the valley of the Po and all the interior of the peninsula to Beneventum; the Byzantines held only the coast-line of the three seas, with the large islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. Italy was cut in two.

**4. Social and Political Consequences of the Lombard Invasion.**—The Lombard invasion caused more changes than did any of the preceding ones. Not that they were more cruel or intolerant than other barbarians, but that they were animated by a different spirit. The Lombard kings were not eager for office under the Empire, as Alaric, Odoacer, or Theodoric had been. They treated Italy like a conquered country. They refused to admit

the principle of personal law. All Romans, priests as well, lost the benefit of living "according to Roman law"; they were in a condition lower than freedom. Lands were divided anew, and the land-owners were forced to give to the conquerors a third of the agricultural produce. Towns were less severely treated. The Lombard nobles lived in the German way—in the country, and occupied chiefly in the chase. The counts took no part in the municipal administration; they represented the king, presided over tribunals, and guarded the interests of Lombards living in the cities—nothing more. It seemed therefore as if the fusion of the two peoples would be impossible; it was accomplished, however, more rapidly than one would have thought. The Lombards forgot their own tongue, adopted the manners and customs of the conquered people, and, following their example, cultivated the peaceful arts, science, and commerce. Astolf (749-756) divided his subjects into two divisions: proprietors and merchants; these into three classes; each class of merchants performed military service in a rank corresponding to the same class of proprietors. The Italians learned anew in the Lombard school the profession of arms. In the eighth century the absorption was complete.

**5. Greek Government in Italy. Exarchate of Ravenna.**—On the other hand, what was the condition of that part of Italy which was not subdued by the Lombards? In law it was under the authority of the prætorian prefect and the military commandant, who wielded supreme power, with the title of exarch, which had been already borne by the governor of Africa. In the provinces were judges, under the supervision of bishops, and military chiefs—called dukes, or "masters of the militia," in the large cities, tribunes, in the small



ones. But the exarch resided at Ravenna, where it was difficult for him to communicate with the other provinces, which were surrounded by Lombards. Busy with his private affairs, or with intrigues which were going on at Constantinople, he abandoned them little by little to themselves. In this way Venice, Naples, Rome became the centre of military governments or duchies which were almost independent. The privilege of electing its own dukes was early acquired by Naples. Venice, on the contrary, which developed more slowly in the shelter of her lagoons, was attached directly to the Empire.

**6. Rome in the Sixth Century.**—Rome was much fallen. Since Honorius's time it had ceased to be the capital of the emperors of the West; since 476 it was nothing more than a provincial city. It lost its oldest institutions under Justinian; it had no consul after 535; after 555 the Senate ceased to take part in the election of the bishop, and disappeared. During some time longer there were senators, but they formed part of a municipal body only. Honorius had suppressed the gladiatorial games; the last chariot races were held in 549 by Totila in the great amphitheatre. Its mutilated monuments were all that remained of pagan Rome. After the sixth century it was governed by the prefect of the city, and in its military affairs by a master of the militia named by the exarch or the emperor.

**7. Growing Authority of the Bishop of Rome.**—Until that time the bishops of Rome had concerned themselves with religious matters. They took part, with the other bishops of the Christian world, and in the same degree, in the great councils which had decided the dogma and discipline of the Church. Like them, they were closely dependent on the emperor, although accorded the dignity of primates; after Saint Leo the Great the authorisation

of the "Pope" was necessary to legalise an ecumenical council convoked by the emperor. As it was necessary in the Church to have a supreme tribunal to act as a court of appeals, the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome was acknowledged supreme. In this way Saint John Chrysostom had Pope Innocent I. annul a sentence passed against him by his adversaries. Soon this supremacy was extended to questions of dogma and discipline. As early as the fifth century the decisions or "decretals" of the Popes figure beside the canons of the councils in the collections of canonical texts. That composed by the monk Dionysius the Little in 500 exerted a great influence on the government of the Church. One point is worthy of note: the bishops of Rome were almost the only ones to profit by the misfortunes of the times, and to benefit by the laws through which Justinian gave to all bishops a fair share in the government of their cities and the choice of their officers. At a period when the most illustrious episcopal cities, like Milan, were seized and occupied by barbarians, Rome escaped foreign domination. It was pillaged by Alaric, Gaiseric, and the Goths, but the conquerors did not settle down there; the Lombards closed in upon the city, which, however, was not taken. It passed through the most stormy invasions, and, although much tried, it grew great on the ruin of others.

**8. Beginning of the Temporal Power of the Popes.**—As the bishop of Rome was thus becoming the undisputed primate of Italy, and playing a leading part in the universal Church, he began to mix in temporal affairs, not only in Rome, but in the Empire, and even among the barbarian kingdoms. Down to the sixth century all popes are declared saints in the martyrologies. Vigilius (537-555) is the first of a series of popes who no longer

bear this title, which is henceforth sparingly conferred. From this time on the popes, more and more involved in worldly events, no longer belong solely to the Church; they are men of the state, and then rulers of the state. Gregory the Great, who merited canonisation, began the evolution which opened the way to such high destinies for the bishopric of Rome.

9. **Gregory the Great Before his Pontificate.**—Gregory was a member of one of the most ancient noble families of Rome, the Anicii; one of his ancestors, Felix, had been Pope. He was born in 540. His parents intended him for public affairs; he studied dialectics and rhetoric, subjects much honoured in the schools which Theodoric the Great had restored. About 570, when he was thirty years old, he governed the city as prefect or prætor. At one time he was accustomed to be seen in the streets, dressed in silk garments adorned with precious stones. Suddenly he renounced the world, and devoted his inheritance to the building of monasteries. Ordained deacon by Pope Pelagius, he was sent to Constantinople as apocrisiarius, that is to say, resident minister at the emperor's court. He remained there about five years. When Pelagius died the Romans hastened to elect in his place this scion of an illustrious family, who had filled such high offices and had been himself so humble. At first Gregory refused the perilous honour, but he was forced to accept it. He was consecrated in Saint Peter's Cathedral September 3, 590.

10. **The Pontificate of Gregory the Great. Division of the Subject.**—Gregory was the first of the great popes of the Middle Ages. His work may be summed up under two heads: (1) To make the bishop of Rome a temporal sovereign in Rome and Italy; (2) to prepare the West to receive the spiritual primacy of Rome. It is possible

that he did not realise the full meaning of the rôle which circumstances led him to play.

**11. His Temporal Authority.**—As a citizen he had lavished his personal fortune on charities and pious endowments; as a bishop he applied the revenues of the Holy See to restoring churches, supplying Rome with provisions, ransoming prisoners of war, and keeping off the Lombards. Twice he bought off King Agilulf. He looked upon church property as the “common patrimony of suffering humanity.” The papal possessions were much scattered, even lying in Dalmatia and Gaul. Gregory entrusted the management of them to agents, *rectores patrimonii*, whose influence was felt in spiritual as well as in administrative matters. Thus the bishop of Rome, who was a great landed proprietor, became actual sovereign of his domains. The administration in Rome was legally in the hands of the emperor’s agents, but as they had neither money nor soldiers from Byzantium, they were powerless. Gregory controlled them by means of his personal ascendancy and repeated favours. Thus he paved the way for the sovereignty of the Pope at Rome, and for what is known as the “temporal power.”

**12. His Spiritual Authority.**—This he did for the state; in the Church, although he signed himself “servant of the servants of God,” he would not brook the assumption of an authority which might lessen that of the Roman See. Gregory protested energetically against the title of “ecumenical,” or universal, which the Patriarch of Constantinople had assumed—Rome was the capital of the Christian world, not Constantinople.

**13. Progress of Catholicism in the West.**—He profited by the growth of Catholicism in the West. The Lombards were Arians, or even pagans. Gregory was in constant communication with Thedelinda, a Bavarian Cath-

olic princess, and widow of Autharis. Encouraged by him, she began their conversion. When Reccared was converted, in Spain, and forced his subjects to acknowledge the decrees of the council of Toledo, Gregory lost no time in congratulating him, and in reviving a friendship with the bishop of Seville, Leander, whom he had known formerly in Constantinople. He corresponded with the Frankish kings, sent messages to Brunhilda, recommended to her the monk Augustine and his companions, who were going on a mission to convert England. Little by little, and in this way, the Visigothic, Frankish, and Anglo-Saxon kings, the Lombards even, became followers of the Holy See.

**14. Gregory the Great as a Practical Moralist. His Works.**—Gregory accelerated this movement by trying to make religion more moral and lovable. The futile disputes of the Byzantines had aroused but a faint echo in the less subtle minds of the West. Graver and more perplexing questions troubled men's souls; such as free-will and divine grace. Like Saint Amboise and Saint Augustine, Gregory was a practical moralist. For the teaching of novices, he undertook an extensive commentary, very popular in the Middle Ages, under the name of "Moralia," of the book of Job; also a kind of manual to be used by confessors, entitled "Regula pastoralis." He relates, in the "Dialogues," miracles and visions, especially those concerning death and celestial happiness, which were experienced by dying men. The beliefs, superstitions, and poetry of the Middle Ages were influenced in an extraordinary way by these writings. Gregory had no pride as an author. He neglected correct style; he affected such disdain for classic literature that the burning of the Palatine library is attributed to him. He never learned Greek, although he lived several years in Constantinople.

He laid stress on faith, not on science. At the same time he tried to perfect the liturgy, or the order of services, in the celebration of divine worship. Nine authentic hymns composed by Gregory are in existence, and he introduced the Gregorian chant.

**15. Importance of his Pontificate.**—Gregory died March 12, 604. His epitaph bears the title “Consul of God.” He laid solid foundations for the temporal and spiritual supremacy of the popes. Dating from his pontificate, Rome recommenced, as she had done twelve centuries before, the conquest of the barbarian world, though her dominion was not to be established this time over bodies and by force, but over souls, and through faith. Anglo-Saxon Britain was, as it were, the first province of this Roman and Christian empire.

**16. The Celts in Britain and Ireland.**—The country known to-day as Great Britain and Ireland was originally peopled by the Celtic race. There were two distinct groups of dialects spoken there: (1) the *Erse*, or *Gaelic*, used in all Hibernia (Ireland); later carried by the *Scoti* to the Isle of Man and Albany, that is, western Scotland; (2) the *Briton*, spoken in the rest of Great Britain. The configuration of the land accentuated the differences of speech and peoples. The Britons lived in the lowlands along great rivers, such as the Severn, Thames, and Humber, which lay open to invasion; in the north the Scots of Albany and their neighbours, the Picts of Caledonia, could organise a vigorous resistance in their mountains; Hibernia was far enough out of the maritime highway so as not to invite invasion. The Roman conquest stopped at the foot of the Scotch mountains, and did not touch Ireland. The Britons, who had yielded to the Romans, were also the prey of the barbarians.

**17. Beginning of the Germanic Invasions in Britain.—**

Their misfortunes began with the usurpation of Maximus, provincial governor, whom his legions proclaimed emperor (381), and carried into Italy to fight Valentinian II. The northern frontier, which had been fortified by the Romans, was left unprotected, and the hordes of unsubdued Picts and Scots rushed in and ravaged the low country. Stilicho drove them back into their mountains (400), but the invasion of Gaul soon necessitated the presence of his legions on the continent. The withdrawal was final. The country, left to itself, fell back into anarchy, whence the Romans had with difficulty rescued it. The northern pillagers took advantage of it to extend their ravages to the Thames. A king of the south Britons, Vortigern, a usurper, it is said, summoned to aid them Saxon auxiliaries. Led by Hengist, a small body landed on the island of Thanet,\* and helped Vortigern to drive back the invaders. Enticed doubtless by the richness of the land, they made preparations to remain. Their provisions were cut off, and they then revolted.

**18. Conquest of Britain by the Anglo-Saxons. History and Legend.—**A war was thus begun, towards the middle of the fifth century, in the reign of the Emperor Marcian, which lasted more than a century, and which hurled in succession against Britain three Germanic peoples: the Jutes, who lived in what is now Denmark; the Angles, their neighbours, who emigrated in a body; and the Saxons.

Tales of Briton origin boast of the exploits of a Roman chief, Ambrosius Aurelius, who successfully resisted the Saxons; they tell of a great defeat which the Britons

\* At the mouth of the Thames, near the right bank. It is to-day a part of the mainland of the county of Kent.

of the west, or Welsh, inflicted on the barbarians, perhaps near Bath, which secured peace for the country during one generation. Tales of Saxon origin ignore these reverses. They enumerate, on the contrary, the successes of Hengist and Horsa, his brother; of Ælla and his three sons (477-491); of Cerdic and his son Cyneric, who, victorious at Charford (519), seized the Isle of Wight (530); lastly, of Port and his two sons, who settled at Portsmouth. The legend is further embellished with the account of Vortigern's life, his marriage with Hengist's daughter, the beautiful Rowena, his quarrel with his father-in-law, his defeat and death, which left the kingdom of Kent in the power of its enemies. Arthur is supposed to have led the national defence, after Vortigern; but the period when he lived and the scene of his miraculous exploits are unknown. One sole fact stands out from all these tales: it is that the Britons were the only subjects, or almost the only subjects, of the Empire to oppose a determined resistance to the barbarians. It may be questioned whether the occupation of Gaul by the Franks took on the character of a violent conquest; that this was the case in Britain cannot be doubted. |

Continued and trustworthy history in England begins in 547, with Ida, king of the country to the north of the Humber, and especially so with the introduction of Christianity into the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

**19. The Heptarchy.**—Seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were gradually formed in the course of the sixth century. They were: Northumbria, to the north of the Humber; East Anglia, between the mouths of the Humber and Thames; Mercia, in the centre; Kent, in the southeast; the three Saxon kingdoms of the east, Essex, south, Sussex, and west, Wessex. The government of the region di-



vided into these seven states was called a heptarchy.\* It lasted two centuries and a half. It is the most deplorable period in the history of England; anarchy and civil and foreign wars added to the disasters of the invasions.

**20. Fate of the Britons.**—What became of the original inhabitants, the Britons? In the few documents of this period which remain are accounts of the frightful ravages committed by the Anglo-Saxons. It is even said that the Briton population was completely exterminated. This is improbable. Doubtless it was reduced to slavery, there to remain, since history is silent concerning them. On the other hand, the entire island of Britain was far from being conquered; the invaders occupied the south and east only; the west and north did not fall under their sway. The Scots continued their raids into the south until arrested by Aethelred, king of Northumbria, who was victorious over them near Carlisle (603). The Picts were the dominant people in Caledonia until the ninth century; they were then absorbed by the Scots, who finally gave their name to the whole country. The vast mountainous peninsulas of western Britain sheltered the Britons and included independent states between the Clyde and the Solway, in Wales, or Cambria, in Devon and Cornwall. Finally a large body of Britons emigrated to Armorica. They took with them their customs and speech; it is since that time that Celtic has been spoken in the peninsula, which was then wholly Romanised. Henceforth it bore the name of Brittany.

**21. Celtic Civilisation in Britain and Armorica.**—The Britons were sustained in their long resistance by a double sentiment: hatred of the foreigner and faith in the future.

\* This term must not be understood to mean that these seven states were united into a single government, but merely that there were seven states.—ED.

Arthur, the Christian hero, who is said to have borne the cross in the battle of Bath, became the symbol of their independence. They believed that he was not dead, but one day would rise from his long sleep, take up the struggle against the Saxons, and win back England for the Britons. The bards fostered religiously these proud hopes. A continual state of warfare did not modify their institutions, however. They remained grouped in families down to the ninth generation; the members of these patriarchal families, or clans, rendered one another mutual assistance, either to avenge an insult or a murder, before the courts, or in battle. A hereditary king was at the head of the chiefs of the clans; his power was slight, for he had no finances nor organised administration. The various divisions of the state were loosely bound together. The weakness of these political institutions had given Britain to the Romans, then to the Anglo-Saxons. The severe lesson of experience was not learned by the vanquished nation, and this carelessness was at last fatal to them.

**22. Christianity in Ireland. Saint Columba.**—The Britons were Christianised at the time of the Conquest, and it was through them that Ireland was converted. The Catholic faith was taught there by three great saints: Patrick, Brigitta, and Columba, all popular in that country to this day. The written history of Saint Brigitta is a tissue of fables; but Saint Patrick and Saint Columba are better known. The first has left authentic letters; Columba, from his real name, Crimthan, was of royal birth, but he chose to be a monk. In 545 he founded the monastery of Derry, in the “valley of oaks,” built many churches, and effected important conversions. Persecuted by his compatriots, he withdrew in 563 to the small island of Hii, or Iona, full of old monuments of

paganism, that he might organise, at his leisure, a monastery remote from the tumult of the world. Thence he visited the Scots, whose king he induced to receive baptism, and founded the national church of Scotland.

**23. The Irish Monks in Britain and on the Continent. Saint Columban.**—His disciples went on with his work of propaganda after his death (597). His identity must not be confused with that of his contemporary, who bears a similar name, Columban. The latter was also Irish. After being a monk at Bangor, he departed with twelve disciples for the continent (590); he founded the monastery of Ainegray in the Vosges. His reputation for saintliness attracted many followers, for whom he founded not less than two monasteries: Luxeuil was the most renowned. Driven from the country by Brunhilda, he withdrew to the upper valley of the Rhine, where his disciple, Saint Gall, organised a new brotherhood of monks; thence he passed on into Italy, where he died at the convent of Bobbio. There were other Irish monks who preached to the idolatrous tribes in Germany. Their success was a passing one, for they lacked enthusiasm, and worked undirected and often unprotected. Their efforts were a complete failure in England. To overcome the Anglo-Saxon stubbornness they needed the coöperation which Rome afforded them towards the end of the sixth century.

**24. Roman Mission to England. Saint Augustine, 597.** The great Pope, Gregory I., began the Christian conquest of the heptarchy. In 596 he sent out Augustine, prior of Saint-Andrew at Rome, recommending him to Brunhilda and her grandsons. Augustine's companions, men of little faith, were afraid to go to a barbarian people whose language was unknown to them. The following year Augustine set out with them again. He was well

received by Aethelberht, king of Kent and husband of Bertha, who was a Catholic and daughter of Caribert, king of Paris. He established himself at Canterbury, which was henceforth the seat of the primate of England. He converted the king of Kent, and died in 604. One of his companions became the first bishop of Rochester; another accompanied into Northumbria Aethelburga of Kent, bride of King Edwin (627), and laid the foundations for the great bishopric of York. Dunwich, Dorchester, Lindisfarn, and Litchfield were successively bishoprics subordinate to the primate. The work did not go smoothly forward, however, and the new faith often relaxed into paganism. It was finally triumphant, and towards 600 was freely adopted by all the kingdoms of the heptarchy, and England thus became a part of the civilised world.

**25. Ecclesiastical Organisation of England. Saint Theodore.**—A Greek monk, Theodore, born at Tarsus, was named by Pope Vitalian archbishop of Canterbury in 669, and entrusted with the organisation of the Church. The missionaries' first converts were kings, whose chaplains they became; the dioceses were bounded by the limits of the kingdoms. Theodore divided into two most of these early sees, the new dioceses corresponding, however, to former political divisions, kingdoms, or sub-kingdoms which had already lost their independence. In this way the two divisions of East Anglia, Norfolk, and Suffolk became the bishoprics of Dunwich and Elmham. Wessex was cut in two by Selwood forest; the western part formed the diocese of Sherborne, the eastern, that of Winchester. The new sees depended, like the former ones, on the resident primate of Canterbury. The heads of parishes ranked next below the bishops. Until that time there had been wandering missionaries only, who,

at the foot of a cross set up in the villages, or on the estate of some proprietor, preached and officiated at mass. The village now became the sphere of action for a priest, who was often named by a rich landowner, who would take him as his chaplain. In order to supervise and direct this clerical body, Theodore convoked several councils, and urged the bishops to gather around them, in their residences, all priests not employed in outside services; these inmates were required to lead a kind of monastic life; therefore the same word was applied to the bishop's house as to the church: *monasterium*, minster. The cloistered monks were subject to the rule of Saint Benedict of Nursia, the celebrated founder of the abbey of Monte Cassino, who enjoined zeal at services, prayer, and song, and manual and intellectual labour. Theodore outlined a plan for a "Penitential," which was for long years the manual of confessors. After him the English Church was strong enough to dispense with foreign assistance. He was the last primate, until the Norman conquest who was not Anglo-Saxon.

**26. Christian Civilisation in Northumbria. The Venerable Bede.**—This beneficent activity bore fruits, especially in the northern countries. Northumbria at the end of the seventh century was the most powerful kingdom of the heptarchy; its clergy was the most enlightened in England; the monasteries of Lindisfarne, Wearmouth, and Jarrow were centres of holiness and learning. Benedictus Biscop, founder of Wearmouth, went to Rome five times and brought back with him books and sacred images. He brought over masons from Gaul to build a church of stone "in the manner of the Romans," and glaziers to close the windows of the church and the cells. Ceolfridus, first abbot of Saint Paul of Jarrow, had a rich manuscript of the Scriptures made to

offer to the Pope, which still exists. The man who has rendered most illustrious Anglo-Saxon literature, Bede, entered this monastery at seven years of age. He was the author of various works on theology, orthography, and metre, natural history and chronology. The "Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation" is an invaluable work on the beginnings of the history of England. He brought it down to 732. He died three years later, in the midst of his work and preaching. That same year there was born at York Alcuin, who was to give a new impetus to study in France, under Charlemagne.

**27. Effects of England's Conversion.**—England's conversion had important results. It created a love for letters in a barbarian country; made possible a contemplative life in a society given over to anarchy; broadened the influence of the bishop of Rome in the West; and gave the land the appearance, at least, of unity. Though several kings might dispute its possession, it knew but one Church, subject to Canterbury, and attached to Rome. Its national councils were like the first form of the national parliaments of the future United Kingdom.

**28. Results of the Invasion. Summary.**—Compare now the condition of the Roman world in 395 with that about 630. Towards the end of the fourth century the emperor controlled the whole Mediterranean basin; the inheritance of the Cæsars was intact; the Latin and Greek worlds were closely allied; Catholicism, the official religion, was imposed on all consciences, as the emperor with absolute power governed all wills. In the seventh century the sovereign at Byzantium commanded the Greek world alone; with the exception of some garrisons on the African coast, and a few spots in Italy, the Latin world had slipped from his grasp. The barbarian nations who had acknowledged the imperial supremacy had thrown it off;

the late-comers, such as the Anglo-Saxons and Lombards, ignored or disdained it. While in the East Greek continued to be spoken, Latin was gradually being transformed by the barbarians, and the diversity of tongues derived from the Latin is the living proof of the diversity of peoples. The slow development of modern states made impossible a return to the old political unity imposed by the Empire on peoples different, yet more malleable. Religious unity even was threatened. The Greek Church exhausted itself in vain theological discussions, and struggled fruitlessly against heresies which cast doubts in men's minds without appealing to their hearts. The Latin Church, on the other hand, strengthened itself by taking for its head the bishop of Rome, Saint Peter's successor; it strove to reëstablish unity. In the opinion of the thinkers, writers, and rulers of that time, the Pope already seemed to represent the continuance of the imperial order. But the new force which was taking shape was a moral one; it lacked material means for rendering the Catholic idea triumphant; it sought them in the barbarian society, born of violence, and fostered by revolutions, a poor way for the Church to keep its purity and honour. The Church, therefore, could not end the confused struggle of Christian Europe.

At the same time a revolution was taking place in Asia which is as important in the history of civilisation as the barbarian invasions. The Mohammedan Arabs were rushing to the conquest of the Mediterranean world. After the death of their Prophet (632), who was to stop them? The Roman Empire was exhausted by wars with the Persians and Bulgarians. The barbarian kingdoms of the West were plunged in anarchy; the Visigoths of Spain were enfeebled by rival claimants to the throne; after Dagobert, the fainéant kings threatened France

with a fresh series of civil wars; the Lombards, in Italy, kept up an unceasing struggle with the Greek Empire and the popes; England was a prey to quarrels in the heptarchy. Everything was favourable then to the bold undertaking of the Arabs, who threatened Europe and the Christian world.



## CHAPTER X.

### THE ARABS—MOHAMMED.\*

**1. Geographical Situation of Arabia.**—Arabia is a vast quadrangular peninsula, bounded on three sides by the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, and the Persian Gulf. It is divided into two very unequal parts by a chain of mountains which runs parallel with the western coast line. Between these mountains and the neighbouring sea the land is generally arable and inhabited. Hedjaz, along the Red Sea, and Yemen, in the southwest angle of the peninsula, are clearly distinguished. Hadramaut, Mahra, Omant, towards the Indian Ocean, and Haca, on the Persian Gulf, are still important centres of population; but it was mainly on the slope of the Red Sea that the political and religious activity of Arabia was developed. Nedjed, on the central plateau, is a kind of desert dotted with numerous oases. Towards the south all vegetation ceases, it being a region of quicksands and barren desert; towards the north the Arabian plain has no natural boundary, but may be said to extend from the Euphrates to the Jordan. On this side the country spreads out into the regions which have been, since the earliest times, the possessions of great civilised states: Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria,

\* SOURCES.—“The Koran,” translation of Sale or of Palmer.

LITERATURE.—Muir, “The Coran: its Composition and Teaching”; Articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: “Islamism,” “Caliphate,” “Koran”; Bury, and Bury’s *Gibbon* as above; T. W. Arnold, “The Preaching of Islam;” Noeldeke, “Sketches from Eastern History.”

empires built on sand, indeed, and always changing; but the rest of the country lay out of the route of the early migrations, and was somewhat forgotten.

**2. Arabian and Bedouin Customs.**—The geographical isolation of Arabia explains how the Semitic race has been able to remain so pure. It comprises two principal branches: the Bedouins, a pastoral and nomadic people of the desert, loving war and pillage. The Egyptian Simneh so described them in the time of the nineteenth dynasty; so they were in the sixth century of our era, so they are to-day. But the population on the south and southwest was sedentary, given to agriculture, and rich through the caravan trade. These two groups of the race—the tent-dwellers and those who lived in houses—despised each other and waged continual warfare. They were all of the same type, however,—darker in the south, because of mixing with the African blacks,—speaking the same language, and having the same social organisation. Nowhere were they embodied in a nation. They were separated into independent tribes, made up of families which recognised the authority of a chief, as sheikh. The Arabs were polygamous; it was seldom that a maiden or a young widow remained long unmarried, since the family needed many children in order to be strong, rich, and respected. In certain Bedouin tribes, however, sons were preferred to daughters, whom fathers did not hesitate to bury alive, so as not to have useless mouths to feed. In times of war the freemen fought under the orders of an emir, but in peace the family alone was the organisation. Hence there was no state—that is to say, no courts, no police, no army, no taxes. Any man who was wronged had the right to inflict vengeance, and his family was expected to uphold him; but, as among the Germans, the affair might be settled by payment. If the

injury were done by a member of his own family, the Arab did not hesitate to retaliate, but on him alone; he would never have thought of destroying voluntarily his family. Later, as Mohammedan, he would not pardon infidelity or apostasy in his relatives. He was hospitable, but greedy, cunning, and violent. He had a quick, exact mind, a brilliant imagination, and an innate taste for eloquence and poetry.

**3. Religion of the Arabs Before Mohammed.**—His religion was simple, like his mind. He believed in the existence of one god, Alla Taala, creator of earth and sky, giver of rain; but he knew little more, this god having neither priests nor temples. But he believed in the *djinn*s. They were invisible genii who lived and multiplied like men; they filled the outer world, and interfered for good or ill, at any moment, in human affairs. Various families had different beliefs as to where they lived; it might be in stones, in trees, in statues. Therefore the worship of this fetich was as ardent as it was self-interested. Each tribe or group of tribes had its *djinn*, and consequently its tree, or stone, or statue, to which they sacrificed victims and whose oracles they obeyed; the *djinn* was expected to acknowledge this worship by gifts, and it was not unusual for an Arab, displeased with his *djinn*, to overthrow the fetich which he had adored.

**4. The Mecca. The Kaaba and the Arab Pantheon.**—Arabia possessed nevertheless religious unity. Mecca was the religious centre of the country. The village was young, founded in the middle of the fifth century, in a long narrow valley, by the tribe of the Koreishites. The sanctuary there was celebrated throughout Arabia, and because of its cubical form was called the Kaaba. It was an Arabian pantheon. Three hundred and sixty idols were collected there; among them were images of

Abraham and Jesus, a silver statue called Hobal, which was the idol of the Koreishites, and the famous black stone, the most venerated of all, which had fallen from heaven, and which is still preserved. The presence of the Kaaba made the territory of Mecca inviolable. The tribe of the Koreisheites was peculiarly respected; two of its families rose to importance: the Omeia, which gave the first dynasty of caliphs; and the Hachem, whence came Mohammed.

**5. Jewish, Christian, and Persian Influences in Arabia.**  
**Hanifism.**—At the time of Mohammed's birth the faith in idols was beginning to weaken. Some believed in a future life, though the greater number considered this ridiculous. Others listened to outside influences. Christianity had penetrated the country, either through the south by way of Abyssinia, or through the north, for Syria was Christianised, and Sinai was peopled with monasteries. Judaism had numerous partisans, who strengthened the belief in one god, and introduced a mythology, the elements of which were mainly borrowed from the religion of Zoroaster. Yet not one of these foreign religions was to triumph in Arabia. Christian dogma was too complex for the Arabians; Judaism was the religion of a chosen people, and the Arabs would not sacrifice their independence. Nevertheless, Jewish, Christian, and Persian ideas prepared the way for a reformer. A few persons already believed in a god who would punish or reward human actions; they were known as "Hanifs," or penitents.

**6. Mohammed. Childhood and Youth.**—Mohammed, or Mahomet, was born at Mecca, according to Arabian traditions, April 20, 571. He belonged to the family of Hachem, which was poor, but to whom was confided the care of the holy well of Zamzam, and the privilege of

drawing water for the pilgrims. His father died before his birth; he lost his mother when he was six years old. He was thus left an orphan, with an inheritance of five camels, some sheep, and a slave. He was obliged to tend flocks of sheep and goats, a despised occupation, on the neighbouring hills of Mecca. At twenty-five he entered the service of a young widow, Khadijah, twice married, who carried on an active, successful trade by caravan. He married her, and she bore him six children. Like all Arabs, he practiced polygamy; he had fifteen wives, nine of whom survived him.

**7. Mohammed Begins Preaching. His Doctrine.**—The poor herdsman's marriage with the rich Khadijah brought him wealth and consideration. Work was unnecessary. He was of a nervous temperament, with a vivid imagination, tending to dreaminess. His mind was early attracted to religious ideas; he liked to talk with Christians and Jews; for a period, he adopted the doctrines of Hani-fism. Yet he could not reconcile the idea of one god with the worship of idols. He lived with his family on Mount Hira, a barren, scorched tract of land. One day he had a vision: the holy spirit, whom he called later the Archangel Gabriel, appeared to him. "Preach!" he said. "But I cannot preach." "Preach!" repeated the inner voice, which, in his hallucination, he thought was audible. Mohammed believed himself charged by God to teach what he henceforth considered as the truth: There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet; He guides and watches over human acts; after death He rewards the good and punishes the wicked; man should acknowledge these truths, should pray, and fast at prescribed times, and practise charity.

**8. The First Mohammedans.**—Mohammed was about forty when he began to preach this simple lofty doctrine.

His wife was first converted, then his daughters, then his cousin Ali, whom he adopted after the death of his male children, and whom he married to his favourite daughter, Fatima. The first among his friends to believe in him was Abu-Bekr, a rich merchant; then Othman, who became converted in order to marry one of the Prophet's daughters, the beautiful Rokaïa. In the beginning Omar was angry with the Prophet, but it is related that he found a precept dictated by him, which was of such beauty that his anger was dissipated, and he sought out Mohammed and became one of his most ardent and violent partisans. This was in the fifth year of the revelation (615); the new religion then numbered but fifty-two followers, but among them were two valuable recruits, Abu-Bekr, a man of practical common sense, and Omar, one of energy. They were a fitting complement to Mohammed's dreamy, irresolute nature; the first as the counsellor, the second as the sword.

### 9. Mohammed Driven out of Mecca. The Hegira, 622.

—A prophet is not without honour save in his own country. Hostilities began when Mohammed preached the breaking of idols. His unprotected partisans were persecuted; his family was proscribed; he fled to Yatrib, where he had made proselytes. This was the decisive moment of his life, when he first stood out as the leader of a party. The birth of the new religion dates from that time, and with it the Mussulmans begin a new era, that of the flight, or Hegira (July 16, 622).

### 10. Organisation of Islamism at Medina.—

From that time on Mohammed dwelt at Yatrib. The name was changed to Medinet-el-nabi, or City of the Prophet—Medina at the present time. He made and kept the promise of never leaving his adopted land, were he even victorious. He was first active in building a mosque, and

in regulating an order of worship. He preached to his people resignation to the will of Allah (Islam); he commanded those who professed Islamism, the Mussulmans (submissive to Allah), to pray five times daily, and observe faithfully the fast of Rhamadan. He organised them into a single body or nation, where the condition of peace or war should be common to all. Law and justice were observed; the rights of property were protected; the condition of the married woman was relieved; and, although the right of vengeance was not abolished, with him rested the authority for shedding blood. Religious unity thus prepared the way for the political unification of Arabia.

**11. Mohammed's Wars Against Mecca. He Is Victorious.**—Mohammed was now strong enough to wreak vengeance on his enemies. In the name of his revelations he proclaimed a holy war against the people of Mecca. Progress was slow, but a crushing defeat near Mount Ohod did not dampen the ardour of the believers (625). Two years later, in Medina, he repulsed a furious attack of the people of Mecca. He enlisted the Bedouins on his side, who were an excellent body of cavalry, and strengthened the alliance with his principal lieutenants by marrying Aïcha, daughter of Abu-Bekr, and Hâfsa, Omar's daughter. In 628 he resolved to perform the annual pilgrimage to Mecca. Fourteen hundred armed men escorted, this time, the man who six years previously had fled from the holy city. The Koreishites intended to bar his way. A conference took place, not far from Mecca, between the Mussulmans and delegates of that city. The latter were amazed at the marks of veneration lavished on the Prophet by his followers: when he had finished his ablutions they hastened to gather up the water which he had used; if one of his hairs fell, they

rushed to get it; if he spit, they fought over his saliva. One of the delegates, returning to the Koreishites, could not refrain from saying to them: "I have been at the court of emperors, I have seen Cæsar and Chosroes in all the glory of their power; but I have never seen a sovereign revered by his subjects as Mohammed is by his followers." This frightened them from their project of combating him. An advantageous truce was signed, which was to last for ten years: Mohammed and his followers had to leave the holy territory that year, but they might freely perform a pilgrimage of three days the following year.

**12. Mecca Taken. Idolatry Condemned.**—Mohammed soon gathered in the fruits of this great moral victory. Several Koreishites went over to his party, among others, Amru, the future conqueror of Egypt, and Khaled, the victor of Ohod. The truce was broken by Mecca. Mohammed marched against the city with an army of ten thousand men, and with such rapidity that it offered almost no resistance. He stopped the fighting and pillaging as soon as possible, being content to outlaw about fifteen of his most notorious enemies. He then withdrew to the Kaaba. Seven times he rode around it, mounted on his camel; he touched the black stone respectfully with a bent rod carried in his hand; the images, which recalled the ancient superstitions, henceforth condemned, were ordered to be destroyed. Three hundred images fixed in lead were arranged along the roof; as he passed before these false gods he raised his stick while pronouncing these words: "Truth is come; let falsehood disappear!" Instantly they were overthrown and broken into pieces. He ended the day by receiving the vows of the inhabitants of Mecca; the men promised absolute obedience to his commands, the women, to adore Allah



alone, to desist from theft, adultery, infanticide, and slander (630).

**13. Entire Arabia. Subdued by Mohammed.**—As a conqueror Mohammed pardoned his enemies: Ibn-abi-Sarh, at one time the Prophet's secretary, who had dared to falsify the text of the revelations, and who finally returned to idolatry; and Abdallah, son of Zibara, Koreishite poet, who, by his virulent satires, had stirred up others against him. They bought pardon with conversion. He then subdued a part of the Bedouins who threatened Mecca, the Christians of Nadjra, the princes of Mahra and Oman, and the tribes of Yemen and Nedjed; at the end of 631 entire Arabia was at his feet, and idolatry was abolished.

**14. Mohammed's Death, 632.**—Ten years had passed since Mohammed fled from Mecca. He returned as a pilgrim, in March, 632, in all the splendour of glory and power, accompanied, according to certain writers, by more than a hundred thousand believers. He had sent on before him the ninth chapter, sourate, of the Koran, in which he declared war on those who refused to believe his doctrine; and on all sides princes and people joined Islamism, "more numerous than the dates which fall from the palm trees." But the Prophet was worn out by these ten years of labour. He had come back to Medina to die. Before returning, he distributed the command of the conquered countries among his principal lieutenants, and sent an expedition into Syria. He felt that life was slipping from him. "Allah," he said, "I have delivered my message and fulfilled my mission." Though suffering from fever, he went to the mosque, and, after having praised God and asked pardon for his sins, he went up into the pulpit: "If any man has occasion to complain that I have maltreated him, here is my back, let him pay me my blows; if I have wounded the reputation

of anyone, let him revile me; if I have taken money from anyone, I am ready to return it." A man claimed three drachmas, which were paid immediately. Then he gave orders and advice to the faithful: battle with idolaters, gentleness towards converts, constancy in prayer. The poor were also thought of, and Mohammed had Aïcha distribute among them the gold which was in her house. June 8 he returned once more to the mosque and spoke a last time to the people. "By Allah!" he exclaimed, "no man can say aught against me. I have not permitted anything which God has not permitted, nor forbidden anything which God has not forbidden." Going home to Aïcha, he lay down, uttered a few broken words: "Allah! help me in my agony! Gabriel, come near to me. Allah! pardon me, and take me to my friends on high! Eternity in paradise." Then he fell asleep.

**15. Mohammed's Portrait.**—Mohammed was of medium size; he had a large head, strong hands and feet, thick beard and straight hair. Though silent, as a rule, he was easily enlivened. He was quick, though not unkind, in repartee. Careful in his person, to the extent of staining his brows and lids black, with kohl, and his nails red, with henna; he wore a simple woollen garment. He was sober, charitable, thoughtful for his friends, loving to his wives, tender towards his children. He loved poetry and dreaded satire. His favourite poet was Hassan, who outshone the poet of another tribe, the Benou-Temim, and by this victory persuaded them to be converted. Another poet, Cab, proscribed by Mohammed, was pardoned, after reciting verses on the subject; Mohammed was so touched by them that he gave him his cloak. The Turks believe that they still have this garment, which is carefully preserved in the Sultan's palace in Constantinople. Mohammed had his shortcomings. He knew how to recon-

cile his interests and his pleasures with his religious mission; it is difficult to say to what degree pretence and calculation blended with sincere belief and enthusiasm; but he was a wary politician, broad and tolerant in his mind, and had a compassionate heart for misery and suffering. He was neither a theologian nor a philosopher; he never expressed himself clearly on predestination and free-will. Yet, in preaching Islamism, he laid the foundations for a very simple religion, which has kept to the present incredible vitality and capacity for expansion and propagandism.

**16. The Koran. How It Was Written.**—His teachings are contained in the Koran (more exactly, *Qor'an*). This book is in no way like our Gospels. The precepts which Mohammed said were revealed to him, and which he formulated to meet all the circumstances of life, were gathered together by his disciples into chapters, or *sourates*, of unequal length. Some were written on skins or palm leaves; the greater part were kept in the memory of certain worshippers, who were called, for that reason "Ashab" readers or bearers of the Koran. More than six hundred of these were killed in a battle one year after the Prophet's death. Abu-Bekr, Mohammed's successor, fearing that the Koran might be mutilated, commanded Zaid-Ibn-Thabit, Mohammed's former secretary, to collect all the verses into writing. The third caliph, Othman, had a new copy made, and all others destroyed. The *sourates* were arranged according to their length, and the form has been but slightly modified since then. This strange classification is sufficient to explain the dryness of the Koran; therefore it is little read, in spite of the beauty of some passages. The Mussulmans consult it for everything, for all questions are treated in it.

**17. The Mussulman Dogma.**—The dogma taught therein is very simple, since it consists solely in the belief in the unity of God and the divine mission of the Prophet. The creation of the world is related as in Genesis; the *djinns* are changed to angels and demons, as with the Persians. The angels are mortal beings who will die on the day of the Last Judgment. The chief of the demons, who may be converted, resembles the Jewish and Christian Satan. Mohammed converted several of them himself. God reveals himself to man through his prophets; there have been one hundred and twenty of them since the world began, but the principal ones before Mohammed were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus Christ. The Mussulman has five great duties here below: (1) admit the two principal dogmas of Islamism; (2) pray five times a day; (3) fast during the entire month of Rhama-dan—that is to say, refrain from food and drink until the setting of the sun; (4) give alms and pay the poor tax; (5) make at least once during life-time a pilgrimage to Mecca, observing all the rites of the tradition of Adam and Abraham. These are the five “pillars” of Islamism. A holy war is enjoined on Mussulmans, but only in case the infidels are the aggressors. The early Mussulman leaders did not force their belief on conquered nations; later the theologians interpreted differently the words on this subject in the Koran. The Koran teaches belief in another life; the dead will rise on the last day, in the clothing which they wore at their death; meanwhile, they are placed, according to their merits, in heaven or hell. The latter has seven divisions for as many categories of the damned. Paradise is composed of beautiful gardens, where youths serve, to the chosen ones, a perfumed non-intoxicating drink, and where the latter have as companions *houris*, or young girls “with black eyes.” Heaven

and hell are separated by a wall. The intermediate space is the abode of persons whose good actions during life have compensated for their bad ones. The adaptations from the Christian, Persian, and Jewish religions are recognisable, and tended to facilitate the conversion of Persians, even of Christians and Jews, to Mohammedanism. Lastly, the Koran contains simple rules for daily life, or hygiene; it forbids gaming, wine, and pork. It is consulted by judges to decide the simplest, as well as the most complicated, differences, and it has long remained the only code of law of the Mussulman states.

**18. The Legend.**—Although the Koran is consulted, it is never read. It is in legend and tradition that the Prophet's life is known. They tell of the countless decisions he rendered, which are now a precedent for all legal and moral questions. More often the tale is purely legendary, and hence has a charm of its own. Begun during Mohammed's lifetime, the story is gradually embellished, as with all great men, and when later it was taken down in writing it had transformed Mohammed. The small, dark, thick-set, nervous Arab, loving perfumes, verses, and women, dreamy and enthusiastic, generous and unscrupulous, was become a saint.

## CHAPTER XI.

### ARABIAN EMPIRE—CONQUESTS AND CIVILISATION.\*

**1. Abu-Bekr, Successor of Mohammed, and First Caliph, 632-634.**—There was some hesitation in the choice of Mohammed's successor. The people of Medina claimed the right of choosing him, since they had received the Prophet as a fugitive, and bought his victories with their blood. The emigrants from Mecca insisted that the Prophet's successor should come from among the Koreishites; they won the day, and after a brief debate Abu-Bekr, Mahommed's chosen friend, was elected. He assumed the title of "caliph." Elsewhere, many who had adopted Islamism through fear, on learning of Mohammed's death, rebelled and returned to their idols. Abu-Bekr sent out against them Khalid, with explicit orders to exterminate the "apostates"; Khalid, the "scourge of infidels," vanquished them with great carnage. The alarm was intensified, since the caliph's sole body of troops had already gone into Syria; Arabian conquests had begun.

**2. The Holy War Preached by Mohammed, and Begun by Abu-Bekr.**—Mohammed had already given the signal for conquest. In the unsophisticated pride which the successes of 628 had aroused, he believed himself master of the world. He had sent an embassy to the great Chosroes Parwis, to invite him to adopt Islamism. "Is it

\* LITERATURE.—Ameer Ali, "A Short History of the Saracens"; Muir, "The Caliphate"; Bury and Gibbon, as above.

thus," replied Chosroes, "that a man who is my slave dares to write me?"—alluding to an epoch when the Persians had possessed Yemen, and he tore the letter. "May his empire be so destroyed!" exclaimed Mohammed, on learning of the affront. A second embassy bore the same invitation to Heraclius, who was bringing the war against the Persians to a glorious end. The emperor, accustomed to treat with Arab chiefs and to avoid useless conflicts with them, received the letter respectfully and made a gracious reply. Mohammed was more fortunate with the Egyptian governor. He was a Copt, named Djarih, who had almost acquired independence; he was a Christian, partisan of the Jacobite sect, and hated the orthodox. He welcomed Mohammed's messages, and sent him presents: silver, a horse, a white mule, a silver-grey donkey, and two young girls of noble birth. Mohammed gave one maiden to the poet, Hassan, and kept the other for himself. In 629 an expedition which had been sent out against the Ghassinides of Bosra, on the Syrian frontier, failed; in 632 Syria was attacked by Mohammed. Abu-Bekr sent a second army against Persia.

**3. Conquest of Syria.**—Syria succumbed first. A great victory gained by Khalid on the shores of the Hieronoma (or Yarmouk) delivered the province over to the Mussulmans (634). Damascus was taken by assault and sacked; then Emesa and Aleppo. The following year Caliph Omar, elected after Abu-Bekr in 634, entered Jerusalem and founded a mosque on the site of the stone on which Jacob fell asleep. Finally the governor of Mohammedan Syria equipped a fleet, which took possession of Cyprus, Crete, and Rhodes, and inflicted a defeat on the empire along the coast of Lycia. The submission of Armenia, which consented to pay tribute, brought the Mussulmans to the Caspian Sea, and beyond the Caucasus.

The indolence of Heraclius, who, after his victories over the Sassanides, had fallen into shameful apathy, and the fact that Roman Syria and Mesopotamia were peopled by Arabs, who went over to the conquerors at once, explain sufficiently the rapidity of the early Mussulman conquests. Other causes led to the ruin of the Persian empire, which was no less prompt, but more complete.

**4. Persia of the Sassanides. Its Extreme Importance in the History of Civilisation.**—This empire had existed four centuries. Founded in 226 by one of the magi, who had restored the ancient religion of Zoroaster, according to the sacred texts of the Avesta, it had prospered rapidly. Situated, so to speak, in the centre of the ancient world, it was an intermediary between the East and the West. It gave the West the doctrine of Manichæus, founded, like that of Zoroaster, on the idea of a twofold god of good and evil. It received from Byzantium, either through the exiled Nestorians or the last Platonists driven out by Justinian, the seed of Greek philosophy and science. On the other hand, it was in constant relations with the Chinese empire, whose frontiers touched its borders; and with India, which had brought Buddhism into Bactria. Contact with these strong, fecund civilisations helped in the development of its own genius.

**5. Decadence of Persia.**—But the prosperity of this brilliant state was doubly imperilled. In the first place the religion, *Parseeism*, administered by an exclusive, particular, sacerdotal caste, had degenerated into gross superstition and ceremonial, whilst cultivated minds were tending to free thought; from that time on its moral force was broken. Parseeism, conscious that power was slipping from its grasp, grew intolerant, and consequently was detested. On the other hand, the Persians believed in an absolute monarchy, and in the divine nature of their



kings. As long as their kings had been victorious their authority was unquestioned; the defeats which the Romans inflicted on them in the seventh century shook their faith in monarchy, the more, since the reign of Chosroes the Great had been most brilliant. After Chosroes II., revolutions in the palace made and unmade sovereigns. Such was the condition of political and moral decadence of Persia at the time of the accession of Yezdegerd, who was to be the last reigning prince of the Sassanides.

**6. Conquest of Persia by the Arabs.**—This young prince soon arrayed against the Arabs all the forces of the reorganised empire. He forced the Arabs first to evacuate the posts occupied by Kalid in Irak; but Sad, who was put in command by Omar, rallied the Arabs. He gained a great victory at Kadesiah (636), took and destroyed Madain, the Persian capital, fought Yezdegerd at Nehavend, and pursued him into Khorassan. The unfortunate prince was assassinated at Merv by a miller with whom he sought shelter. His son fled to the Chinese emperor; the last member of the dynasty of the Sassanides died soon after in exile.

**7. Conquest of Egypt.**—The conquest of Syria had taken seventeen years, and Persia eight; Egypt was subdued in two years. In 639 Amru invaded it with four thousand men; Farma, old Pelusium, “the key of Egypt,” was captured after a siege of thirty days. Amru was held in check for seven months by the fortified city of Babylon, which was guarded by a Greek flotilla, and an army intrenched in a camp on the left bank of the Nile; he finally took it, and changed the name to El Cahira (Cairo). Alexandria, being constantly reinforced through communication with the sea, held out for more than a year, and was at last taken by assault in 641. It is said

that the remains of the famous library collected by the Cæsars was used for fuel to heat the Mussulman baths; but it is doubtful if anything remained of the library, which was sacked in the fourth century in the furious struggles between orthodox and heretics. The Arabs rushed on from Alexandria into Libya; they took Barca, Tripoli, Sabra, and began the conquest of the Berbers; however, the civil wars which wasted Arabia during the second half of the seventh century called them back. The Arabian invasion was delayed until the following century.

**8. Internal Discord in Arabia. Ali and Aïcha.**—Omar, the second caliph, died in 644. Othman, secretary and friend of Mohammed, a believer from the first, was elected. He favoured the men of his tribe, the Meccaian aristocracy, and the Ommiades. The inhabitants of Medina and the old believers were indignant that preference should be given to those who had persecuted the Prophet twenty years before. They had the caliph assassinated, and put in his place Ali, the Prophet's adopted son and son-in-law (655). At once the new caliph had two civil wars on his hands. An accusation of marital infidelity had been brought against Aïcha, the favourite wife of Mohammed, and Ali had believed it. Her innocence was proved to the Prophet in a revelation, but she never forgave Ali, and now rebelled against him. Mounted on a camel, she directed a campaign of one hundred and ten days; after giving battle ninety times she was overcome and taken.

**9. The Ommiades. The Mussulman Schism, 660.**—When the "war of the camel" was ended, a more serious struggle burst forth. The Ommiades, threatened by Ali's victory, had revolted, under the leadership of the Syrian governor, Moahwijah: Finally the two parties, weary of futile warfare, agreed to submit their cause to two arbi-

trators, who should judge according to tradition and the text of the Koran. The judgment was against the Prophet's son-in-law, and Moawijah was proclaimed caliph. Ali, however, did not abdicate; he kept his position in Mesopotamia and Persia, while his rival fixed himself at Damascus. The Arabian empire, which had scarcely been formed, was thus cut into two parts; in the one was the orthodox party, or Sunnites, who, according to tradition (*sunna*), recognised the legitimacy of the first three caliphs; in the other were the schismatics, or Shiites, in whose eyes Ali was the Prophet's only direct and legitimate heir. Another sect, the Kharidjites, had been formed; they were uncompromisingly orthodox in religion, and democratic in politics; they even denied the principle of the caliphate. Hence Ali and Moawijah were their common enemies. One of the sect tried to settle the controversy by a double assassination; but Ali was the sole victim (660). In the end the caliph of Damascus re-established political unity in the Arabian empire, but the religious schism still persists.

**10. The Ommiades at Damascus. The Political Element Stronger than the Religious Element.**—The victory of the Ommiades is the triumph of politicians over the founders of Islamism. Except in the two holy cities, the Arabs felt indifferent; Islamism was to them merely a perfunctory belief. The caliphs impeded rather than favoured conversion. The Mussulmans were exempt from a land tax required from subjects who professed another religion: the Ommiades preferred to increase the revenue rather than the number of the faithful. True believers waxed indignant at this policy. On the death of Moawijah (679) Ali's partisans were roused; his younger son, Hossein, who had married a daughter of the late Sassanidean king, revolted. Attacked by the Syrian troops of Jezid

I., he was overcome and killed near Kerbelah (680). The spot where the martyr fell was as much revered as Ali's tomb. The Alides and the Kharidjites were successively attacked, the Ommiades fearing the political ideas of the latter; they were crushed after a war of extermination (685).

**11. Uprising of the Old Believers. The Two Holy Cities Taken and Sacked.**—The old believers in Medina, scandalised by Jezid's conduct, who drank wine, hunted, surrounded himself with Bedouins, and never prayed, excommunicated the caliph. Assembled in the mosque, each believer stripped off one of his garments, and cast it away, saying: "I cast off Jezid as I cast off my mantle, or my turban, my sandal!" The Ommiades were then all driven from the city. An army was sent out against the faithful, and routed them completely; Medina was taken and pillaged during three days; the places hallowed by Mohammed's presence were profaned; the inhabitants, who were spared, were forced to proclaim themselves slaves of the Prophet. During this time, at Mecca, one of the Prophet's companions, Abdallah, son of Zobeir, of the tribe of Koreishites, had refused to acknowledge Jezid, and caused an uprising of the people on account of the "martyr" Hossein. He thought himself secure in the holy city; but those who had profaned Medina did not hesitate to take Mecca. The year following all Arabia was subdued. Henceforth it ceased to be important; the centre of the Mohammedan world was no longer at Mecca, but at Damascus, among Christians and Jews.

**12. Conquest of Northern Africa by the Mussulmans.**—A fresh impetus was given to the Arabian invasion. During the first period the East had been subdued; in the second, the West was overrun. Hassan, governor of Egypt, took Carthage, which was forever destroyed (697);





# EUROPE

END OF 7TH CENTURY

695

- Roman Empire. ---
- Teutonic Kingdoms
- Celts. ---







he subdued the Berbers, and laid the lasting foundations of Mohammedan dominion in Magreb, from Barca to the Atlantic Ocean (708). The Berber conquest had been the most difficult task to accomplish; it required seventy years of bloody struggle. Many of the Berbers were transplanted into Asia and replaced by Arabs; the remainder adopted Islamism, but they kept their customs, their language, and their institutions, which endure to-day in their descendants, the Kaybles.

**13. The Arabs in Spain. Tarik, 711.**—Ceuta and the neighbouring country were all that remained to the Greek empire on the African coast since the destruction of Carthage. In 710 Count Julian was governor or exarch of this remnant of a province. Surrounded by Mussulmans, he had to depend on tardy reinforcements from Constantinople, or the Visigothic alliance. That same year King Vitiza died. He was a merciful prince, a friend to justice and a sincere Christian, although inimical to the growing powers of the episcopacy. The clergy, therefore, has shown little esteem for his memory; it was to punish his excesses, so wrote later chroniclers, that God permitted the Arabian invasion. He left sons, but the nobles preferred Roderick, who was known to be a good general. Vitiza's sons acknowledged him. Unfortunately Roderick affronted Count Julian by carrying off his daughter. Julian then turned to the Arabs; instead of fighting them, he entrusted to them his vengeance. Mousa, who had just succeeded Hassan, answered his appeal. He commanded one of his lieutenants, Tarik, to cross into Spain; but, according to the express orders of the caliph, he charged him to use his light cavalry for exploration and pillage only, and return as soon as possible. Tarik landed near Algeziras, on the promontory of Calpe, since called after him, Djebel Tarik (mountain of Tarik, Gibraltar);

he met Roderick and his army near Xeres, not far from the Guad-al-Lete. The king, betrayed by Vitiza's sons, was routed, and disappeared, never to be heard of again (711). Carried away by this unlooked-for success, Tarik forgot Mousa's orders. He surprised Cordova, took Granada by assault, and occupied, without striking a blow, Toledo, the capital of the kingdom. Most of the Visigothic princes treated with the enemy; Vitiza's sons were of the number. They did not dream that the Arabs would remain in Spain, and when they saw their error, it was too late.

**14. Mousa. Visigothic Kingdom Ended.**—The following year Mousa, who was envious of these successes, crossed the strait with a second army. He stopped Tarik at Toledo, to punish him for his disobedience, and continued alone the conquest of the country. Saragossa and the fortresses along the Ebro threw open their gates. Soon after he was recalled by the caliph, and made a triumphal entry into Damascus. Nevertheless, his loyalty was questioned; he was arrested, condemned to pay a heavy fine, then to be whipped, and was finally exiled to Mecca. The significance of the work he had finished was unrealised by him. The Arabs had the entire peninsula, except the mountains of Galicia, where the Christians held their ground. Their occupancy was a permanent threat to Christianity in the West. Spain does not seem to have suffered from it much; many Christians, weary of the oppression of their bishops, well treated on the contrary by the Mussulmans, and eager to escape the payment of tribute, were converted. In some localities the two races were mixed. Moreover, the Arabs brought with them excellent agricultural methods, which tended to enrich the country, in the south especially. Four governors or emirs were appointed by the caliph. The country en-

joyed under their rule a peace and quiet scarcely known with the Visigoths.

**15. The Arabs in Gaul. Defeated near Poitiers, 732.**—The Arabs were not stopped by the Pyrenees. They again took advantage of their enemies' quarrels, and passed on into Gaul, over which the Neustrians, the Austrasians, and the Aquitanians contended. In 719 they took Narbonne, the capital of Septimania; in 725 they crossed the Rhone, ravaged Burgundy, and entered the Vosges; in 731 they stormed Bordeaux, and pressed on to Tours, attracted by the rich church of Saint Martin. But they were stopped near Poitiers by the Austrasian duke, Charles Martel. There two races were pitted against each other: the Indo-European and the Semitic. Two religions were opposed: Christianity and Mohammedanism, both of which promised paradise to the warriors who died for the cross or the crescent. Two army systems were there tested: the heavy infantry of the Franks, and the light Berber cavalry. The two armies fought desperately all day, as if the fate of heaven and earth were at stake; but the Mohammedan soldiery could not break the thick ranks of the Franks, who pierced them with lances. They withdrew towards evening to their tents, and under cover of the night they silently departed.

**16. Why Did the Arabs Withdraw?**—It was a great victory for the Christians, and the first serious check which the Arabs had encountered since the death of Mohammed. However, this defeat did not arrest the invaders; they took the offensive in 743, and devastated Lyons. An eventful change was taking place among the Berbers during this time. The democratic doctrines of the Kharidjites had procured many followers among these people, jealous of their independence; in 740 they rebelled. It was henceforth impossible for the caliphs to send rein-

forcements to the West, still more so to withdraw them from Africa. This is the true reason of the Arabian retreat.

**17. The Arabs Repulsed Before Constantinople.**—In the meanwhile, at the other extremity of the Mediterranean world, the Arabs had attacked Constantinople; they assailed it by land and sea. Here, too, they were repulsed; Greek fire,\* an exceptionally severe winter, and the Bulgarian invasions decimated their army. They lost more than twenty-five thousand vessels, and one hundred and forty thousand men. They suffered another defeat in Phrygia, at the hands of Leo the Isaurian, which compelled them to desist (740).

**18. Political Institutions Under the First Caliphs.**—The Arabian conquest had consumed an entire century, from the death of the Prophet (632) to the battle of Poitiers (732). The institutions, which were very rudimentary under the first four caliphs, were gradually modified. Originally the caliph, or “vicar” of Mohammed, had been chosen and resided at Medina; all the members of the Mohammedan community took an oath of fidelity to him. He wielded temporal power as caliph, and held spiritual sway as *imam*; he was pontiff, leader of the state, and judge. There were three sources of revenue: (1) the poor tax, which was required of every Mussulman; (2) the fifth part of booty, reserved for the caliph; (3) the land tax, which was paid by all non-believing subjects. The

\* Greek fire seems to have been used for the first time by Callinicus, an engineer of Heliopolis, in Syria, to burn the Saracen vessels. It was an explosive mixture, made of combustible materials, the essential ingredients being used later in gunpowder. It was projected by means of bronze tubes, similarly to our projectiles, and thrown by hand, or in burning pots, which were launched from catapults. The Greeks kept the process secret for at least three centuries.

caliph rendered no account of his disposition of the treasure.

**19. The Ommiades. Bureaucracy and Hereditary Caliphate.**—Omar borrowed of the Persians their bureaucratic system or *diouân* (divan, *douane*); the financial registers were held by Persians, Greeks, or Copts. Under the Ommiades the state mechanism was more complicated. Moawijah, who lived at Damascus, copied the etiquette of foreign sovereigns: he received strangers, seated on a throne; he sat behind a grating when attending ceremonies in the mosque; he was accompanied by a body-guard. A chancellor's office was created. The exclusive use of the Arabian language was required in all official acts; also the exclusive use of Arabian inscriptions on all coins. These were *dinars*, or gold pieces worth about twelve francs, and *dirhams* (drachmas), silver pieces worth one franc. Justice was referred to cadis, from whose decisions appeal might be taken to a supreme court presided over by the caliph. The caliphate at last became an hereditary institution; this is not the least serious innovation borrowed from civilisations which the fortunes of war had called upon them to perpetuate. They contracted a heavy debt to Persia after the revolution which overthrew the Ommiades.

**20. The Abbassides, 750. Persia Victorious Over Arabia.**—The Shiites had supported Ali and Hossein against the half-unbelieving caliphs of Damascus; after the victory of the Ommiades they fled to the extreme north of the empire, in Khorassan, where Buddhist doctrines were generally received. Towards 750 the governor of this province, Abu Moslem, "who never laughed," revolted at Merv, unfurling the black flag of the Abbassides. They caused to be proclaimed that one of the Alides had bequeathed his powers to an Abbasside;

they falsified the text of the Koran, and Abul-Abbas, great-grandson of Abbas, the Prophet's uncle, was acknowledged. Merouin II., caliph of Damascus, was vanquished by the insurgents on the shores of the Zab, and pursued into Egypt, where he was killed. The struggle ended in a frightful massacre; the representatives of ninety families of the Ommiades were invited to a banquet of reconciliation, and were there murdered. Abul-Abbas "the Bloody" died soon after (754). The capital of the new state was later established at Bagdad, on the middle Tigris, not far from the ancient capital of the Sassannides. Under the Abbassides Persia prevailed decidedly over Arabia, as formerly Damascus had done over Mecca, but the change was more profound than the preceding one had been.

**21. Influence of Persia on Arabian Institutions.**—In accord with Persian ideas, the caliph became absolute sovereign; his person was regarded as half divine. He was chief of the believers and supreme judge in questions of dogma. Subjects took the oath of allegiance, but if he failed in his duties they might unseat him. Insurrection is, truly, the sole remedy against despotism. The caliph possessed the right of life and death over all Mussulmans. His powers were often delegated to viziers, or a grand vizier. The family of Barmecides gave three generations of prime ministers to the early Abbassides: Khalid, Yahia, and the latter's two sons, one being the celebrated Giaffar, of the "Thousand and One Nights." But it was especially in all that concerned law, religion, science, and arts that Persian influence was felt. The first written collection of Mohammedan traditions was compiled by Bokkari (870), of Persian origin, whose teaching was followed, in Bagdad, by twenty thousand auditors. In Medina the Koran had been interpreted as literally as

possible; in Chaldea, on the contrary, a freer reading was given to judicial and religious precepts. It was not sufficient to invoke the traditions and decisions of the early caliphs; reason was appealed to, and four great schools were formed, which exist to-day, and are all equally orthodox.

**22. Religious Sects in Mohammedan Persia.**—Orthodoxy endured, in Persia itself, most formidable attacks. Less intolerant than Christianity, the Mohammedan religion permitted the existence of peculiar sects; one tradition claims that Mohammed himself foretold the formation of seventy-three religious sects in Islamism. The greater number sprang up in Persia. They disputed two weighty problems which philosophy has not yet resolved; the unity of God, and predestination. A more serious phase was the unexpected revival of the old philosophical and religious ideas of Persia. The Barmecides were Zoroastrians or atheists. One of their all-powerful ministers used to say: "I have been persuaded by the Arabs into everything; I have eaten olives, I have ridden on camels, I have worn sandals, but they have never been able to induce me to be circumcised." Such Mussulmans became indifferent to God, as well as to the Koran; they passed on to doubt as well as incredulity. The sect of Soufis, founded about 815 by the Persian Abusaïd, merged God and man into one. They asserted that through abstinence, rejection of all pleasure, and mortification of the flesh, man might be as the elect, or even as the angels, and receive the spirit of God, as Jesus had done. Hence human acts might become divine. But it was impossible while living in the world. So, in spite of what the Prophet had taught,—“there shall be no monastic life in Islam,”—convents were soon erected in Khorassan and elsewhere. Mohammedanism, like Chris-

tianity, was obliged to pay its tribute to a contemplative life. The Soufis had their saints and martyrs. Their religion, which appealed entirely to the imagination, inspired the greatest Persian poets, who sang ecstasically of the passions of the mind, and often of the senses.

**23. Philosophy and Sciences in the Empire of the Abbassides.**—Philosophy is the younger sister of religion. At Bagdad the doctrines of the Greeks were taught. Aristotle was translated; Persians and Syrians wrote commentaries on him who was the renowned doctor of the Mohammedan scholastics before being that of the Christian scholastics, their disciples. There were translations of the geographer, Ptolemy, the mathematician, Euclid, the doctors, Hippocrates, Dioscorides, and Galen. Mathematics, alchemy, and magic were cultivated successfully where formerly Chaldean science had flourished. The arts even were borrowed; the so-called Arabian architecture is entirely Persian in form as well as in origin. Poetry only, at least lyric poetry, remained faithful to Arabian traditions. Persian poetry, however, appeared gradually at the court of the Abbassides. Under Mahmoud the distinguished poet Firdouci (916-1020) wrote the "Shah Nameh, or Book of Kings," a kind of poetical history of ancient Persia. Persia thus became conscious of herself, in renewing ties with the past.

**24. Erudition and Poetry.**—Erudition kept pace with science. Under Haroun-al-Raschid, Khalid compiled the first known dictionary. Solid encyclopedias of history and geography were issued by the Persian schools. During Mansour's caliphate the earliest biography of Mohammed and the history of the first Mohammedan conquests were written. Ibn Kiteibah composed a valuable epitome of universal history. Tabaria, in the tenth cen-



ture, treated the subject more fully; his account begins with the creation and ends with 924. The conquest of Persia by the Arabs and the accession of the Abbassides are treated with peculiar care. Macoudi, born at Bagdad, spent twenty-seven years in travel over the entire extent of the Arabian empire, gathering reliable information. He mastered the subject of Greek and Judaic antiquity; his "Prairies of Gold" is a real historical and literary treasure. In the story of Sindbad the Sailor the custom of making long journeys and the taste for travel are clearly shown; and these tendencies were a help to geography as well as to commerce. The Arabian tongue, which was like Latin in its universality, spread the knowledge acquired at the price of so much effort through the West; it was the means of introducing Greek antiquity into Europe. It was in this way a large contributor to the first renaissance—that of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

**25. Dismemberment of the Empire of the Abbassides.**—The most brilliant epoch of the dynasty of the Abbassides corresponds to the reigns of Haroun-al-Raschid (786-809) and his son Mamoun (813-833). After them, decadence was rapid. Spain had already broken loose from the empire; the last survivor of the Ommiades, Abd-er-Rhaman, had founded the caliphate of Cordova, in 755. The new capital soon rivalled Bagdad; it became the stronghold of the orthodoxy combated by the Abbassides. Somewhat later the great-grandson of Ali, Edris, driven out of Arabia after an ineffectual uprising, roused Magreb and founded in present Morocco an independent state (785-793). Still another descendant of Ali, Ismael, founded the sect of Ismaelians, which fomented the greatest disorders in the empire, and led to fresh uprisings. The Ismaelians of the West seized Kairowan, the holy city of

the West; one of their chiefs, Saïd, had himself proclaimed caliph (909). His fourth successor established the dynasty of Fatimites in Egypt. Although the Ismaelians kept the Koran, they interpreted it in an allegorical sense. Since the holy book commanded prayer, payment of taxes, war against the infidels, it meant, as they looked at it, to inspire in them a love for Ali and his descendants, hatred of his enemies, especially the first three caliphs; fasting was the silence which the initiated should observe concerning secrets confided to them, etc. These doctrines were taught in secret associations or lodges, which admitted members only after exacting a promise of entire devotion—devotion which was often carried to the length of crime.

**26. The Sect of the Assassins, and the Old Man of the Mountain.**—These ultra-Shiites soon came to an understanding with the Ismaelians of the East, or Karmates, who took possession of a part of Irak, towards 900; their dominion was transient, but their doctrines and their ferocity were perpetuated among the Druses of Lebanon, and especially among the “eaters of haschisch,” or Assassins, of Syria. This latter sect was founded in the eleventh century by Hassan Cabbal, who, after taking possession of a fortress, like an eagle’s nest, in the district of Roudbar, to the north of Kazvin, founded a brotherhood which made numerous converts. He adopted the title of grand master, or Sheik (chief, Old Man) of the Mountain, having under his orders the three governors of Djebel, Kouhistan, and Syria. Beneath them in rank were the missionaries, the initiated, the companions, in the order named; lastly the Assassins, sworn to death. As a preparation for martyrdom the grand master invited a young man, vigorous and determined, to a feast; he was there made intoxicated with the seed and the leaves

of haschisch; he was given a drink prepared from this plant, then he was transported into delightful gardens, where he experienced, in a dreamy reverie, the keenest pleasures of the senses. Convinced that he had seen paradise, he would no longer hesitate, on an order from his chiefs, to risk his earthly life to obtain eternal happiness. During two hundred years this horrible sect was the terror of the Orient; the Crusaders had occasion more than once to make the acquaintance of the Old Man of the Mountain.

**27. The Seldjuk Turks.**—Thus the empire of the Abbassides was giving way on all sides. Not knowing in whom to trust, in the midst of heresies which were constantly springing up, they hired mercenaries ignorant of Arabian. The Berbers, then the Turks, formed the principal force of their armies. In the eleventh century a Turkish chief, Togrul Beg, grandson of Seldjuk, took possession of Ispahan and Bagdad, and founded the dynasty of Seldjuk sultans (military chiefs). About the same time the caliphate of Cordova was broken up. After having given Spain three centuries of prosperity, it was ruined by civil discord, and disappeared in 1033, leaving seven small Mohammedan kingdoms in its place.

**28. Conclusion. Islamism a Permanent Danger for Christianity.**—Glancing over the succession of Mohammedan conquests, it is seen that the Arabs bore a small part in the invasions. Though Arabia was the cradle of Mohammedanism, it was never more than a province of the Mohammedan empire. It was outside of Arabia, especially in Persia, that the new religion acquired its most fanatic adherents. On the whole, the Mohammedan religion has not added much to the general progress of humanity; although coming after Christianity, it did not carry a higher message to believers or free-thinkers. On the

other hand, by combining spiritual and temporal power, it promoted the cause of despotism; it placed religious fanaticism at the service of the state, and augmented continually a force which was a constant menace to the Christian world.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE PAINÉANT KINGS—FOUNDATION OF THE CAROLINGIAN DYNASTY—CHARLEMAGNE.\*

**1. The Sluggard Kings.**—The period known as the “fainéant” kings dates from the death of Dagobert. These later Merovingians merely pass across the stage; they succeeded to the throne as children, and most of them died young. They no longer governed; it is true royal diplomas still bear the date of their reign, but it is not always known when these shadowy reigns begin and

\* **SOURCES.**—The continuation of the chronicle known as “Frédégaire” (641-768). The “Gesta regum Francorum,” until 1720. The various Carolingian annals, published in volume v. of Bouquet, and in volumes i. and ii. of the “Monumenta Germaniæ” (principally the “Annales Laurissenses majores” and the annals known as Eginhard’s); the “Vita Caroli,” by Eginhard (translation by Turner and Glaister), is in the “Monumenta Carolina,” edited by Jaffé, which contains also letters from the same author, and the “Codex Carolinus,” or correspondence between the Popes and the Frankish kings. The letters of Saint Boniface are in the “Monumenta Moguntina,” also edited by Jaffé, and those of Alcuin, in the “Monumenta Alcuiniana,” same editor. The “Gesta Caroli,” by the Monk of Saint Gall, are a collection of legends and anecdotes. There are biographies of the Popes in the “Liber Pontificalis,” edition Duchesne (2 vols., 1884, 1893). Boehmer has given in his “Regesta” a catalogue of the acts of the Carolingian kings from 752 to 918. M. Muehlbacher has revised and reëdited them (1880-1899).

**LITERATURE.**—In the “Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte,” works by Bonnell, Breysig, Hahn, Oelsner, and Abel and Simson; Hodgkin, “Italy and Her Invaders,” vols. vii. and viii.; Hodgkin, “Charles the Great”; Mombert, “Charles the Great”; Bryce, “The Holy Roman Empire.”

end. Chroniclers of the seventh century depict them for us, dragging out useless lives, buried in their villas, whence they issue on the days of assemblies, when the mayors of the palace show them to the people, riding in a cart drawn by oxen, driven by an ox-driver. The nobles were contending for the power in the three kingdoms, and the struggle went on between Austrasia and Neustria. Victory fell to Austrasia from the first. This branch of the Frankish state was the most alert and pushing. One of its kings, Theodebert, was the first to assert his independence of the Empire, by coining money bearing his own name. While taking part in the struggles against the Visigoths, it was Austrasia alone which continued, during the seventh and eighth centuries, the conquest of Germany. The sympathies of the Church were with her, for her victories meant those of the Christian faith, and it was in Austrasia that the missionaries found their support. In Neustria and Burgundy the Germans, in contact with the Gallo-Romans, were losing their native energy in the ease of a more civilised life; but in Austrasia the population was almost exclusively Germanic, and kept its characteristics through constant intercourse with the Germans beyond the Rhine. Whilst the mayors of the palace in Neustria were only the impotent defenders of a tottering monarchy, the mayors of the palace in Austrasia were chiefs of a military authority which aimed at the reality and profits of power. Energetic, intelligent, and ambitious, first they dominated, then supplanted, the incapable and weak descendants of Clovis. The Carolingian accession represented a new conquest of Gaul by the Germans. The centre of government was transported from the shores of the Seine to the Rhine; the Austrasian mayors of the palace had to subdue, not only northern France, but to conquer all of the entire

south of France, which was in part occupied by the Saracens, and the remainder, encouraged by the weakness of the Merovingians, was living independently under native chiefs or, under the government of bishops, in various cities.

**2. The Mayors of the Palace. Arnulf and Pippin, the Elder.**—Two important families, whose chiefs were Arnulf and Pippin, dominated Austrasia in the beginning of the seventh century. Their possessions, watered and bounded by the Ambleve and the Roer, lay between the Meuse, the Moselle, and the Rhine. Yielding to their influence, Lothaire II. granted Austrasia semi-independence, under the control of Pippin, mayor of the palace for Austrasia, and Arnulf, who, although bishop of Metz since 615, continued to mingle in public affairs. They finally induced Clovis to recognise Austrasia as a kingdom, under the government of his son, Dagobert. A marriage between Ansegisel, son of Arnulf, and Begga, daughter of Pippin (630), strengthened the friendship of these two individuals. Their grandson Pippin of Heristal was the first of the dynasty of the Carolingians.

**3. The Mayors of the Palace in Neustria. Ebroin, 660-681.**—About this time Ebroin, mayor of the palace in Neustria, having conquered the Burgundian nobles commanded by Leger, bishop of Autun, made an attempt to establish Merovingian unity, by forcing on Austrasia his king, Theodoric III. Pippin of Heristal resisted him, but was totally defeated at Laffaux near Soissons; he regained the ascendancy after Ebroin was assassinated (681), conquered the Neustrian mayor Berthair, at Testry, and became the sole head of the Frankish kingdoms.

**4. Pippin Mayor of the Palace for All the Frankish Kingdoms, 681-714.**—He governed under four kings, up

to the time of his death. He reserved the personal direction of Austrasian affairs, the wars against the Frisians and the Alemannians; Burgundy and Neustria were administered by the two sons whom he had by Plectrude, Drogo and Grimoald.

**5. Charles Martel Succeeds Him.**—After his death (714) his widow tried to seize the power, but Charles, son of another wife, contended for it. He shut up Plectrude in Cologne, vanquished the Neustrians, who had elected a king, and the Aquitanians, who had come to their aid, had himself proclaimed mayor in both Neustria and Austrasia, under Theodoric IV., whom he withdrew from the monastery of Chelles to place on the throne; and when this king died, after a shadowy reign of sixteen years, he did not deign to choose a successor.

**6. His Able and Successful Rule.**—By means of his sound home policy and his successful wars, Charles laid the foundations for the greatness of the Carolingian dynasty. He stamped out anarchy by forcing the leaders of the nobility and clergy to respect his authority. The bishops were recruited from among the noble families of the country, as in the time of Gregory of Tours; although many, because of increasing barbarism, led a life more than secular. Certain ones, like Saint Leger, the rival, friend, and, at last, the victim of Ebroin, had become party leaders. Charles disposed of bishoprics as he wished. If a bishop of his own family were refractory, like Wido, abbot of Saint Waast and Saint Wandrille, he was merciless to him. On the other hand, he paid for the devotion of those who had helped him to success; he rewarded them by giving Church lands as *beneficia*, but exacted an oath of fidelity from them. He bargained rather than fought with his rivals. He yielded the county of Angers to Regenfried, who had disputed the



mayorality of Neustria. The powerful duke of Aquitania, Eudes (729-730), was first his enemy, then his ally, against the Arabs; and the great victory of Tours is doubtless due to the assistance of the Aquitanians. His victories earned him the name of Martel (*Carolus Martellus*, or the Hammer). The despoiler of churches seemed to have become the most formidable champion of Christianity.

**7. The Pope Vainly Solicits the Intervention of Charles Martel in Italy.**—About this same time he was asked to interfere in Italy. The Lombard king, Luitprand, was a sincere Christian, and an able, enterprising politician. Although naturally hostile to Greek dominion in Italy, he was not, like most of his predecessors, an enemy of the Pope. He was anxious, rather, to subdue the independent Lombard dukes of Benevento and Spoleto. At one time he thought he had succeeded, but the dukes found an ally in Gregory III. Luitprand then laid siege to Rome. In this distress the Pope should have claimed aid of the emperor, whose subject and deputy he was; but they had quarrelled about the question of image worship, and the bishop had severed all connection with the exarchate of Ravenna. Gregory therefore turned to the leader of the Franks; he promised him, if he drove off the Lombards, to break off forever from the Empire of the East, and confer on Charles Martel consular authority. But Charles could not undertake a long and painful war in Italy when the Arabs were ever threatening the valley of the Rhone. He refused the offers made him by three embassies, and remained Luitprand's friend, though without quarrelling with the Church.

**8. Charles Martel's Wars in Germany.**—Beyond the Rhine Charles fought the Bavarians, who, like the Aquitanians, had acquired independence; the Frisians, whom

he conquered in 732; and the Saxons, whom he could never break. He looked favourably on the missionary work of Saint Boniface, and thus outlined the policy which Charlemagne was to render triumphant.

**9. Charles Martel's Sons Share his Power. Grifo's Revolt.**—Before dying (October 21, 741), Charles Martel, who since 737 had governed without a successor to Theodoric IV., shared his power, as an hereditary possession, with the two sons whom he had had by Rotrude: the oldest, Karlmann, had Austrasia, Swabia or Alemannia, and Thuringia; the younger, Pippin (surnamed the *Short*, because of his small stature), received Burgundy, Neustria, and Provence. Neither Aquitania, nor Bavaria, nor Friesland was involved, since the Franks no longer exerted power there. Grifo, the son of a second wife, had a share, which was taken from the inheritance of the older brothers; but his mother wished the entire inheritance for him, and incited him to revolt. Grifo was vanquished and made prisoner in 741. Karlmann and Pippin, doubtless to strengthen their authority, reestablished royalty. Childeric III. came to the throne in 743; he was the last of the Merovingians, and one of the most insignificant. Affairs were simplified when Karlmann renounced his power in 747 and withdrew to the monastery of Monte Cassino. Left sole ruler, Pippin believed himself strong enough to liberate Grifo. The latter took advantage of his freedom to incite the Saxons to revolt; they were beaten, and he fled into Bavaria, where he had himself proclaimed duke, on the death of his grand-uncle Odilo. Pippin followed him up to his duchy, but treated him honourably, on the whole, for he gave him Mans and twelve cities—the very territory which was to be given later to Robert the Strong, ancestor of the Capetian family. For two years Grifo was quiet; then he took up

arms for the third time, and fled to Waifar, duke of Aquitania. Pippin now resolved to make a decided move. Unhindered by the shadow of prestige lingering around Childeric III., he deposed the king and took his place. The transition from hereditary mayor of the Franks to hereditary king of the monarchy was an easy one.

**10. Pippin the Short Usurps the Crown, 751. He is Crowned by the Pope, 754.**—This revolution was so natural that contemporaries did not realise its gravity. Pippin was first acknowledged king by the nobles assembled at Soissons (November, 751). It is said that when Pope Zacharias was consulted by some Frankish ambassadors, he replied that it was "better to call him king who had the kingly power." Another Pope, Stephen II., came in person to crown the new king. The ceremony, which took place at Saint Denis, recalled the consecration of the ancient kings of Israel and the close union of God and his chosen people. Pippin and his two sons were, at the same time, named patricians by the Pope—that is to say, protectors of the Roman republic and the Roman Church. The union of the Frankish kings with the Church, inaugurated by the baptism of Clovis, was thus made closer; it associated the two greatest forces which existed at that time in the Christian West—the temporal power of the king and the spiritual power of the Pope. Stephen II. anointed also Pippin's two sons, forbidding, under penalty of excommunication, the election of a prince descendant of another family. Who would then have ventured to doubt the legitimacy of the new reign?

**11. Pippin's Donation, 754.**—To crown Pippin was not the sole object of the journey performed by Stephen II. The Pope expected to persuade the king of the Franks to attack the Lombards, who, with King Aistulf, had re-

commenced their aggressive policy. This time he succeeded. Pippin promised the Pope to obey him, to give him the exarchate of Ravenna, which the Lombards had just conquered, and to render to the Roman republic its rights and property. The reality of the gift made by Pippin, since he disposed of something which did not belong to him, has been often, though not authoritatively, denied. It meant war against the Lombards—whence Pippin would derive great advantage. It meant also an assertion of his independence of the Empire, a closer union with the Pope, and rich booty; this gift to celebrate his accession to the throne was an important political move.

**12. Pippin Subdues the Lombards and Finds the Temporal Power, 755.**—He departed at once with the Pope and his followers. The pass over Mont Cenis was free, and he reached Pavia without striking a blow. Aistulf hastened to offer his submission; he promised formally to give up, to Saint Peter, Ravenna, and the other cities donated by Pippin. The Franks had hardly turned back when he took up arms, marched on to blockade Rome, pillaging the country and despoiling the churches of their most precious relics. Pippin was recalled in hot haste; he besieged Pavia, compelled the Lombard king to carry out the treaty of 754, which was made more onerous. Aistulf was killed by a fall from his horse not long after. Ratchis, his brother, who had entered a monastery, claimed the crown. But the Pope, urged by Pippin's agents, supported the duke of Tuscany, Didier, who ratified the treaties concluded by Aistulf. The temporal power of the popes was henceforth founded on a solid territorial basis.

**13. Pippin's Victories in Gaul and Germany.**—Italy once pacified, Pippin returned home to attack the Arabs,

or Saracens; he retook Narbonne and Septimania. He conducted not less than eight campaigns against the Aquitanians, but did not conquer them until after the death of Duke Waifar, who was assassinated by one of his own people. Beyond the Rhine the Saxons maintained their footing, and the Bavarians regained their independence under Duke Tassilo; but on their own side of the river the Franks found powerful auxiliaries in the Christian missionaries, and an especial friend in the greatest among them, Saint Boniface. The conversion of Germany, begun in the sixth century by Irish monks, was ended in the eighth by the Anglo-Saxons.

**14. Conversion of Germany. St. Boniface.**—As early as 690 a Northumbrian monk, a disciple of the Irish, Wilbrod, went among the Frisians. His preaching covered a period of forty years. With the aid of Pippin of Heristal he founded the bishopric of Utrecht. In 715 he was joined by one of his compatriots, Wynfrith. Both about 680 at Kirton (Wessex), Wynfrith entered the convent of Exeter, young, against his father's wishes. He studied seriously, and in turn taught successfully in a convent of Southampton. He had been a priest for five years when he went to Germany. In 718 he journeyed to Rome to offer his services to Pope Gregory II., who, after assuring himself that he possessed the necessary knowledge and courage, ordered him to "carry the word of God to unbelievers." Wynfrith then went to Thuringia, where he took up the work begun by Saint Kilian; thence he passed on into Hesse, where he baptised several thousand pagans.

**15. Intimate Relations of Saint Boniface with the Pope.**—In 723 he went to the Pope to render an account of his early successes, who appointed him bishop, under the name of Bonifatius, an approximate translation of his

Anglo-Saxon name ("who brings peace"). Boniface vowed "never to attack the unity of the Church, but to give his entire faith, his purity, his zeal, to the service of the Holy See and to its vicar." The Pope gave him for a code a collection of the canons of the Church, and for a moral guide the correspondence of Gregory the Great with Augustine; he provided him with letters for the Frankish duke, Charles Martel, who took him under his protection. Armed with these instructions, with metropolitan authority, and the right to appoint bishops in Christian communities founded by him: invested, moreover, with the *pallium*,\* which the Pope sent him in 732, he retraced his steps through Hesse and Thuringia and completed the conversion of Bavaria. Besides the bishopric already existing at Passau, he established those of Salzburg, Frisingen, and Ratisbon (739).

He founded monasteries purporting to be, not only asylums of peace and prayer, but schools for young missionaries. They were under the direction of his best disciples: the one at Fritzlar was controlled by the Anglo-Saxon, Wicbert, the Bavarian Sturm was at Fulda. He created for women, Bischofheim, and gave it into the keeping of the gentle, wise Lioba. The organisation was completed by the foundation of the archbishopric of Mainz, which was the metropolitan see of entire Germany (751). The ecclesiastical constitution was, then, the first form of national unity for Germany as for England. This great work was alike a benefit to Germany, which in this way became a part of civilised society; to the Holy See, whose dominion extended, henceforth, undisputed be-

\* The pallium, the mark of the archbishop's office, was a scarf of white wool with black crosses on it, in wool. It was often taken to mean the symbol of the lamb which the Good Shepherd carries on his shoulders.

yond the Rhine and the Danube; and even to Gaul, which, having furthered the efforts of the "Apostle of Germany," called him to reform the habits of the Frankish clergy.

**16. Reform of the Frankish Clergy.**—The evil was widespread. The ecclesiastical hierarchy had been overthrown during the civil wars; no bishops' names are recorded, in the south, during this period. In the north there was often one bishop for two bishoprics; thus Charles Martel's brother, Drogo, held Rouen and Bayeux; and Milo, Reims and Trèves; or bishoprics were conferred on laymen, who squandered the revenues as they willed. With such pastors there was no restraint put on evil habits: clerks and monks abandoned themselves to intoxication, lust, vagrancy, hunting, and war. Those who remained faithful to their duties were starving, since Church lands had been given by Charles Martel, and even Pippin, to their soldiers. No council had been convoked for eighty years to check the evil. Pippin's brother, Karlmann, was the first to be aroused, and at his request Zacharius ordered Boniface into Gaul to direct the reform. The prestige of his faith, works, and his submissiveness to the Holy See clothed his mission with full authority. The task was accomplished by four councils, assembled within six years (742-748). Faithless priests were degraded, unchaste monks and novices were beaten with rods, nuns were shorn; gaming, rich clothing, drunkenness, were forbidden. No one might exercise priestly functions unless consecrated and accepted by the bishop. It was decreed that each city should again have a bishop, that the metropolitans should have the rank and authority of archbishops,\* with powers to supervise

\*The use of the term archbishop dates from the middle of the eighth century.

the habits of the clergy, and administer ecclesiastical justice. On monasteries was enjoined strict observance of Benedictine rule; abbots, subject to the bishop and consecrated by him, must be well versed in Scripture. There was an attempt to get back the property which had been taken from the churches, but the decree was not carried out; however, Boniface decided that a census of the property should be made, and that it should be returned to the clergy on the death of the proprietors.

**17. The Frankish Church Dependent on the Holy See.**—Thus constituted, the Frankish church was forced to acknowledge the authority of the Holy See. Boniface decreed that the metropolitans should not exercise their new prerogatives until they had received the pallium from the Pope, as he had done at Mainz. And finally Boniface offered boldly to use ecclesiastical authority in the service of the Frankish kings. Public authority was henceforth represented in the person of the prince, the bishops, and the counts; the Church gave the support of religious consecration to civil laws, just as the civil power guaranteed the execution of religious commands. Hence the close union between Church and State, which was the source of the greatness of the Carolingian empire. Charlemagne's legislation and the principles of his administration were already embodied in the ecclesiastical policy of Boniface. The councils held by Boniface and the Frankish princes established order and discipline in the state, as in the Church, for there was the same staff for both civil and ecclesiastical administrations, and the two bodies were closely associated.

**18. Martyrdom of Saint Boniface, 755.**—Boniface did not think he had done enough. At the age of sixty-five he set out to convert Friesland. On arriving near the present city of Dockum he was attacked by a body of



pagans. He did not try to defend himself, but was massacred with his servants and neophytes (June 5, 755). His disciples continued his work, which was completed under Charlemagne's firm rule.

**19. Charlemagne. Youth; Accession.**—Charles was the oldest son of Pippin the Short. Born April 2, 742, he was twenty-six years old at the time of his father's death. He was fairly well educated; he could read and almost write; he spoke Latin as well as his own tongue, and understood a little Greek. But he was, above all, a man of action, of iron will, and untiring activity, which was not broken by illness during thirty years. He first reigned with his younger brother, Karlmann, who inherited Burgundy, Provence, Gothland, Eastern Aquitania, and, in Austrasia, Alsace, Alemannia, Hesse, and Thuringia; but Karlmann died at twenty (771), the Franks excluded his children from the throne, and Charles remained sole king. He was great as a soldier and legislator. Aquitania, Italy, Spain, and Germany were the scenes of his four principal wars.

**20. Submission of Aquitania, 769.**—Hunold, who is mistakenly identified as the father of Waifar, took up arms in Aquitania. Defeated by Charles (769), he took refuge among the Gascons. Delivered up by them to the conqueror, he succeeded again in escaping. He went to Rome, then to the Lombards, where he was stoned to death a short time later. In order to dominate the country, Charles built the fortress of Fronsac.

**21. Destruction of the Lombard Kingdom.**—In Italy the king of the Lombards had at first lived on good terms with the Franks. Pippin's widow, Bertha, had even attempted to found a solid alliance between Desiderius and her sons; but Charles repudiated Desiderius's daughter a short time after marrying her. To avenge this insult,

the Lombard espoused the cause of Karlmann's widow, and made an attempt to gain the royal inheritance for her sons. He took Faenza and Comacchio from the Pope, since the latter would not countenance his designs, and pursued the aggressive policy of Aistulf. These mutual affronts led inevitably to war; it burst forth in 773, after futile negotiations on both sides. Charles crossed the Alps as easily as Pippin had done eighteen years before, blockaded Desiderius in Pavia, while a portion of his troops went on to Verona to seize Karlmann's widow and sons. The siege of Pavia dragging on indefinitely, Charles marched on to Rome.

**22. Charlemagne at Rome, 774. He is Named Patrician.**—He reached there Holy Thursday (April 2, 774). He was received with the honours formerly accorded a patrician and an exarch. Battalions of militia, led by the chiefs of the nobility, went out to meet him; young men from the schools bore olive branches and palms; all sang and cheered the king of France, defender of the Church. Thus escorted, Charles went on foot to Saint Peter's, where the Pope was awaiting him. He climbed the steps of the cathedral, on his knees, kissing each step devoutly as he went up. The king and the Pope kissed, and went into the church, amidst the shouts of the crowd, which sang: "Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord!" After having witnessed all the ceremonies incident to the holy days, Charles was asked to be present at a meeting held in Saint Peter's, where were the Pope and the principal members of the clergy and the nobility. There, near the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles, the Pope recalled the promises of Pippin, which were solemnly renewed. Duplicate copies of the act were drawn up by a notary of Charlemagne, who signed the act, as did most of his followers; the paper was carefully deposited

in the archives of the Lateran. Unfortunately all traces of this document have long since disappeared. However the assertions of Pope Hadrian's biographer are questioned by modern criticism, it seems improbable that the "pious and magnanimous Charles" should have given to the Pope central Italy entire, especially provinces which he did not possess, such as Corsica, Venetia, Istria, and the duchy of Beneventum. In any case, whatever may have been the terms of Charlemagne's gift, and although the Pope got with great difficulty but a part of it, this donation completed the work of Pippin, and the establishment of the temporal power of the Holy See. But, on his side, Charles exacted all his rights as patrician; that is to say, supreme jurisdiction over Rome, and the duchy and the provinces of the exarchate; the pontiff became a subject of the king of the Franks, and his states were less an independent sovereignty than a kind of fief under the lordship of Charlemagne.

**23. Italy's Submission.**—Having settled his affairs with the Papacy, Charles returned to Pavia, which was finally taken after a siege of six months. Desiderius was shut up in the monastery of Corbie, where he passed the remainder of his life in holy living; Charles assumed, with the iron crown, the title of King of the Lombards (774). He then attacked the Lombard dukes, who had declared independence on the fall of national royalty. The duke of Spoleto acknowledged the authority of the Holy See. The duke of Friuli was killed while fighting the Franks, and his estates were taken. The duke of Beneventum, Arichis, submitted when Charlemagne had gone as far as Capua. Charles was now opposed by a league of the Avars and the Greeks with Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, his vassal, but also son-in-law of Desiderius. The empress Irene had apparently favoured a Frankish alliance, a mar-

riage had been arranged between her son Constantine and Rotrude, Charlemagne's daughter; but she broke off all relations with him, and sent an army to Apulia with Desiderius's son, Adalgis, whilst the patrician, Theodoric, governor of Sicily, was to invade the duchy of Beneventum. But the Avars were driven out of Friuli; Theodoric conquered by the dukes of Beneventum and Spoleto; Adalgis taken and killed. Tassilo, arrested at the diet of Ingelheim, was condemned to death as a rebel, but was pardoned and shut up for the rest of his days in the monastery of Jumièges (788).

**24. Italy Under Carolingian Government.**—Italy was no longer a source of disturbance to Charlemagne. He governed it from a distance through his son, Pippin, whom he had crowned king in 781. Several times the Pope demanded the fulfilment of the promises made in 774; he cited a famous document which was then first mentioned in history, by which Constantine, first Christian emperor, gave to the Pope Rome and the Occident entire. The deed was false; perhaps it had just been made up for the occasion. Charlemagne, without questioning the validity of the gift, was in no hurry to yield all his conquests to the Pope. He maintained his political authority, even in countries subject to the Pope; he refused absolutely to yield his rights to Ravenna. Hadrian was, in fact, master of the duchy of Rome only, which had been much enlarged by the liberality of the Frankish king. As long as the Frankish empire maintained its strong power, the Pope was in the position of a powerful vassal, invested with regal rights, rather than in that of an independent sovereign. The Frankish king considered Rome as a city of his domain, and early assumed to exercise a right of control in the election of the popes. Later on in history the German emperors wished to con-

tinue this dependent position of the popes. This was the cause of their struggles with the Holy See.

**25. Germany in the Eighth Century. The Saxons.**—More time and effort were necessary for the Franks to conquer Germany. Charles Martel, then Pippin and Karlmann, had succeeded in subduing the Thuringians and the Alemanni. They had allowed the Bavarians to keep their national dukes, but demanded allegiance from them. They had attacked and beaten the Saxons repeatedly, but this noble people had fought off the Frankish yoke and the Christian religion. They occupied lower Germany entire, from the Eider on the north to the junction of the Werra and the Fulda on the south; from the Elbe and the Saale on the east almost to the Rhine. They were composed of four or five principal groups: the Saxons of the west, Westphalians; those of the east, Eastphalians; the Angrians the middle, and the Nordalbingians, between the Elbe and the Eider. They had kept the customs of primitive Germany; the districts (*Gaue*) were governed by princes, from among whom the military chief or duke was chosen by lot, in time of war. However, the duke was far from commanding the whole tribe, as the tribe was incapable of uniting in a struggle against an enemy. The Saxons had remained faithful to their gods, as to a sign of their national independence. Odin was their most important god, and their most revered spot was the wood surrounding the Irmensäule, a colossal tree trunk, which was, in their eyes, the column which supported the world.

**26. Submission of the Saxons.**—Germany could not be at peace as long as the Saxons were unsubdued and unconverted. It took Charlemagne thirty years and eight campaigns to conquer them. In 772 he went as far as the Weser, burned Irmensäule and the sacred wood which

surrounded it; in 775 he crossed the river, was victorious in every encounter, and forced his enemies to be baptised at Paderborn, and to give hostages. His religious and administrative laws were so irksome that they took up arms again; one of their chiefs, Widukind, ravaged the valley of the Rhine. For three years this adversary eluded Charles's grasp. In 780 it seemed as if he were at last conquered; the Saxons in the west lay down their arms, and Charles divided the country into counties, and built numerous garrison stations; at the same time he created new bishoprics and commanded Willehad to Christianise the country between the Ems and the Elbe. Widukind reappeared, however, in 782; the new converts abjured; the priests and counts were driven out; an army of Franks was destroyed at the foot of the Sonnehal. This time Charles treated the Saxons as rebels, not as enemies; forty-five hundred hostages were mercilessly decapitated, and he carried on a war of extermination. Widukind, brought to bay, delivered himself up to Charles, in his palace at Attigny, and consented to be baptised. From that time on the hero of Saxon independence served his victor faithfully. Saxony remained quiet for eight years, and Charles could undertake the conquest of the Slavs to the east of the Elbe, and the Huns in Pannonia. In order to do this he was obliged to withdraw the troops in the subdued country, and the Saxons, tired of paying tithes and performing military service, like other subjects of the Franks, revolted. Charles exercised exceeding severity; many Saxon tribes were transplanted into Gaul and Italy, and were replaced by Slavs; new bishoprics were established, and permanent armies were stationed on the frontiers. In 804 the last rebels offered their submission; they were forced to accept Christianity, and acknowledge the judges ap-

pointed by Charlemagne, although they were allowed to keep their own customs. Charlemagne revised their laws and exempted them from all tribute except the church tax. The conquest was complete; not merely the material subjection, which leaves in the hearts of the vanquished nothing but sharp regrets and thirst for revenge, but above all, the moral and religious conquest was accomplished. Saxony was destined to give Germany her first imperial dynasty, after the disappearance of the Carolingians; it was to be the centre of German civilisation in the Middle Ages down to modern times. Henceforth she was in the vanguard of European civilisation, as opposed to barbarism, which was thrust back beyond the Elbe.

### **27. Charlemagne's Wars Against the Slavs and Danes.**

—Charlemagne attacked vigorously this fresh onslaught of barbarism. In 796 the Franks reached the fortified camp of the Avars, and carried off their treasure, rich booty, which was divided among the apostolic churches in Rome and Charlemagne's palatines. Meanwhile a breach was made in the main body of the Slavs: the Obo tribes had early treated with the Franks, doubtless through hatred of their neighbours, the Saxons; but there were others to subdue. The Sorabes, Wiltzi, the Bohemian Czechs who were subdued and obliged to furnish auxiliaries in the Frankish army; but they kept their national chiefs and no tribute was exacted of them. Lines of fortifications along the Eider held the Danes in check, although with difficulty.

**28. Wars Against the Arabs. Roncesvalles, 778.**—Each victory of Charlemagne over the Avars, the Slavs, the Scandinavians, the Germans was an advantage to civilisation. This barbarian, a kind of lieutenant of the emperor, and protector of the Church—since he was patri-

cian—was defending the interests of Roman and Christian Europe, was extending the Empire. He attacked the Arabs also; but there he came in contact with a civilisation at least the equal of the one he was spreading, and one more fertile in resources; therefore his success was not as brilliant nor as lasting. Pippin had accomplished an essential work by forcing the Arabs back over the Pyrenees; the Arabs themselves summoned Charles to cross the mountains. While he was holding a diet at Paderborn (777), several emirs who had revolted against the caliph of Cordova solicited his aid. Charlemagne listened to their prayers, and the following spring he invaded Spain, on two sides, simultaneously. He took Gerona, Pampe-luna, and Barcelona, but failed at Saragossa, and beat a hasty retreat. In the pass of Roncesvalles his rear guard was suddenly fallen upon by the Gascons, who held the heights above them: the Franks, taken unawares, perished to the last man. There died Eccehard, the king's steward, Anselm, count of the palace, and Roland, count of the frontier of Brittany. This event, which has been exaggerated and embellished by popular imagination, became the subject of the finest of mediæval epic poems, the "Chanson de Roland." Charles was unable to avenge the affront immediately, he merely had Lupus, duke of the Gascons, killed. The Arabs took back, one by one, their conquered cities; in 793 they invaded Septimania, and vanquished near the Orb William the Pious, count of Toulouse, renowned in the chansons de geste as William Short Nose. They were soon driven out of the province, and pursued to the Ebro; Barcelona was recaptured after a siege of two years and the march of Gothia was established, to hold them in check. In the Mediterranean these Arabs, more often termed Saracens, ravaged the Balearic Islands, Sardinia, and Corsica, while the Scandi-



navian pirates were beginning their depredations on the northern coasts. This was a double danger which Charlemagne could but foresee, and to which his descendants succumbed.

**29. The Empire of the West Reconstituted, 800.**—Thirty years of wars and conquests brought marked results. Since Theodosius the Great no leader of the state had reigned so brilliantly, no one had so well embodied the imperial idea; that is to say, the union of the peoples of the West under one sceptre and of consciences under one religion. Now, in the last year of the eighth century many considered the imperial throne unoccupied. Irene, having reigned in the name of her son, did not fear to set him aside and to take his place, first having his eyes put out. This sacrilegious usurpation was a precedent; it facilitated the restoration of the Empire to the advantage of Charlemagne. The popes disliked the idea; they had long been subjects of the emperor, and preferred a master at a distance, who had little power. But circumstances forced them to sacrifice their desire of independence to their fears. Hadrian I. died in 795, after a reign of twenty-five years; his successor, Leo III., had to struggle with the factious passions of his adversaries, the first of whom was Hadrian's nephew, the primate Pascal. One day, in the year 799, he was attacked in the midst of a religious ceremony and dragged from his horse; twice there was an attempt to pull out his eyes and his tongue. Nevertheless, he succeeded in escaping, and reached Charlemagne, who had him taken to Rome, under a military escort of chiefs and bishops. The numerous friends whom the king of the Franks had among the clergy had already started the idea that it was imperative to break off relations with the Empire of the East, the stronghold of despotism and heresy. Charles had been

proclaimed patrician twenty-five years before; was it not still more to their interest to name him emperor? Charles came to Rome in 800. His first act was to summon before his tribunal the Pope and his accusers; none of the latter appeared. The Pope, on the contrary, "in the presence of everyone, mounted the pulpit of Saint Peter's, bearing the Gospels, and having invoked the Holy Trinity, he purified himself of the crimes which were imputed to him." His enemies were arrested, charged with *lèse-majesté*, and condemned to death, but at the request of the Pope Charles granted them their life, and sent them into exile. In the meanwhile Christmas ceremonies were celebrated with great pomp; Charles went to Mass at Saint Peter's. "At the moment when he kneeled down to pray, before the altar, the Pope placed a crown upon his head, and all the Roman people shouted: 'To Charles Augustus, crowned of God, great and pacific emperor of the Romans, life and victory!' After this proclamation the pontiff bowed down before him, adored him, following the custom established in the time of the ancient Cæsars, and henceforth Charles, giving up the name of the patrician, bore that of emperor and Augustus." Charles seemed surprised, but it is difficult to believe that the surprise was sincere. Yet he may not have been untroubled as to the legitimacy and the consequences of this bold act. What had just happened—the coronation by the Pope's own hand, the acclamation of the people, the applause of his own warriors—all was irregular, if not revolutionary; yet the deed was done. Charlemagne accepted it, and one might believe that the Roman Empire was restored. Actually the emperor and Pope had founded a German and Christian empire, for which Roman traditions were to be, later, a source of deception and ruin.

**30. Charlemagne's Friendly Relations with the Greek Emperor.**—Charlemagne in no wise intended to build up a power to rival that of Constantinople; on the contrary, he assumed to live on good terms with the sovereign who still possessed so many rights in Italy. He treated with the Empress Irene, whose hand, it is said, he asked in marriage. When she was overthrown (801) he succeeded in having his imperial title officially recognised by the Byzantine chancery; in return for which he gave up to the Greeks Dalmatia and Venetia (811); Greek merchants came to the fairs at Aix-la-Chapelle, and Venetian merchants travelled freely through Greece.

**31. Relations with England.**—The influence of Charlemagne extended beyond what might be considered then the limits of the Empire. After the death (796) of the powerful king of Mercia, Offa, with whom he was unable to establish friendly relations, he interfered twice effectively in England: his legates, acting with the Pope's, established on the throne of Northumbria Eardwulf, who had been driven off by a sedition. He helped to bring back to the throne of Wessex (802) Egbert, who had, it is said, lived thirteen years at his court and served in his army. A later legend goes so far as to relate that Charlemagne had subjugated England. Should not a Roman emperor reign in Britain? The leaders of the small Irish kingdoms were lavish in their expression of submission.

**32. Relations with the Caliph of Bagdad.**—From the other extremity of the civilised world the caliph of Bagdad, Haroun-al-Raschid, sought his alliance against the Greek emperor of the Orient, and against the caliph of Cordova. Two embassies were exchanged, in 801 and 807. Among the presents sent Charlemagne by the caliph, the one which aroused the most lively curiosity

was an elephant, brought, not without difficulty, to Aix-la-Chapelle. It was named Aboulabasand; its sudden death was recorded in the Carolingian annals as a great event. The sending of the keys of the Holy Sepulchre was less commented on, although it led to great consequences in the future, since it conferred on the king of the Franks a right of protection over the holy places of Palestine.

59  
**34. Charlemagne's Death, 814. Physical and Moral Traits.**—Charlemagne had been <sup>53</sup>reigning for fifty-five years. For a long time fatigue seemed to leave no mark on his strong constitution; but since 810 frequent attacks of fever warned him to save his strength. He paid no attention to them, and after an acute attack, lasting six days, he died, January 28, 814, aged seventy-two. Eginhard, or Einhard, his historian, left the following description of him: "He was stout and vigorous, of good stature, although his neck was short and thick, and he had a large, prominent abdomen; yet he was so well proportioned that these defects were not noticeable. His eyes were large and bright, the nose somewhat long; he had beautiful white hair, and an open, pleasing countenance. His step was firm, and his whole bearing was virile, but his thin voice was not in keeping with his size." Like all the members of his family, he had given up wearing his hair long, in the Merovingian way. He wore no beard, and his moustache was thin and drooping. His costume was simple, consisting of short stockings, breeches, a shirt, a linen tunic, over which fell a short mantle, opening on both sides. In winter a jerkin of marten or otter completed the costume; and when hunting a sheep's skin was his extra wrap. He was passionately fond of violent exercise; and in the pool at Aix-la-Chapelle he delighted in hot and cold baths, and in

great political power as did the mayor of the palace. The chamberlain (*camerarius*), who was on the contrary a secondary agent under the Merovingians, was often employed in important political and military affairs, although, in his proper functions, he regulated court ceremonial and received the annual gifts from the nobles. The seneschal (*dapifer*) shared with the count of the palace in the inner administration of the royal houses, but his especial province was the princely table, as the cellarer's was the wine cellar, and the constable's (*comes stabuli*) the stables.

**5. The Ministeriales.**—These were the low officers of the palace, as the porter, the beadle, the commissary, marshal, master of the hounds, grooms, etc. They never played any part in politics.

**6. The King's Council.**—As early as the beginning of the eighth century there appeared, near the person of the king, clerical and secular counsellors, regularly appointed confidants of the sovereign, on whom was enjoined the most absolute secrecy concerning the conversations held with him. The high officials of the palace were recruited from among their number. There were also at court the students of the palace school, the hosts of servants and men-at-arms who never left the court, as well as the merchants of all kinds who were attracted by the courtiers.

**7. Political and Administrative Divisions of the Frankish Empire.**—Counsellors, high officers of the palace, general assemblies; such were the principal organs of the central government. The local administrative system was different. In 781 Charlemagne created the two kingdoms of Aquitaine and Italy; he placed his two sons, Louis and Pippin, over them as kings; but the kingdoms were not independent; they did not cease to form an in-

tegral part of the Frankish kingdom. So it was when Charlemagne divided his empire between his three sons, in 806. If Charles, Louis, and Pippin did actually take possession of their shares, which is not certain, Frankish unity did not suffer by it. In that vast empire which stretched from the Ebro and Vulturna to the two seas and the Eider on the north, and from the Atlantic to the Elbe and the Theiss, a distinction must be made between the countries governed directly by the emperor's agents, the tributary states which kept their national dukes, as did Gascony and Brittany, and the Papal States, theoretically independent under the authority of the Pope. In the first group, comprising ancient Gaul almost entire, all Germany, and half of Italy, the administrative division was the county (*pagus, civitas, Gau*).

**8. The Count.**—As a rule there was a count to each county. The counts were named by the king, perhaps for life, but always removable. They were mostly chosen from among the most important landed proprietors; in Saxony they were designedly taken from the oldest noble families of the country. They had extended powers in the affairs of the army, justice, and finance; they sat in the annual assemblies, and took part in the making of capitularies, which they were later ordered to enforce. They had no salary, but were entitled to a third of the royal revenues; moreover, they often received “benefices” for the services they rendered. For these benefices they took a special oath of fidelity to the king, so that the latter found it to his advantage to confer these grants on all these counts, whatever might be their personal estates, so that they might be bound to him by ties of vassalage. In France the count was aided and replaced, if necessary, by a lieutenant of his own choice, who was called, after the eighth century, viscount (*vice comes*); to dispense jus-

tice in the lower tribunals, he had agents, likewise chosen by himself, named *vicars* or *centenars*. These subordinates the count paid in the same way that the king paid him; he conferred grants upon them, which were taken, naturally, from his own personal property, or allodium, not from the land which he had received from the king. His agents became thus his vassals, just as he had become the vassal of the king.

**9. The "Missi Dominici."**—These great landowners, invested with kingly authority, might abuse their powers. Charlemagne had them supervised by temporary envoys (*missi dominici*), who were unknown to the Merovingian period. They were priests and laymen, invested during the time of their appointment with royal power to dispense justice, inquire into the needs of the people, and correct abuses. In 802 Charlemagne made this office a regular one; the kingdom was divided into departments; an archbishop and a count were apportioned to each region; sometimes two laymen were associated with an archbishop, or two ecclesiastics alone. Apparently the *missi* were named each year, perhaps by the general assembly. In 812 they were required to make, annually, four rounds of inspection lasting a month each, and send in a report to the emperor each spring. Although not altogether agreeable to the counts and the bishops, the regulation was one of the benefits of Charlemagne's reign.

**10. The Dukes.**—In addition to the counts are found dukes. Charles continued the national dukes in Brittany, Gascony, and Italy, at Spoleto and Benevento; but he abolished them entirely in Germany. The ducal office was simply a military one, in the region which was directly under a duke's supervision. Charlemagne organised special commands along the frontier most open to invasion, the so-called marches; of these there were, the

march of the Goths to the north of the Pyrenees, the land governed by Roland on the frontier of Brittany (later the county of the Maine), and the marches established as a protection against the Danes, the Sorbes, and the Avars, etc. They were ruled by counts, who were also called dukes or prefects, but more often marquises or markgrafen. As to the cities, we nowhere find in them governing agents representing the central power.

**11. Bishops. Charlemagne's Freedom of Choice.**—The bishops, in addition to the counts, were the principal agents of Charlemagne, whom he chose, like the latter, to suit himself. They were chosen with care, however, often from among the novices in the palace school, whose studies and conduct he could watch himself. Birth was not a consideration with him: he preferred sons of freedmen or serfs, if they were worthy of the episcopal office, to sons of nobles, if the latter were indifferent or lazy. He commanded them to live amicably with the counts, and to work jointly with them in the maintenance of order; at the same time he placed them under the metropolitan, who assumed henceforth the title and rank of archbishop. There were also special bishops for the rural districts, *chorepiscopi*, or country bishops; the office was kept up, here and there, into the middle of the tenth century, but it gradually disappeared, and the duties were assumed by arch-deacons, entrusted with the material administration of the diocese, and partly by parish priests, who were fixed in their office. Priests might be named either by the king, bishops, or individuals who had endowed churches.

**12. Canons.**—In order to establish perfect discipline among the city clergy Charlemagne made general an institution established in 760 at Metz by Bishop Chrodegand, who had gathered his priests around him and had



compelled them to live under a monastic rule (canon) borrowed from Saint Augustine. They were called *canons* (*canonici*), and the college was termed a chapter.

**13. Monastic Reform. Saint Benedict of Aniane.**—The abbots, as well as the bishops, were often named by Charlemagne, who did not hesitate to place laymen in control of monasteries. The manners and morals in religious houses of monks and nuns were carefully watched; they adopted, or were forced gradually to adopt, the Benedictine rule, reformed in 817, by the Goth Vitiza, known to religion as Saint Benedict of Aniane. The bishops were required to maintain the discipline; although several monasteries had thrown off the jurisdiction of the ordinary (bishop) to be under direct control of the Pope: they were known as “exempts.” The two important public services of the citizen of the Carolingian state were the judicial system and the army.

**14. Judicial Organisation.**—There were two judicial innovations which should be noticed. The obligation of all freemen to be present at the judicial assemblies, which were frequent, had grown burdensome, especially to poor men. Charlemagne decided that there should be but two or three compulsory sessions a year. In the second place, the former *rachimburgi* disappeared and were replaced by the *scabini*. They were chosen by the king’s envoys or the count from among the “important persons fearing God”; they swore to judge justly and honestly; unworthiness was the sole cause for removal; they were actual magistrates. Seven *scabini* were usually required to be present at the sessions of the tribunal, although the number was not fixed. The institution was completely organised and general after 803 throughout the empire, except in Friesland, where the name and office were unknown. The assizes were held by the count in various

places, in suitable halls sheltered from the weather, but never in churches; he might be represented by his lieutenant (*missus comitis, vice-comes*) or by inferior judges, centenarius or vicar, except in important cases. When the king's missus was on his circuit he administered justice in the same tribunals and in the same forms as did the count. There were no scabini in the king's tribunals; there the assessors were nobles and palatines, clerical and secular.

**15. Administration of Justice.**—Charlemagne watched closely the administration of justice; he declared himself the protector of the innocent and the oppressed, especially the poor; judges were forbidden to receive presents. It was a common failing. Judges accepted everything; poorer clients brought linen and woollen stuffs, shoes, gloves, boxes for manuscripts, rolls of wax for writing tablets. A bishop of Orleans, Theodulf, who was *missus* in 798, describes a precious vase that was accepted by some official: "The exterior was effaced, but the river Achelöis was still visible, Hercules and Nessus struggling for Deianira, the tragic end of Lichas, and the defeat of Antaeus; the interior represented the cavern of Cacus, and Hercules trampling under foot the conquered monster." Theodulf himself accepted merely small presents: fruits, eggs, milk, goat's milk cheese, and fowls. In Racine's time Chicaneau tempts Dandin with a quarter-cask of muscatel. The custom of giving *épices*, presents, to judges goes back to the time of Charlemagne, and continues until the French Revolution.

**16. Military Service. Formation of the Army.**—There was no standing army. When war broke forth the order to take the field was issued by royal proclamation (*bannum, heribannum*). Military service was not compulsory on all freemen, but on proprietors alone. Towards the

end of his reign Charlemagne specified those who were liable for service. Those who possessed a certain number of *manses*, farms,—two, three, four,—according to the year, must enlist. Those who owned fewer joined with others in such a way that one would join the army and the others would pay him an indemnity in money, which took the place of pay. Counts were obliged to keep a list of all who were answerable for service. Those who failed to answer the royal summons, except for cause, were fined. There were few legal exemptions. The palatines, certain agents of the counts, bishops or abbots alone were privileged. Service was required of members of the clergy: the bishop or abbot led his men to war, as a lay noble did. The soldiers equipped and fed themselves at their own expense. The length of service was not stated; but a capitulary of 811, ordering soldiers to provide themselves with food for three months, counting from the day when they should have reached the frontier of the country to be invaded, leads to the inference that it did not exceed three months. Charlemagne's army was made up of horsemen, not infantry, as in the preceding epoch; but the organisation of these armies is little known. If a frontier were invaded, a general levying of troops was made in the neighbouring countries: this was the *landwehr*, already so-called in the ninth century.

**17. Finance. Disappearance of Public Contributions.**  
—Justice and the army were therefore public institutions: it was in the name of the state and of the chief of the state alone that judgments were pronounced and war was declared. It was otherwise with the finances. Public contributions had almost entirely disappeared in the eighth century; beyond the annual gifts, rents, or quit-rents, which continued to be paid for some time on certain lands, and the judicial fines and peace money, the

king had only his personal revenues at his disposal. It is true that they were large; to the Austrasian property of the Pippins were added many territories, either confiscated or conquered from the numerous enemies of three-quarters of a century. Charlemagne was doubtless the greatest landed proprietor of the Empire. He supervised the administration of these lands as a sovereign who knows that his power rests partly on his riches. The capitulary "De Villis" and the description of his domains which he had drawn up in 812 bear interesting testimony on this point. The revenues in money and in kind drawn from the exploitation of his farms, woods, mills, mines, and salt marshes, etc., were increased by booty, tribute paid by subject princes, presents from subjects of the Empire or foreign potentates. Moreover, in his changes of residence the king required his subjects to contribute to the support of his person and household. What was in the Merovingian period merely voluntary homage, became a right which Charlemagne exacted.

**18. Extraordinary Expenses: Public Works; Public Charities.**—There were no public expenses, just as there were no public contributions. The maintenance of roads, dikes, sluices, bridges, fords, and coastguards was at the expense of the population, not of the state. In certain cases, however, it was necessary to contribute to works whose utility was apparent: as for the construction of strategic bridges, and the palace and chapel of Aix-la-Chapelle. Charles attempted to revive commerce, by affording protection to merchants and Jews, establishing new markets, and supervising weights and measures, which he wished to render uniform. He organised a public fund for the benefit of the poor, by imposing a tax on bishops, abbots, and counts. All these measures were evidently taken in the interests of the state; but they did

not constitute, as in the present time, so many public offices kept up by regular funds. Here, as elsewhere, everything depended on the personal foresight of the emperor. His efforts bore fruit: during his reign his states enjoyed a degree of prosperity unknown for more than a century.

**19. Monetary System. Disuse of Gold Coin.**—Pippin modified considerably the monetary system: the mintage of gold coins was discontinued, and on the demand of the council of Rheims (813) the circulation of the gold *solidi* of imperial Rome was forbidden; the *denarius* and half-*denarius* in silver were the current money. Twelve *denarii* equalled a *solidus*, and twenty *solidi* were worth a pound of 7680 of our grains. The character of the coinage, which had deteriorated under the later Merovingians, was improved, especially after the conquest of Lombardy. The king kept the exclusive right of coining money in his mints, of which there was a restricted number.

**20. Literary Revival. The Palace School. Alcuin.**—Conqueror, legislator, benefactor of his people, Charles was also the protector of arts, letters, and instruction. He drew around him the most distinguished writers of his time. Northumbria sent him Alcuin. A pupil of the episcopal school of York, he was imbued with the spirit of classic literature; Vergil was his delight. Sent on a mission to the continent, he met Charlemagne in Italy, and consented to follow him to court (782); here he was made director of the school which Charles had established in his own palace. Through his writings and correspondence he exerted marked influence on the theological, literary, and scientific doctrines of his time. Later he withdrew to the rich abbey in Tours, and there formed a school on the model of the one at York. The beautiful manuscripts, which were copied there in the ninth cen-

tury, and that are still in existence, bear witness to the work done in this school. He died in 804, sowing over France, as he expresses it, "the seeds of knowledge in the evening of his life, as he had scattered them through Britain in the flower of his age."

**21. Charlemagne's Zeal for Enlightenment.**—Italy contributed also a large share towards the education of Charlemagne and his people. He found among the Lombards, at Benevento, Milan, and Pavia, schools of deep learning and a civilised nobility. He brought from Rome professors of grammar and arithmetic, architects and sculptors. The idea of a Christian empire, which Charlemagne had drawn from the "City of God" by Saint Augustine, and whose realisation he had dreamed of before he even thought of imperial restoration, imposed on him the duty of doing everything to civilise his subjects and lift them towards the kingdom of God. His capitularies are an eloquent testimony of the importance he attached to instruction. He considered it of prime importance that the priests should be learned; he sent forth this edict: "Each father of a family must send his son to school, and there leave him until he shall be well informed." The children of the nobles were sent to the palace school, as well as those of the poor, who, in the preceding age, were alone destined for study and the Church. Their progress was supervised by him, and the most ardent students were rewarded with bishoprics and abbeys. Eager for all knowledge, especially that concerning theology, grammar, and astronomy, he invited and kept with him the finest minds of his time. Beside the Anglo-Saxon Alcuin stands the deacon Paul, who descended from a noble Lombard family living in Friuli; Theodulf, of Gothic origin, was bishop of Orleans; there were Paulin of Aquileia; Peter of Pisa; Einhard, or Egin-

hard, Charlemagne's biographer, also of illustrious birth; Angilbert, of Frankish race like Eginhard, married one of Charlemagne's daughters, Bertha, and was the father of the celebrated historian Nithard.

**22. The Palace Academy.**—These favoured sages who were employed in council or administrative affairs formed themselves into an academy, after the Anglo-Saxon way, and assumed names borrowed from classic antiquity and the Bible. Alcuin was Horatius Flaccus; Angilbert, less modest, took the name of Homer; Charlemagne, David, the royal singer and warrior of the ancient alliance. In this spirit, the seneschal of the court was called Menalcas, and his chamberlain, Tircis.

**23. Literary Pedantry and the Worship of the Beautiful.**—These titles smack of the pedant; and, in fact, Carolingian literature is steeped in pedantry. The students of the court made too great a parade of their learning, freshly gathered from classic books. Grouped around the new Augustus, the poets imitated Vergil and Ovid; the prose writers, with less taste, Suetonius, Cornelius Nepos, Aurelius Victor. Eginhard's life of Charlemagne is a tissue of phrases borrowed from Latin historians. They had too much acquired science and not enough natural genius; yet in a barbarous age they professed a worship for the beautiful. They attempted, and not unsuccessfully, to be worthy of their models. Their pupils, who continued their traditions, sought refuge in cloisters when there was no longer place for them at the Carolingian court. The torch which they had lighted was not to be extinguished.

**24. The Arts.**—While the bulk of these writers' works has been kept, but little is known to-day of the contemporary sculpture and architectural works. Theodoric's palace at Ravenna was partly demolished, with the

Pope's consent, and its columns and precious marbles were taken at great expense to Aix-la-Chapelle, there to be used in building the palace and church. The latter, erected on the plan of San Vitale at Ravenna, is partly standing, and offers a fine example of Byzantine style. The poet Ermoldus Nigellus has left a description of the frescoes which covered the walls at Ingelheim, now a shapeless ruin. The plan of the abbey of Saint Gall gives one an exact idea of those monastic establishments which held so important a place in the social and intellectual world of the Middle Ages. Judging from the small number of Carolingian monuments which are extant, art at that period was not more original than literature; but the efforts which it cost to produce these monuments bore fruit some two or three centuries later. Sacred music was reformed in imitation of the Italian style, and the old barbaric chants, more howling than singing, were no longer heard in the churches.

**25. Collection of Barbarian Poems Made by Charlemagne. Beginning of Modern Literature.**—Although an admirer of classic literature, Charlemagne did not disdain his maternal tongue, nor the national songs that his Germanic subjects handed down from generation to generation. He commanded them to be collected and taken down in writing; he had a grammar of the Frankish language compiled; unfortunately these collections have been lost. It shows, however, that there was an appreciation of the possibility of writing in a tongue other than the Latin. The Latin language was breaking up, and new idioms were beginning to blossom on the old Roman trunk.

**26. Royal Authority of the Early Carolingians. Its Degree and Limits.**—It is now possible to appreciate the degree and nature of the powers exerted by the early Carolingians. Apparently they were all-powerful; in



reality the limits to their authority were narrow and many. They were not the sole law-makers, since the people shared in the privilege. They had no standing army, and soldiers were as attached to their seignors as to their sovereign. They appointed the state officials, yet the most important among them were great proprietors whom they needed to conciliate as well as to supervise. Their financial resources were limited and uncertain. The title of emperor had conferred greater prestige, but no new powers on Charlemagne. In the same way, the oath required of subjects of the empire in 802 imposed various moral obligations, without modifying their constitutional attitude towards the sovereign; in principle, they were to practise the Christian religion, which was the foundation of imperial unity. Meanwhile the state idea, so foreign to the conception of Germanic royalty, reappeared, especially in the works of ecclesiastical writers, who were still imbued with the doctrines of antiquity. The capitularies speak of the "safety of the fatherland," "the honour of the realm," "the profit of the people." Notwithstanding this phraseology, nothing in the nature of things had been changed; the Carolingian empire remained a Frankish empire. Nothing had been borrowed from the institutions of the Roman Cæsars except the name. Pippin bore the title of *Vir inluster*; Charlemagne that of *Imperator augustus*. Superlative expressions were applied to him which recall those of the fourth century: *excellentissimus*, *serenissimus*; also *piissimus*, which strikes the keynote of the Holy Roman Empire. Something of antique pomp reappeared at the barbarian court, yet Charlemagne adapted himself to it with difficulty. Twice only did he wear the imperial costume, with the long tunic, the chlamys, and the sandals, the sceptre, and the crown; but he kept the sword.

**27. Importance of Charlemagne's Work.**—The early Carolingians accomplished a great and beneficent work. One must not consider alone the blood that was shed, the peoples torn from their homes, the religion of Christ forcibly imposed upon pagans. The methods which Charlemagne, his father, and grandfather employed were those of an age of violence. Yet these princes undertook to bring government out of anarchy, and society out of barbarism. They partly succeeded, and in working for the good of humanity they contributed to their own glory.

**28. Why Their Work was Transient. The Advantages of Vassalage.**—Yet their work survived them but a short time. There were three principal reasons for this: (1) The stability of the Carolingian empire depended, in a great measure, on the spirit of its founders; it crumbled away under Charlemagne's incompetent successors. (2) A monarchical and military government which is not supported by a standing army and assured revenues is bound to go to pieces. Every measure taken by the Carolingians to systematise the administration and ensure obedience from their subjects reacted against themselves and accelerated the formation of feudal society. The great proprietors, to whom were confided frontier duties, and to whom were accorded benefices, considered themselves as vassals rather than government officials; their duties were made hereditary, and they kept, as vassals, the regal powers that had been bestowed on them as agents of the king. The bishops, whom Charles had associated in the administration, gradually identified themselves with the feudal aristocracy, and used, for their personal advantage or that of the Church, the privileges granted them by the kings. (3) Vassalage and the system of benefices were prime factors in this transformation of

society. The lands which the Carolingians gave their warriors out of the Church domains as a recompense, or "benefice," were of the same character as the grants, *precaria*, made by the Church. In principle, the concessions were limited to the lives of the donor and recipient. In order to be perpetual and hereditary they must be renewed at the death of one of the parties; they were revocable should the beneficiary fail to perform the requisite services. Moreover, the recipients bound themselves to the king by an especial oath of "commendation," homage, and fidelity, which made them his vassals. This system of territorial concessions, that seemed to assure to royalty faithful adherents, was imitated by the lay and ecclesiastical proprietors, who had vassals also on whom they conferred benefices. Royalty looked favourably upon this hierarchical organisation, that apparently united more closely the various members of the social body, at a time when it was difficult to exact obedience, in the name of the state, from the officials, and the confused mass of subjects in the vast Carolingian empire. It seemed to be a means of regulating the military organisation. Under Charlemagne the army was commanded by counts and royal vassals, who had under them, first, the freemen of their counties, many of them their own vassals; and, second, the inhabitants of their domains. Gradually all freemen found it to their advantage to commend themselves to a seignior, a count, or rich lay or ecclesiastical proprietor, who granted them protection and benefices, to which were attached obligations and duties, but also privileges and immunities. The classification in the army and Carolingian administration became identical with that of the feudal system. All political and administrative relations disappeared in the one relationship of vassal and lord. This was fatal to a society imbued with the

Germanic spirit, that had never understood the judicial and abstract ideas of state, law, and administration on which rested the Roman world, and that could only appreciate the personal relationship of man to man. Merovingian society was based on the oath of allegiance taken by the subject to his sovereign. To the tie of obedience between subject and king were added the oaths which created personal obligations between the sovereign and his vassals. The former duties were the first forgotten, and when the Carolingian realm was divided into several kingdoms and torn by invasions and civil wars, it was on the basis of vassalage, intimately connected with the concessions of benefices or fiefs, that the new order, the feudal world, grew up.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE CAROLINGIAN DECADENCE, 814-888.\*

**1. Louis the Pious. His Character.**—One of Charlemagne's three sons survived him; he was the youngest and least capable, Louis, called the Mild, or Pious.† He was born in 778 at Casseuil near Dropt, and was thirty-six years old on his accession to the throne. He was of medium size, though robust; early accustomed to physi-

\* **SOURCES** —“*Annales royales*” or of “*Saint-Bertin*,” edited by Abbé Dehaisnes (“*Société de l’histoire de France*”). The division which covers the years 836–861 was written by Prudence, bishop of Troyes from 846; the last part (861–882) was written or directly inspired by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims. (“*Mon. Germ. hist.*,” v. i.) “*Annales de Saint-Vaast*” (with the “*Annales de Saint-Bertin*.”) “*Chronicle of the Monk Reginon*.” “*Life of Louis the Pious*,” by Thegan, Frankish noble, chorévêque of Trèves, who knew and admired the emperor. Another biography of the same, by an anonymous author called the “*Astronomer*”; these two biographies are in volume vi. of “*Bouquet*,” with the poem by Ermoldus Nigellus in praise of Louis the Pious (the texts are also in “*Mon. Germ. hist.*”). The four books on the revolts of the sons of Louis the Pious against their father, by Nithard, son of Angilbert and Bertha, daughter of Charlemagne (“*Bouquet*,” volume vii., and in “*Mon. Germ. hist.*”). Nithard is the first lay writer of the Middle Ages. The historic poems of this period have been collected by Ern. Dümmler under the title “*Pœtæ latini mediæ ævi*” (“*Mon. Germ. hist.*,” 1881–1884).

**LITERATURE.**—Simson, and Dümmler in “*Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte*.”

† He was known to contemporaries as Ludovicus Pius, a laudatory title. The term *Débonnaire* was given him by posterity, a term implying blame because of his weak nature.

cal exercises, he was a good horseman and skilful with the bow and lance. His mind had been carefully trained; he was a thorough Latin scholar and understood Greek perfectly. As a child he had been trained to public affairs, and at the age of three years he was crowned king of Aquitaine; he had fought, though unsuccessfully, the Gascons and Arabs, and had concerned himself with the happiness of his people and the reform of the Church. Yet this virile education had produced neither a man nor a ruler. He was vacillating and of a timid nature; a pupil of Saint Benedict of Aniane, he was more monk than warrior. The military empire of Charlemagne fell away from the hands of a crowned priest.

**2. Reaction Against the Autocratic Government of Charlemagne.**—In 813 Louis the Pious had been associated in the government of the empire; his succession was uncontested. His first care was to purify the court by sending off the persons of evil life whom Charlemagne's dissipated old age had tolerated and encouraged. He did more; he disciplined even the ministers of the emperor. Wala, grandson of Charles Martel, was forced to become a monk; his brother Adalhard, abbot of Corbie, was exiled to Noirmoutiers. One of the leading *missi* of Charlemagne, Leidrade, archbishop of Lyon, was shut up in a monastery at Soissons; Benedict of Aniane succeeded him in the confidence of the emperor. Exiles were recalled; *missi* were sent throughout the empire; an attempt was made to win the nobles, by conferring perpetual grants of domains of which they had usufructs; and the Church, by extending its privileges. Louis the Pious consented even to receive from the hands of the new Pope, Stephen IV., the imperial crown with which he had crowned himself when associated with the empire. He thus repudiated the very principles of Charlemagne's government.

**3. Division of the Empire in 817.**—He went farther on his way of concession and weakness. His wife, Ermen-gard, had borne him three sons: Lothaire, Pippin, and Louis. The oldest, Lothaire, had been living in Bavaria since 814, and Pippin in Aquitaine, both having the title of king. It was desired to give Louis his share. Some proposed that, according to the old Germanic law, each son should have his portion, unalienable and independent; others wished to maintain imperial unity. The latter carried the day. It was decided that Aquitaine and Gascony should be ceded to Pippin, that Louis should have Bavaria, with the tributary Slavic peoples, and that Lothaire should be immediately associated with his father. His two brothers were to be entirely subject to him; they must consult with him each year on the affairs of the empire; they might not marry nor make treaties without his consent. Thus, said this “charter of division,” there shall be “one sole empire, and not three.”

**4. Bernard's Revolt and Death, 818. Public Penance of the Emperor, 822.**—But a strong hand was needed to maintain unity in this division. A natural son of Pippin of Italy, Bernard, took up arms to defend his paternal inheritance, of which he was being despoiled; abandoned by his own followers, he was compelled to trust to the emperor, his uncle. Although protected by a safe-conduct, he was brought before the court of the Franks, convoked at Aix, and condemned to death, with his lay accomplices. The emperor spared his life, but commanded his eyes to be put out, according to Byzantine custom. The operation was performed so brutally that the young prince died, it is said, three days later. Louis the Pious experienced such remorse for the deed that he wished to do public penance for his sins. In the church of Attigny, in the presence of the nobles and people, he

confessed that "in his life, in his faith, and his duties he had been too often negligent and criminal." This act of humility was a great mistake. What respect indeed could the poorly disciplined subjects of the empire feel for a ruler who made such a confession of incompetency?

**5. Abdication of Louis the Pious, 833.**—His personal ignominy, accentuated by family quarrels, brought final discredit on the empire. After the death of his first wife Louis the Pious wished to retire into a monastery; finally he submitted to remain on the throne, and to remarry. The new queen, Judith, was beautiful, charming, and ambitious; she had no trouble in controlling her weak husband. She wished to secure for her son, Charles the Bald, a share in the paternal inheritance; and on the haughty refusal of the nobles and clergy, who intended to keep intact the charter of 817, she made a coup d'état: an imperial edict issued without the concurrence of the nobles in assembly granted Alsace, Alemannia, and Rhætia to the young child. This was the signal for a fruitless civil war that lasted four years. Finally in 833 Lothaire crossed the Alps with an army; Gregory IV. accompanied him; he joined his two brothers in the plain of Logelbach, between Colmar and Basel. The emperor took the field against them, then consented to negotiate. The Pope pretended to act as mediator, but in reality won over for the rebellious sons the principal lieutenants of the father, and when the latter decided to fight he found himself alone; thereupon he went to Lothaire's tent, obtained from him the assurance that his wife and son Charles should be left unharmed, and yielded all other points. Lothaire was sole emperor, Charles losing his inheritance, and Pippin's and Louis's shares being increased. Louis the Pious agreed to sign his own abdication, and to



read publicly, standing bareheaded in the church of Saint Medard at Soissons, a general confession of eight articles, dictated by the partisan bishops of Lothaire, then he laid aside the military belt and was clothed in the garb of a penitent!

**6. Louis's End, 840. Deplorable Consequences of his Reign.**—Lothaire's triumph was short-lived. The following year he was obliged to liberate his father and return to Italy. Louis the Pious was reinstated in the basilica of Saint Denis, and crowned for the third time; but he was the mere shadow of an emperor. His last years were passed in sharing his estates among his sons, or in fighting them. He died on an island in the Rhine opposite Ingelheim, as he was about to march against Louis the German, who had revolted. His reign was deplorable. Although the material integrity of his empire had not been seriously injured by the Norman invasions or the revolts of the Gascons and Britons, moral unity was compromised by the sovereign's weakness, his children's ambition, and the greed of the aristocracy.

**7. Origin of Modern Nations.**—One of the first consequences of the speedy disintegration of the Carolingian empire was the beginning of modern nations. For example, what could have been the state of mind of a Bavarian forced to take an oath of fealty to his king, Louis, and another to each one of the two emperors. How could he serve at once three masters who were always quarrelling? It was inevitable that a subject should have less and less respect for the supreme power and should adhere to the king who would give him a share of the booty. The Carolingian empire did not fall because several hostile nations existed within its realm, but these nations took form from the day when the moral unity of the empire was shaken.

**8. The Battle of Fontenoy, 840.**—This was apparent immediately after the death of Louis the Pious. Lothaire assumed the imperial crown and attempted to force his brothers to acknowledge his authority. However legal his claim might have been, it brought on a new civil war. Louis the German took up arms, allied himself with young Charles, who, by the treaty of Worms (839), had acquired possessions in France as far as the Meuse and the Rhone. Lothaire joined Pippin II., whom Louis the Pious had robbed of the rich inheritance of his father, king of Aquitaine. On June 25, 841, the two armies met near Fontenoy-en-Puisaye, not far from Auxerre. After a short, though fierce and bloody, fight, Lothaire was beaten, and fled, leaving much booty to the conquerors. Notwithstanding his defeat, he won the Saxons over to his cause, by promising to restore to them the liberties they enjoyed in the time of pagan independence; he also made an alliance with the Danes, and soon reappeared to threaten Aix-la-Chapelle. Charles hurried to join Louis on the borders of the Rhine.

**9. The Oath of Strasburg, 842.**—February 15, 842, the two brothers “met in the city formerly known as Argenteratum, now Strasburg, and there swore an oath of alliance and brotherhood, Louis in the Roman tongue, Charles in the Teutonic.” The warriors of the two armies bound themselves by a like vow. Nithard has preserved the text of the words interchanged during this solemn event.\* He was the historian of these wars, and

\* Louis's Oath: “Pro Deo amur et pro christian poblo et nostro commun salvament, dist di en avant, in quant Deus savir et podir me dunat, si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo, et in adiudha et in cadhuna cosa, sicum om per dreit son fradra salvar dist, in o quid il mi altresi fazet, etc.” (For the love of God, and for the common safety of ourselves and the Christian people, from this day forward,




# THE WESTERN EMPIRE

AS DIVIDED AT VERDUN

843

- Lothar
- Lewis
- Charles



an ardent partisan of Charles. The document shows that the separation of the languages was already an accomplished fact; that of the nations was soon to follow.

**10. Treaty of Verdun, 843.**—Thereupon Charles and Louis, lavishing on each other marks of confiding friendship, advanced against Lothaire, who beat a retreat towards Lyons, where he gathered together an army of Italians and Aquitanians. The forces were about equally balanced; but the kings wearied of a fruitless war, and the nobles longed for peace in order to enjoy their benefices. So they began negotiations, and after long conferences the kings agreed to share the empire equally among themselves. A definite agreement was concluded at Verdun (August, 843). To Bavaria, which he had governed for sixteen years, Louis the German added the German countries on the right bank of the Rhine, with the dioceses of Mainz, Worms, and Speyer on the left bank. Charles the Bald had the countries which were distinctively French, as far as the Scheldt, Meuse, Saône, and Rhone. Lothaire took the remainder, that is to say, Italy and the countries lying between Charles's and Louis's possessions: thus the Austrasian territories, cradle of the Carolingian race, with the two capitals, Aix-la-Chapelle and Rome, fell to his share. This concession was an act of homage rendered to the imperial dignity.

**11. Imperial Unity Proclaimed, Yet Unrealised.**—There was an attempt made to keep up the illusion of imperial unity. At Thionville in 844, at Mersen in 847 and 852,

with all that God has given me of knowledge and power, I will protect this my brother Charles with help and with each thing, as one should by right protect his brother, on condition that he do the same for me.) Charles's Oath: "In Godes minna. . ." etc. The two texts, Romanic and Teutonic, are the oldest documents, bearing a date, in the French and German languages.

the three brothers united themselves in bonds of "brotherhood and charity"; they reaffirmed their claims to their own possessions, and promised mutual help against their enemies. It was futile to declare that the empire had been "not divided, merely apportioned," for none the less three great kingdoms had been created: France, Germany, and Italy, rival kingdoms, born of homicidal struggles, and doomed to be eternally separated by warring interests. The antagonism of nationalities was a consequence of the treaty of Verdun; not, as has been said, the treaty a consequence of the antagonism of nationalities. By establishing between countries purely German and countries purely French an intermediate state, made up of territories in which the two languages and peoples were mixed, France and Germany were forcibly awakened to a consciousness of themselves.

The treaty had just destroyed the most fragile part of Charlemagne's work—territorial unity: the very spirit of his government was thereupon to disappear. Secular and ecclesiastical authority had supported him in his reign. This double prop was taken from his unworthy successors whilst the various Carolingian kingdoms were assailed by the Slavs and Hungarians on the east, the Saracens on the south, and the Norsemen on every point.

**12. Lothaire Commands Respect for Imperial Authority, 840-855.**—In spite of his mistakes Lothaire was still a representative of the imperial idea. During his father's reign he had reëstablished intercourse with the head of the Church on the same terms as Charlemagne. The emperor's share in a pontifical election was clearly defined in 824, in the oath imposed upon the Roman people: "I swear to prevent with all my strength and intelligence any pontifical election, in this Roman city, made otherwise than according to the canons, or the consecration of

the elected pontiff before he has taken, in the presence of the people and the imperial envoy, an oath like that made and sworn to, of his own free will, by Pope Eugene." At the time of the election of Sergius II. Lothaire proved that these were not vain words.

**13. The Last Representatives of the Imperial Idea: Louis II. and Hincmar, 855-875.**—The emperor was still respected in his person under Lothaire; Louis II., who succeeded him in 855, was less fortunate. Italy was this Louis's sole resource, since by partition Lothaire, his second brother, had acquired Friesland and the Austrasian countries which were called Lorraine, the realm of Lothaire, and his youngest, Charles, had been given Provence. He was unable to exact from his brothers or uncles the peace and concord so many times sworn. He did nothing to defend Charles the Bald, driven for a time from his own realm by Louis the German (859). Nor did he interfere to protect his brother, Charles of Provence, attacked in his turn by Charles the Bald. When his nephews, Lothaire's sons, were despoiled by Charles the Bald and Louis the German (878) he sought the intervention of the Pope; but the legates of Hadrian II. were received coldly at Saint Denis and Aix. The archbishop of Rheims, Hincmar, pertinently recalled to them the fact that Pippin had founded the temporal power of the Papacy, and that it was not the province of a mere bishop "to sow discord throughout an empire under pretext of disposing of crowns." The Pope sent no reply, and the emperor, wholly occupied in fighting the Saracens in the south of Italy, let the matter drop. Yet he had a clear idea of the sacred character of the empire. In 871 he captured the Greek town of Bari from the Saracens. Thereupon the emperor of the East sent him a contemptuous letter, in which he refused him the title of Basileus, for-

merly accorded to Charlemagne, and gave him to understand that the power of the Western emperors was usurped, and consequently illegal. "This empire," Louis retorted, "was received from our ancestor, not by usurpation, but by the will of God, by judgment of the Church, and its sovereign pontiff, by the laying-on of hands, and holy anointing. If you condemn the act of the pontiff, then you dare to blame also Samuel, who, rejecting Saul, whom he first consecrated, did not hesitate to anoint David as king."

**14. Charles the Bald, Emperor, 875. Imperial Authority Ruined.**—Louis II. died in 875. Charles the Bald, who controlled the passes in the Alps through his conquest of Provence, made all speed to Italy. He reached Rome, called thither by the new Pope, John VIII., and was crowned December 25, just seventy-five years after Charlemagne. He paid dearly for his crown. His predecessors had received it either from their fathers or from an assembly held away from Rome; Charles, on the contrary, took it from the Pope and the Romans. In fact, the Pope proclaimed that he had created the emperor. So this dignity, of which Louis spoke in terms so emphatic, was degraded; the constitutions of Charlemagne and Lothaire became a dead letter.

**15. Growing Power of the Church in the Ninth Century. Hincmar.**—All the power and prestige which were lost by the emperor passed over to the Church. Moreover, since the beginning of the century conceptions of royal and ecclesiastical power were being modified. Charlemagne had been looked upon as a second David, as a priestly king: but dating from Louis the Pious most political writers had gone back to Saint Augustine's theories. In their opinion, the chief end of man in this world and the next was peace; which was attained through



charity and justice. Royalty was useful in maintaining order, but in no wise essential: "its authority serves to exact, through fear, what the priest cannot accomplish through persuasion." So stated Jonas, bishop of Orleans, and friend of Louis the Pious. Hincmar, who was a distinguished theologian and resolute politician, spoke in like manner under Charles the Bald. His faithfulness to Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald earned him the archbishopric of Rheims. He served his king courageously and successfully, less in the interests of royalty than the profit of the Church, and especially the see of Rheims, which he aspired to make the leading metropolitan see of Gaul. "The king," he wrote, "is a force and instrument in the hands of the Church, who is superior to him, since she guides him to his true destiny. Without this special force which he wields, and that entails especial duties, the king is a man like other men. He must respect the Church and the property of others; his duties are the same as those of all Christians."

**16. The False Decretals.**—These opinions are repeated in the celebrated apocryphal compilation, the so-called "False Decretals." This book was made about 851 or 852, with the help of genuine documents, and of old and recent falsifications. The author or authors hid behind the imaginary name of a certain Isidorus Mercator; their purpose was to free the bishops from the yoke of the metropolitans, by placing them under the direct authority of the Pope, and to prevent secular powers from interfering in the constitution of ecclesiastical provinces. They were certainly compiled in Gaul, and undoubtedly at the instigation of Aldric, bishop of Mans, to serve in local quarrels and interests, and their principal result was to increase the authority of the Holy See and justify its pretensions to universal domination. Dating from the

eleventh century the bishops used them constantly, and made no distinction between them and the authentic decrees embodied in the letters of their predecessors.

**17. The Pontificate of Nicolas I., 858-867.**—Nicolas I. was one of the most intelligent workmen who laboured for the foundation of a theocratic power exercised solely by the Church. The importance of his pontificate is shown especially in his conduct of three important affairs: that concerning the schism of Photius, the archbishop Hincmar, and King Lothaire, brother of the emperor.

**18. Right of Appeal to the Holy See. The Pope Superior to the Metropolitans.**—Rothad, bishop of Soissons, was suffragan of Rheims, but, favoured by civil wars, he had assumed an attitude of independence in his relations with his archbishop, as well as with the king, and refused to recognise the metropolitan authority in the administration of his diocese. Hincmar had him deposed by a synod, assembled at Senlis in 863, and imprisoned in a monastery. But Rothad had appealed to the supreme authority of the Holy See, and Nicolas I. had taken up the quarrel of the dispossessed bishop; he called him to Rome, and no one appearing as his accuser, he reinstated him in his dignities (865). "It is from the power and sanction of the Holy See that the synods and councils draw their force and stability," he wrote on this subject. Hincmar was forced to yield. Nicolas had thus established the right of appeal to the Holy See and the supremacy of his judgments over those of provincial synods.

**19. Lothaire's Divorce, 865. The Pope Supreme Judge.**—The other affair was longer and more delicate. Lothaire, a brother of the emperor Louis II., having lived with a young woman of noble birth, Waldrade, as his wife, married Theutberge, sister of Hubert, abbot of Saint-Maurice-en-Valais (855); then, tiring of his legal

wife, he returned to Waldrade, and was henceforth most anxious to obtain a dissolution of the hated marriage. His brothers and several prelates were enlisted in his favour, and a synod, convoked at Aix-la-Chapelle, pronounced Theutberge in the wrong, and condemned her to perpetual imprisonment. The judgment was sharply attacked by Charles the Bald for political reasons (Theutberge being childless, he coveted Lothaire's kingdom), and by Hincmar for moral and theological reasons. Nevertheless Lothaire married Waldrade, by whom he already had three children (862). Nicolas I. then intervened. He quashed the judgment against Theutberge, deposed the prelates most closely implicated, excommunicated Waldrade, and refused to receive Lothaire at Rome as long as he was recalcitrant. He proclaimed that kings are not worthy of the crown unless they can govern themselves, "otherwise they should be looked upon as tyrants, not kings; and rather than submit to them, we should resist and rebel against them." Lothaire, menaced by his uncles, who were already preparing to seize his states, at last humiliated himself before the Pope's legate, and granted Theutberge her position of legitimate wife.

**20. Increasing Strength of the Papacy.**—Nicolas I. died in 867, after having strengthened, during his short and busy reign, the authority of the Holy See. He had established the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over all bishops, weakened the authority of the principal synods and metropolitans, judged, in final appeal to his tribunal, the greatest ecclesiastical or secular suits, and also shaken royal authority to its base.

**21. Deposition of Charles the Fat, 887. Triumph of the Aristocracy.**—Little by little the Papal power was thus built up on the ruins of the empire. After the death of Charles the Bald (877) and Louis the Stammerer (879),

the imperial throne remained vacant for three years; then Pope John VIII. placed on it Charles the Fat, only surviving son of Louis the German (880). This incompetent prince acquired the inheritance of his brothers and cousins, Karlmann and Louis II. in Germany, and Louis III. and Karlmann in France. The unity of the empire was thus reconstructed, but to what purpose? He was incapable of defending it. After fruitless wars in Italy, Lorraine, Moravia, and Friesland, he made shameful treaties with the Norseman, who were besieging Paris. Arnulf, an illegitimate son of his brother Karlmann, headed an insurrection, which he was afraid to combat. He was deposed by the diet of Tribur, near Mainz, and shortly after died forgotten.

**22. Dissolution of the Carolingian Empire. Royalty Elective.**—The dissolution of the empire was final. The treaty of Verdun had created three kingdoms, whose rulers, legally and actually independent, had formed among themselves an ideal bond of brotherhood and charity. After the deposition and death of Charles the Fat seven kingdoms were formed. The crown was elective and at the disposition of the aristocracy. Arnulf was chosen in Germany; in France Count Eudes, or Odo, who had just defended Paris most gloriously against the Norsemen; and in Italy, Berengar and Guido, dukes of Friuli and Spoleto, both great-grandsons of Charlemagne, had an armed struggle for power. Three new kingdoms were erected in the former states of Emperor Lothaire; Aquitaine even thought at one time of choosing a king.

**23. Formation of the Kingdom of Provence.**—Boso, duke of cisjurane Burgundy, whose sister had been a wife of Charles the Bald, and who had married the only daughter of the Emperor Louis II., had himself proclaimed by the council of Mantaille in Viennois, king of the Bur-

gundians and Provençals (October 15, 879). In 887 he died, and it seemed at first as if his usurpation would bring no results; but his son Louis was acknowledged king by the Provençals in 890, and reigned over Arles, Lyons, Uzès, and Nice. Being so near Italy, he took part in the wars of the peninsula, defeated Berengar, and assumed the imperial crown (901), but was shortly after surprised at Verona by his enemy, who had his eyes put out. Louis the Blind, as he was called, lived until 928. His son was despoiled of the crown by Hugh of Arles, who had governed in his name. Hugh had already had himself proclaimed king of Italy, and in order to assure his power there he sold his kingdom of Provence to Rudolph II. of Burgundy.

**24. Formation of the Kingdom of Burgundy.**—The kingdom of Burgundy originated in the duchy of transjurane Burgundy, whose duke, Rudolph I., was elected king in 888 at Saint-Maurice-en-Valais. His territory extended from the Saône to the Aar, and included the cities of Chalons, Besançon, Geneva, and Lausanne; his son and successor added the entire basin of the Aar and the kingdom of Provence, acquired in 932. Burgundy and Provence, united, formed the great kingdom of Arles, which stretched along the valley of the Rhone, the Aar, the Doubs, with the Rhone and the Saône as western boundary, and the vast half circle of the Alps from the sea to the sources of the Rhine as the eastern limit. The kingdom was joined a century later to the German empire.

**25. Formation of the Kingdom of Lorraine.**—The name Lorraine (*Lothairii regnum*), which designates the country fallen to Lothaire II., comprised the vast territory situated to the north of the kingdom of Burgundy, between France and Germany, bounded by the Scheldt, the Meuse,

the Vosges, and the Rhine. On the death of Lothaire II., Louis the German and Charles the Bald disputed its possession, and ended by sharing it according to the treaty of Mersen (870), which settled as the boundary between France and Germany the lower course of the Meuse as far as Liège, a line passing from Liège to Trèves, and then the upper course of the Moselle. This division represented pretty exactly the separation of languages and of the territorial interests of the two countries, but it was not adhered to. Germany encroached again on the land between the Meuse and the Scheldt. In 888 the former kingdom of Lothaire, with the addition of Alsace, comprised an independent state, governed by Zwentibold, a natural son of Arnulf; after his death it was annexed to Germany (900). Yet this Lorraine, where the Romance tongue predominated in the entire western part, and where the Carolingians still had family ties, vassals, and friends, was to be contended for during the entire tenth century between the kings of France and Germany, and to remain thereafter the stake in a quarrel which still goes on between the two countries.

In the six kingdoms just enumerated, a sole prince, Arnulf, belonged to the house of Charlemagne; others were indirectly attached by marriage; certain ones, like Eudes of France, were entirely foreign to the family. The great emperor lived only in popular imagination.

**26. Political Divisions of France.**—The formation of the kingdoms of Lorraine and Arles restricted France proper to the limits outlined by the treaty of Verdun. It still included the former historic divisions: (1) Francia, between the Scheldt, the Meuse, and the Seine; (2) Neustria, between the Seine and the Loire, with the addition of parts of the counties of Tours and Blois to the south of the latter river, but diminished by the loss of Brittany,


# THE WESTERN EMPIRE

AS DIVIDED  
870

- Lewis II
- Lewis the German
- Charles



## THE CAROLINGIAN HOUSE.



Dates in parenthesis are those of accession to the Empire.



## CHAPTER XV.

THE LAST CAROLINGIANS—INVASIONS OF THE SARACENS, HUNGARIANS, AND NORSEMEN—ORIGIN OF FEUDALISM.\*

**1. Slavonic Invasions.**—The Slavs whom Charlemagne had subdued began their attacks anew. The Abroditi and the Wiltzi crossed the Elbe, while the Serbs and the Bohemians desolated Thuringia. In Moravia Prince Ras-

\* **SOURCES.**—The “*Annales de Saint-Vaast d’Arras*,” published with those of Saint-Bertin by Abbé Dehaisnes (“*Soc. de l’histoire de France*”). Reginon, abbot of the monastery of Saint Martin at Trèves (899–915); his chronicle is the first effort made in the Middle Ages to combine contemporary with universal history. Edited in “*Mon. Germ. hist.*,” volume i. and in “*Migne*,” volume cxxxii. Flodoard, priest of Rheims and guardian of the archives of the archbishopric; his “*Annales*,” 919–966, in “*Bouquet*,” volume vii. and viii., and in the “*Mon. Germ. Hist.*,” volume iii.; his history of the Church of Rheims from the origin to 948, in *Bouquet*, volume viii., and in “*Migne*,” volume cxxxv. Richer, monk of Saint Remi of Rheims, and disciple of Gerbert: “*Historiarum libri quatuor*,” edition Guadet (“*Soc. de l’hist. de France*”). “*Letters de Gerbert*,” (983–997); edition J. Havet (1889). Abbon, monk at Saint Germain des Prés: “*De bellis Parisiacæ urbis adversus Normannos libri tres*,” in *Bouquet*, volume viii.; “*Migne*,” cxxxii. Dudon, dean of Saint Quentin (written about 1015); “*Libri quatuor de moribus et actis primorum Normanniæ ducum*”: edition J. Lair (1865, “*Soc. de l’Hist. de Normandie*”).

**LITERATURE.**—Favre, “*Études Comte de Paris et Roi de France*”; Lot, “*Les Derniers Carolingiens*”; Bourgeois, “*Le Capitulaire de Kiersy-sur-Oise*”; Parisot, “*Le Royaume de Lorraine sous les Carolingiens*”; Keary, “*The Vikings in Western Christendom*”; Freeman, “*The Norman Conquest*,” vol. i.

tislav, established by the Franks, made himself independent; he imposed a strong political and religious organisation on his people, who had been converted by two Greek monks, Cyrill and Methodius, whom Nicolas I. protected. Rastislav and his successor waged continual warfare against the Germans.

**2. Hungarian Invasions.**—In the valley of the Danube a Finnish people, related to the Huns of Attila and the Avars subdued by Charlemagne, the Hungarians,—Magyars, as they called themselves,—had gradually pushed their tents from the shores of the Ural to beyond the Carpathians. Led by a chief whom they elected, Arpad, they attacked Moravia; then skirting the German frontier, they crossed the Alps and pillaged the valley of the Po. On learning that the Emperor Arnulf was dead, and that the Germans had taken for their king his son, Louis the Child, they turned back and invaded Moravia, which they laid waste; Bavaria, that they conquered in one battle, where perished the Bavarian nobility almost to a man (July 6, 907); then Thuringia and Saxony. They left a desert waste wherever they passed, while the bulk of the nation settled down in the fertile plains of the Danube, where they still remain.

**3. Saracenic Invasions.**—On the south the Saracens infested the Mediterranean. They made an easy conquest of Sicily, whose Greek governor opened the ports to them. In 846 they sailed up the Tiber and pillaged, at the doors of Rome, the time-honoured cathedral of Saint Peter's. Leo IV. assembled a fleet, vanquished them at Ostia and compelled them to withdraw. Then, carrying out an idea which was conceived by the Emperor Lothaire, he walled in the territory surrounding the newly constructed Saint Peter's. This new quarter of Rome was the Leonine City, known to-day as the Vatican. Rome was

saved, but the Saracens took Corsica and Sardinia on one side and Calabria on the other, while the Lombard princes in the south acknowledged the Byzantine power. Hence southern Italy was lost to the Western Empire. Then pushing their way north, the Saracens laid waste Liguria, established themselves firmly on the coast of Provence at Fraxinet, whence they sallied forth, like wild beasts from their lairs, to waste the country and besiege the towns.

**4. Invasions of the Norsemen.**—The Norsemen, or men of the North, came from the Scandinavian countries, especially Norway and Denmark. Until the eighth century the pagans of these regions had lived in scattered, independent tribes, led by the nobility of the jarls. Charlemagne had no organised navy, and urged by love of adventure, they pillaged successfully along the coasts. Piracy became the principal industry of their poor country. Some invaded the Slavic lands, and went as far as Constantinople, where the emperors took them into their pay. Most of them became pirates. Their vast forests of fir trees provided them with an inexhaustible supply of material to build and arm large open boats, holding from sixty to eighty men, which they sailed or rowed. Their chiefs were called Kings of the Sea, “because they never sought refuge under a roof, nor emptied their drinking horns at a fireside.” They had a primitive mode of warfare, like all pirates; they would coast along the shores, ascend the rivers, and land at the first inviting spot. Then they would assemble their barks in some secure harbour, near some island converted into a temporary fortress, and with this for their base would go out on more distant expeditions. With the horses taken from the peasants they had a cavalry, which bore them rapidly into the heart of lands most distant from rivers and coast.

When the foray was ended they would load the booty in their boats and sail away to dispose of it quietly at home.

**5. The Norsemen in France. Robert the Strong.**—Towards the end of his reign Charlemagne had been forced to take defensive measures against the pirates. Louis the Pious had been partly successful in subduing them, but the intestinal wars among his sons emboldened them. The year of the battle of Fontenoy they burned the abbey of Jumièges, the town of Rouen, and held for a ransom the monks of Saint Denis. Other bands ascended the Loire as far as Tours, and the Garonne to Bordeaux and Toulouse. Near the mouths of these three rivers they established permanent settlements, which became the starting point of later invasions. Robert the Strong, count of Anjou, held them in check for some time, but the Normans of the Loire took their revenge at the battle of Brissarthe, near Anger, where this brave champion of national defence was killed (866). Twelve years later a party of Norsemen from England, refusing to accept the treaty which the king of Wessex, Alfred the Great, imposed on one of their kings, departed to the continent and pillaged the valleys of the Scheldt, the Sambre, and the Somme. They were attacked and defeated near Saucourt en Vimeu by the king of France, Louis III. A German poem written soon after by a monk of Saint Amand relates that the king “poured out to his enemies a bitter hydromel; woe to their life!” In spite of this they returned to besiege Paris.

**6. Siege of Paris by the Norsemen, 886.**—It is related that they came, forty thousand strong, and that the Seine was covered with their boats for a distance of two miles. The figures are doubtless exaggerated, but it is certain that the Norsemen made a great effort; those along the Seine united with those on the Loire, some even came

from England. At that period Paris was a village within the narrow limits of the City on the island, with the entrances to the two bridges leading to either bank fortified. Obstructions had been placed under the arches of the bridges to prevent the Norman boats from ascending farther the course of the Seine. Resistance was directed by Bishop Gozlin, who was replaced later by Ebles, abbot of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Count Eudes, oldest son of Robert the Strong. The enemy began the attack on the right bank; they assailed the tower that was built on the present site of the Châtelet, but were repulsed. A river flood, by carrying off a part of the small bridge, separated the tower on the left bank, with its garrison of twelve brave men.\* The Norsemen rushed upon them and forced them to surrender, after heroically defending themselves for a day; all were killed save one, who escaped by swimming to the other shore. However, the town held out, partly blockaded by the enemy, who scoured the country for food and booty. In May a body of imperial troops attacked the Norman camp intrenched at Saint Germain le Rond (to-day Auxerrois), while Eudes made a determined sally; the camp was taken and the cattle and horses carried off, but that was all that was accomplished. Eudes then went to Metz to ask for fresh aid. The emperor, Charles the Fat, came at last, leisurely, and camped on the heights of Montmartre, when the principal chief of the Norsemen, Siegfried, appeared with large reinforcements. Charles was intimidated, and

\* Their names are carved on a slab of marble which was placed, in 1889, at the entrance to the street Petit-Pont, near the quay. The inscription is thus worded: "At the entrance to the Little Bridge stood the wooden tower that the twelve heroes of Paris defended against the Norsemen, during the siege of 886." Then follow their names.

negotiated. He bought off the pirates with seven hundred pounds of silver; this was a large sum, but he allowed them besides to pillage the upper Seine, during the winter, as far as Burgundy, a shameful concession. The spirited resistance of the Parisians, that had lasted for ten months, was all in vain! By showing that it was incapable of self-defence, the empire lost all prestige.

**7. Consequences of the Invasions. Self-defence a Necessity. The Edict of Mersen, 847.**—The situation was clearly defined: each one must look out for himself. In a regularly organised society individual safety is assured through the protection of the laws and the police. In the new state of things brought about by the invasions, there was no safety except in “commendation,” which placed the poor and the weak under the protection of the richer and the stronger. The threshold of feudalism had been reached. An edict of Charles the Bald (Mersen, 847), by declaring that every freeman should choose a seignior, legalised this system.

**8. Tendency of Public Functions to Become Hereditary. Edict of Quierzy-sur-Oise, 847.**—The most powerful of these seigniors were those who filled high offices of state; they profited naturally by the weakness of the kings and the value of their own services, to make their offices perpetual and hereditary. When Charles the Bald set out for Italy, he promulgated a capitulary (877) at Quierzy-sur-Oise, in which he granted to the sons of counts who might die during the campaign the right of succession to the functions of their fathers, unless the king should decide otherwise. It is erroneously stated that this capitulary established the heredity of offices and benefices, but it proves that heredity of offices had already entered into the customs, and a list of the holders of the office of count in the ninth century indicates that almost all the counties

were transmitted from father to son. The former administrative divisions were transformed into beneficiary possessions, and the officers were made vassals. The heredity of all offices became one of the characteristic marks of feudalism. Gradually certain seigniors, because of favourable circumstances, courage, or talent, attained an eminent position in the midst of this aristocracy, which had been enriched by benefices and made powerful through the holding of public offices. It has been seen how, by means of usurpations, the royal families of Burgundy, Provence, and Italy had been founded; it is in the same way that the so-called House of France supplanted the family of Charlemagne.

**9. The House of France, or Robertian House.**—The first member of this family was Robert the Strong, who was doubtless of Saxon origin. Count and marquis of Anjou, Auxerre, and Nevers, lay-abbot of Marmoutier and of Saint Martin of Tours, in 861 he was made duke of the country between the Seine and Loire, in command of the military forces assembled against the Norse pirates in Francia. On his death, at the battle of Brissarthe (866), the king gave most of his offices and benefices, not to his son Eudes, but to Hugh the Abbot. Robert had been abbot, although a layman; Hugh was count and duke, although a priest. On the latter's death Eudes received his father's territories, less Anjou, where the dynasty of Fulk was already reigning, the first of whom had doubtless been Robert's lieutenant; Eudes was also count of Paris. The renown and popularity of Robert the Strong, and the valour of Eudes in the siege of 886, fitted him for royalty. "With the consent of Arnulf, the peoples of Gaul elected king, by common agreement, Duke Eudes, who, for his beauty, size, physical strength, and wisdom, outshone all others." His younger brother

Robert succeeded him in the duchy of France and the county of Paris. The territorial greatness of the Robertian house was henceforth assured, and its political greatness was about to begin.

From 888 to 987 the main point of interest in the history of France is the struggle between the descendants of Charlemagne and Robert the Strong.

**10. Robertians and Carolingians. Eudes, 888-898, and Charles the Simple, 898-923.**—The Carolingian dynasty, although fallen, still retained somewhat its prestige; the fact was soon made apparent to Eudes. In spite of his fame for gallantry, that he had so justly acquired, in spite of a victory over the Normans at Montfaucon en Argonne (886), he had to struggle with rivals, the most disturbing of whom was Charles, posthumous son of Louis the Stammerer, whom the chroniclers named the Simple, or Stupid. During an absence of Eudes, engaged in Aquitaine, Charles assumed the crown at Rheims (January 28, 893), and forced his adversary, after three years' struggle, to promise him his rich succession. It fell to him, in fact, at Eudes's death, January 1, 898. Yet Charles was compelled to make concessions to the Robertians. He confirmed Eudes's brother, Robert, in the possession of his family benefices; he gave him the abbeys of Saint Denis, Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Morienval; and granted him the right of transmitting all his fiefs to his son Hugh. He speaks of him in a diploma as "our venerable marquis, the counsel and support of our realm." Robert was the first of his race to bear the title of duke of the Franks. It was transmitted to his descendants. These dukes exercised a kind of military command and suzerainty over all the vassals in the north of France, a power of such a nature as to give them, with the last Carolingians, a position analogous to that exercised by the



mayors of the palace of Austrasia with the last Merovingians, and to fit them for the throne of France, should it become vacant. It was by despoiling themselves of revenues and sovereign authority that the Carolingians attempted to hold their position. Charles gave another significant illustration of this policy, perhaps an inevitable one, but certainly fatal to his dynasty, by creating the duchy of Normandy at the same time that he was bestowing such honours on the son and brother of heroes who had fought the Norsemen.

**11. The Normans Established in France. Rollo.**—The incursions of the Norsemen had gone on uninterruptedly. Several defeats like Saucourt and Montfaucon were of no avail. Their losses were immediately made good by fresh strength. The entire social fabric was deeply disturbed by their ravages. The peasants, brought to bay, joined the pirates, preferring to pillage rather than be pillaged. If credence is to be placed in a later tradition, the most famous of the Norman chiefs of the latter part of the ninth century, Hasting, who spread terror along the Atlantic coast and even the Mediterranean, was a peasant from the neighbourhood of Troyes. An important political revolution that took place in the ninth century in the Scandinavian countries tended to increase the number and boldness of the invaders. Two important kingdoms were founded; that of Denmark, by Gorm the Old, and the Norwegian kingdom, by Harold of the Beautiful Hair (Haarfagr). The two tyrants had no peace until they had conquered and driven out the nobility of the jarls, who were dispersed over the ocean, leaving the land to the peasants. Hence there was a fresh impetus given to Norse invasions. Towards the end of Eudes's reign the Norsemen along the Seine found a chief who was endowed in a remarkable degree with ability for war

and capacity for governing. This was Rolf, or Rollo, of Danish origin, like most of his companions. After having led for many years the rough life of a sea king, he settled down, in 893, at Rouen. From that point he sent out expeditions in all directions, which were generally successful; he laid waste the surrounding country of Paris, Tours, and Amboise. His successes won him such popularity with his own people, that he exercised almost royal authority, and soon he seemed to command the Norsemen in France. The opposition to him was fitful and ineffectual, so much so that Charles the Simple, touched by the groans and prayers of his people, was willing to negotiate.

**12. The Treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte, 911.**—The archbishop of Rouen, Guy, or Witton, was empowered to negotiate with Rollo, who consented to become a vassal of the king of France and to receive baptism, on condition that he be given a large share of Neustria. With these stipulations a treaty was concluded about 911 at Saint-Clair-sur-Epte. Rollo was given the country bounded by the Channel on the north, the Bresle and Epte on the east, the Eure and Avre on the south. The state was enlarged somewhat later by the addition of the dioceses of Bayeux, Mans, and Séez, ceded in 924, and Avranches and Coutances, in 933. Thus it was that the fair duchy of Normandy was constituted. Rollo paid homage to the king of France; on the other hand, the king, Duke Robert, the counts, nobles, prelates, and abbots “pledged themselves on their Catholic faith, to Rollo, swearing on their life and limbs, on the honour of the entire kingdom, that Rollo should hold and possess the land and transmit it to his heirs to the end of time.” Rollo was baptised by the archbishop of Rouen, and took the name of his godfather, Robert. It is said that he married the daughter of

Charles the Simple, Gisela, but she was only three years old, this is therefore doubtful, unless by a political union with a child he wished to secure a hostage that would guarantee the carrying out of the treaty of Saint-Clair-sur-Epte.

**13. Importance of the Formation of the Duchy of Normandy.**—However it may have been about the marriage, the treaty was an act of the greatest importance; it created a large hereditary fief, and ratified legally, so to speak, the existence of feudalism. This was an advantage. In the first place, it put an end to the Norse invasions; besides this, the duchy of Normandy, under Rollo and his son, William Longsword, who succeeded him about 932, was better administered than any other fief in the kingdom. A Norman chronicler wrote, one hundred and fifty years later it is true: “Rollo guaranteed safety to all those who wished to remain on his lands. The land was laid out by line, and divided among his followers, and, since it had been long deserted, new constructions were erected under his supervision; the Norse warriors and foreigners re peopled the land. He established rights and immutable laws for the benefit of his subjects: these he had proclaimed and confirmed by the will of the chiefs; the latter were compelled to live peacefully together. He rebuilt the churches, remade and enlarged the city walls and fortifications.” Prosperity revived under this intelligent control. Gradually the conquerors were merged in the original population, they forgot their language and pagan religion. Henceforth the preponderating influence which the Robertians exercised over the last Carolingians was counterbalanced by that of the descendants of Rollo. Christian and civilised Normandy was one of the prime movers in the struggle between royalty and feudalism in the tenth cen-

ture. The constitutional existence of a duchy, whose chief exercised royal powers, who owed merely a vague oath of allegiance to his king, and who held unrestricted sway over his soldiers and vassals, hastened the transformation of the Carolingian régime into feudalism.

**14. Weakness of Carolingian Royalty.**—Royalty, enfeebled through the abuse of the concession of benefices, could only maintain its existence by means of an acquisition of territory and the support of neighbouring peoples or vassals. The later Carolingians attempted both means. They sought new domains in Lorraine, the cradle of their race, a poorly defined kingdom situated between Germany and France, and coveted by its two neighbours. When they were not compelled to accept the services of the Robertians, the Carolingian kings sought allies in Normandy or Germany—that is to say, from rival peoples and princes. They exhausted their resources in vain struggles. It would be unjust to compare them, however, to the last of the Merovingians. There were no fainéant kings in the tenth century; they struggled with praiseworthy persistence, but they were overwhelmed by the opposing forces of the social and political world.

**15. Charles the Simple Dethroned (922). Rudolf.**—At the time that Charles the Simple was building up the duchy of Normandy there died in Germany Arnulf's son, Louis the Child (August 20, 911). As his successor, the people beyond the Rhine chose Conrad, duke of Worms, and the Lorrainers, Charles the Simple. King of France and Lorraine, Charles's surname was unmerited. However, he could not prevent Robert of France, allied with Rudolph, duke of Burgundy, and Herbert, count of Vermandois, from taking Soissons and having himself proclaimed king (June, 922). He led an army of Flem-

ings and Lorrainers against the usurper. Robert lost his life in a battle near Soissons (June 15, 923), but his troops held the battlefield, which was carried by a bold dash of his young son, Hugh the White. Charles was taken prisoner by Herbert of Vermandois and shut up in the castle of Peronne, where he died October 7, 929. The nobles at once elected Rudolf of Burgundy, son-in-law of Robert I. As for Charles's son, Louis, he was taken by his mother, Edwina, to his uncle, Æthelstan, king of the Anglo-Saxons.

**16. The Carolingian Dynasty Restored. Louis IV., d'Outremer.**—Rudolf of Burgundy reigned not ingloriously down to 936; he died childless. The nobles then separated into two parties: one side wished to put Hugh the White on the throne; the other, recall Louis d'Outremer. Hugh himself advised the latter course. His uncle's uncertain reign, his father's premature and tragic death, perhaps led him to consider their accession as a usurpation; perhaps he did not care for a royalty that was so much disputed, or thought it surer, in an unstable period, to yield the crown to him whom many thought the legitimate heir. An embassy was sent to Æthelstan to persuade him to allow his nephew to return to France. Louis IV. was received respectfully, and crowned at Rheims by Archbishop Artaud, an adherent of Hugh the White.

**17. Struggles of Louis IV. with the House of France.**—By reëstablishing Charlemagne's family, Hugh intended to work for his own personal interest. Indeed, the young king—Louis was sixteen—began to reign under his guardianship, and Hugh had no difficulty in having renewed the title of duke of the Franks that Robert I. had borne under Charles the Simple. Hugh was in reality second in the kingdom, after the king. His vassals were

the duke of Normandy, the counts of Vermandois, Champagne, Blois, Chartres, Anjou, Sens, etc. He became, moreover, lord of Burgundy and, later, of Aquitaine even. His successful intrigues and vast power won him the surname of Great. Yet Louis IV. did not abdicate; his revenues were reduced to several domains, and he possessed but one city that was an actual stronghold, Laon; he could not accomplish a great deal, but he dared attempt much. He wished to take possession of Lorraine, but was only successful in drawing the Germans on into France (940). He tried to take back Normandy, after the death of William Longsword (942), but fell into the hands of his enemies; and even Hugh the Great forced him to give up Laon. In his distress Louis made a close alliance with his brother-in-law, Otto I., king of Germany. A council was convoked in the basilica of Saint Remy at Ingelheim (June, 948), presided over by the Pope's legate, and held in the presence of Otto. There, in the presence of forty-four bishops, mostly Germans, the unfortunate Louis enumerated his grievances against the duke of France, told how he had been victimised by spoliations and had lost Laon through trickery. "It was the only city in which I could shut myself up, the only one in which I could take shelter with my wife and children. What was to be done? I preferred life to the possession of the city; I yielded it and gained my freedom. Now shorn of all my property, I beg the counsel of all. If the duke dares to deny what I say, I defy him to single combat." The assembly listened to his prayers, and summoned Hugh to submit to him, under penalty of anathema. The duke reluctantly yielded; in a conference held on the banks of the Marne "he became the king's man by hand and by oath; he evacuated the citadel of Laon, and pledged himself

to perfect fidelity in the future. Henceforth their friendship was as deep as their struggles had been violent."

### 18. The Kingdom of France under German Hegemony.

—Soon after Louis IV. died from a fall from his horse (September 9, 954). He left two sons: Lothaire, aged thirteen, and Charles, still an infant. His widow, Gerberge, gave them into the protection of their uncle, Otto I. Hedwig, a sister, like Gerberge, of the powerful king of the Germans, appealed to Otto on the death of her husband, Hugh the Great. She had three sons: Hugh, who was duke of France; Otto and Henry, who were successively dukes of Burgundy. The intestinal struggles of the aristocracy against royalty under Louis d'Outremer had reduced the kingdom to nothing more than an annex of Germany.

19. Lothaire's Reign and Death.—Lothaire reigned thirty-two years. He wore himself out in the same struggles, and encountered the same obstacles, as did his father. At first he succeeded in establishing his brother in part of Lorraine, at Brussels; he wanted the rest for himself, and took possession of Verdun; but the intrigues of Hugh Capet and the secret plottings of Adalbero, archbishop of Rheims, held him back. However, he soon died, at the age of forty-five. His burial was magnificent. "His body was placed on a bier adorned with the insignia of royalty, wrapped in silk and covered with a purple cloak embroidered in gold and precious stones; the bier was carried by the nobles of the kingdom. In front walked the bishops and priests bearing the Gospels and crucifixes. The warriors followed, sad-visaged; then came the crowd, lamenting." Did it have a presentiment that it was accompanying, not only the burial of its king, but also that of Carolingian royalty?

**20. Intrigues with Germany against Louis V. Adalbero and Gerbert.**—Louis V. succeeded, without dispute, to his father, who had shared the throne with him since 979. He was politic enough to ally himself with the duke of France, who, according to general opinion, was the most powerful lord of the realm; but he could not deal as successfully with his chancellor, Archbishop Adalbero. The latter was a Lorrainer by birth, and belonged to a noble family which was devoted to the royal house of Germany. During Lothaire's wars in Lorraine he had played a double part, that laid him open to suspicion; but he escaped the dangers attending his uncertain position, thanks to the ability of his principal counsellor, Gerbert. Gerbert was born between the years 940 and 945 in the neighbourhood of Aurillac. His family was poor, and he became a monk. He went to Spain under favourable conditions, and there acquired a thorough knowledge of mathematics; then he returned to Rheims to study philosophy. Of superior intelligence, he rapidly acquired a deep knowledge of the subjects he took up, and soon attained such a reputation for knowledge that Adalbero placed him at the head of the episcopal school. The emperor, Otto II., also gained his support by giving him the abbey of Bobbio in Italy; Gerbert stayed there scarcely a year, and after the emperor's death he resumed his position of professor at Rheims. But henceforth he was bound to Germany by ties of affection and by his duties as a vassal; he therefore entered with determination into the plans of his archbishop. Both worked actively, and, as it appears, effectively, to secure the crown for young Otto III., which his cousin, Henry of Bavaria, claimed; they also bestirred themselves secretly to hinder the enterprises of the king of France in Lorraine, and succeeded in winning over to their cause the



young Duke Hugh, always watchful of the advances which royalty might make. Louis V. wished to break up these intrigues. Adalbero, accused of treason, was summoned to appear before him, but the king died suddenly from the effects of an accident while hunting (May 22, 987). He left no children, and had no other heir than his uncle, Charles, duke of Lower-Lorraine.

**21. The Usurpation of Hugh Capet Favoured by the Church and Germany, 987.**—The archbishop of Rheims seized his opportunity: the day following the royal interment he called for a meeting of the nobles presided over by Hugh, and was declared innocent. Another meeting, held at Senlis, and which he presided over, conferred royal dignity on the duke, who was, moreover, Lothaire's cousin on the wife's side. Hugh was crowned at Noyon (June 1, 987). His renunciation of all claim to Lorraine was the price that he paid for royal power. The accession of Hugh Capet (so named because he wore the cope of an abbot of Saint Martin of Tours) was a triumph for the Church, which had worked to this purpose, and for feudal aristocracy, whose chief ascended the Carolingian throne; that is to say, a triumph for two elements which, after having been the support of the State, had worked eagerly—more often unconsciously and against their own interests—to destroy it. They had at last succeeded. The revolution of 987 seals a new order of affairs political and social, whose institutions it is important to understand well.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### THE FEUDAL SYSTEM.\*

THE feudal system was organised in the tenth and eleventh centuries, but the elements of which it was composed began to develop earlier. In it are to be distinguished three fundamental features: vassalage, benefices, and immunities.

**1. The Constituent Elements of Feudalism. Vassalage.**—*Vassalage* has been likened to Roman or Gallo-Roman

\* **SOURCES.**—All the chronicles of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries; numberless charters published in many works and collections. These charters were often collected, even in the Middle Ages, in registers, which served as the title deeds of the property of churches and abbeys, and were known as Cartularies. An “*Inventaire des Cartulaires conservés dans les Bibliothèque de Paris et aux Archives Nationales, suivi d’une Bibliographie des Cartulaires publiés en France depuis 1840,*” has been made out by M. Ul. Robert (1878). The most celebrated is the Cartulary of the abbot of Saint-Germain des Prés, Irminon, published by B. Guérard, in the collection “*Documents inédits,*” with important “*Prolégomènes,*” which were partly rectified in a new edition by A. Longnon (2 vols., 1887-1895). For an understanding of the terms and feudal institutions, reference must constantly be made to Du Cange: “*Glossarium mediæ et infimæ latinitatis.*” The “*Chansons de Geste,*” composed in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, depict feudal life and chivalry in action. An analysis of these writings will be found in “*Épopées françaises,*” by M. Léon Gautier, second edition.

**LITERATURE.**—Esmein, “*Cours Élémentaire d’Histoire du Droit Français*”; Schroeder, “*Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*”; Luchaire, “*Manuel des Institutions Françaises*”; Viollet, as above, vol. i. pp. 419, ff. The last three contain full bibliographies.

patronage, or to the Celtic clientage, or the Germanic *mundium*. The comparison is inexact, for patronage and clientage presuppose conditions of dependence between persons of different conditions, whilst the vassal is and remains a free person, and of the same condition as his seignior. Vassalage is, therefore, to speak truly, neither Roman, nor Gallic, nor Germanic; it is Merovingian and Carolingian. The act by which the bond of vassalage was originally contracted is "commendation." The one who thus pledged himself became the man of his seignior; thus the act of becoming the vassal of another was called "hommage." Necessity urged men to thus commend themselves; it was imperative in the eighth century during the period of the fainéant kings; in the ninth, at the time of the Saracen, Hungarian, and Norse invasions; in the tenth, during the struggles of French royalty against the aristocracy, the Church, and Germany.

**2. The Benefice, or Fief.**—To assure the fidelity of his vassal, or rather to enable him to fulfil his personal obligations, the seignior usually gave a benefice to his follower or man. The original meaning of the word is "benefit"; it signified the gifts that the rich man, the powerful man, made to the ones whom he protected. At first these were doubtless head of cattle (*Vieh*, whence *fevum*, fief); in the period to which we have come they represented freedom from taxes, offices, lands, and churches, and the right to the use of the forests, etc. It has been seen above how the Carolingian benefices were established in the eighth and ninth centuries; during the course of the tenth century they gradually became hereditary. This evolution may be considered as complete in the eleventh century. The word benefice then disappears to give place to that of fief. As benefices were almost always associated with the functions and rights of sovereignty, the

word "honour" was employed to signify both the functions and the lands conferred by the suzerain on the vassal.

**3. Freeholds or Allodial Lands.**—From that time the possessor of a benefice received, not the full ownership, but only the use of the land. Doubtless there were lands possessed freely and entire; they were called allodial lands.\* Holders of such lands were free in respect to these possessions; they were liable to none of the obligations imposed on vassals; but the number of such freeholders decreased constantly. They held their position in the south of France at least as late as the thirteenth century; in the north, they left but a few traditions, which have become almost legendary. The "kingdom" of Ivetot of past times was doubtless an old allod that was not absorbed into the feudal system. Henceforth it became the rule, in this region, that there was no land without a seignior; that is to say, there was no property exempt from feudal obligations.

**4. Restricted Proprietorship: Fief and Censive Tenures.**—Naturally the master of land did not cede it to every follower on the same conditions. He had to provide for two essential needs: care of his body and defence of his life. Therefore he took into his service strong arms to fight for him, and another set of men to till his fields, make his clothing and weapons, build his houses and fortresses. Now the men of the Middle Ages, filled with the warlike spirit of the Germans, looked upon the military calling as the noblest condition; and in the times of invasions and intestine wars it seemed the most useful.

\* Originally, in Salic law, "allodial" meant inheritance in general. Then lands were granted *in alode*, that is to say, given as an hereditary possession. Later, an *allod* signified land held in this way.

So the nobles monopolised it. Artisans, labourers, villeins (*roturiers*), in short, were restricted to servile occupations; simple freemen fell into a condition of half servitude, varying according to circumstances and individuals, while the most enterprising among them formed a privileged class of nobles unknown to the Merovingians. Soon the term *benefice* (or *fief*) was restricted to the lands granted on condition of military service, or service reputed noble, and *censive* tenure implied other services. The status of persons stamped the character of the land. In so far as the service was noble or servile, the land was noble or common. Conversely the conditions of land-ownership implied the status of the owner. As a general rule, the owner of a *fief* was noble; the holder of a *censive* tenure was a villein; and, since lands held in *fief* varied in importance, there was, among the nobles, a hierarchy determined by the hierarchy of their lands. It was also quite natural to retain in the feudal world the former administrative divisions of Charlemagne's time—duchies, counties, etc.—yet changed.

**5. Immunity. Usurpation of Royal Rights.**—Feudalism was not solely a social order by which the status of land and persons was regulated in a new and original way; it was also a political régime, in which the sovereign power was dismembered for the benefit of feudal lords—at least of the greatest among them. This change was also gradual; the “immunity” was one of its most potent causes. As has been seen during the Merovingian period, immunity was the exemption from certain dues, or certain public obligations, or the granting by the king of financial and judicial rights, especially to churches and monasteries. Charlemagne often granted exemption from customs, market duties, and tolls; Louis I. and his successors went so far as to accord the right to coin money. All

royal rights were thus by degrees granted to the holders of immunities. Thus the counts who wielded power in the king's name became actual sovereigns in their counties when the latter had become hereditary. Actually, there was never more than a relatively small number of feudal sovereigns, but the most insignificant noble had his share in the public power, since, as the result of an evolution which is imperfectly known, the owners of fiefs acquired the right to dispense justice in their own names to their vassals and subjects; and the powerful vassals, successors of the former functionaries of state, took unto themselves the privilege of granting, in their turn, rights which they had received or usurped.

**6. France Divided into Large Fiefs and Ecclesiastical Domains.**—The territory was thus covered by great and petty seigniories, depending the one on the other. First in order were the duchies: France, which became extinct after 987; Burgundy, which at that time belonged to a brother of Hugh Capet; and Aquitaine; then Normandy and Brittany, which had almost absolute independence. The duchy of Gascony was not really a part of the kingdom of France; rather, it was allied to the kingdom of Navarre; but through marriage it was joined to Aquitaine in 1052, and henceforward the countries lying to the south of Dordogne and Gironde shared the fate of those situated between the Garonne and the Loire. The most powerful of the counties were Flanders on the north and Toulouse on the south. These large fiefs were identical with old administrative and political divisions, whose rulers had slowly acquired an independence, which was, however, always disputed. With the large fiefs must be counted the ecclesiastical domains grown from royal immunities: such were the counties of Tournai, Beauvais, Noyon, Laon, Rheims,

Châlons, and Langres. The county of Paris, given by Hugh Capet to Bouchard de Montmorency, passed to the latter's son, who became bishop of Paris, and after this time almost all the fiefs of the county of Paris depended on the bishopric; however, the bishop never bore the title. These vassals in turn had rear vassals, and so on down, so that it would be impossible to say exactly how many fiefs there were in France at any period of the Middle Ages. This federation substituted a new society and a different order for the former Frankish society, which had disintegrated through anarchy; yet feudal rules allowed an ample opportunity for the use of arbitrary force. Society being, in fact, military, and public authority weak, the barons thought they had a right to exact justice for themselves by carrying on warfare with their neighbours. It took centuries for royalty to suppress the custom of private wars.

We must now see how, as a general rule, a man took possession of a fief, what were the reciprocal obligations of vassal and lord, and lastly how a large fief was administered.

**7. The Taking Possession of a Fief: Fealty and Homage.**—The ceremony of fealty and homage constituted the taking possession of a fief. Homage, the act by which one placed himself under the dependence of a lord, was nothing else than the old commendation. In addition the man, the vassal, was obliged to take an oath of fealty to his suzerain. The two acts usually took place at the same time, though the form was different. The would-be vassal kneeled down before the lord and placed his two hands joined in those of the latter, who then raised him and gave him the kiss of peace. But the oath of fealty was taken on the Gospels or some relic. There was something humiliating in the ceremony of homage, so

that powerful feudal lords occasionally refused to perform it; instead they took the somewhat indefinite oath of fealty. In the twelfth century the two acts of fealty and homage were combined; by swearing faith to his suzerain one became his man. Later it was felt to be necessary to record the ceremony in writing; this was the *aveu*, a report of the act by which an individual had "avowed" himself the man of some lord; on his part the seignior exacted a written description of all that the fief comprised, the so-called *dénombrément*. At last, in the fourteenth century, the whole ceremony was represented by two documents: one, drawn up in the presence of a notary, witnessing the taking of the oath of fealty and homage, the other containing the *aveu* and *dénombrément*.

**8. Investiture.**—At the same time that the suzerain received homage from his vassal, he handed to him some material object which symbolised the fief; this part of the ceremony was known as investiture. The investiture of a field was represented by a clod, of a forest by a branch; a prelate was given gloves, a crosier, and a pastoral ring, etc. The vassal was expected on his side to pay for investiture, otherwise the contract was invalid.

**9. The Acquisition of Domains.**—These ceremonies finished, the bond of vassalage was formed. It was more or less close, according as the homage was simple or liege. Liege homage, which occurred rarely before the twelfth century, carried with it certain exact obligations, and gradually took the place of simple homage. Death naturally cancelled the relationship between suzerain and vassal; even when fiefs had become hereditary, they did not pass by right to the heir. The fief was considered to fall back into the possession of the lord, and the heir was required to buy it back, or to redeem it. To do this



he paid a "relief," which was infinitely varied; but when the relief was paid the suzerain could not refuse to accept his vassal's homage. Vassalage thus became not only a means of the seignior's for acquiring devoted adherents, but also the general method of gaining landed possessions. Land which to-day would be bought with money, was then paid for in personal services.

**10. Acquisition of Non-Noble Lands.**—These lands were acquired in much the same way as noble lands. The villein (*roturier*) was granted censive tenure on becoming the man of the seignior, who gave him possession, or *seisin*, by a ceremony similar to that of investiture; the tenant had a "declaration" made out similar to that of the *dénombrement*; he transmitted the land to his heirs, who had also to pay a relief; should he sell his property the buyer must pay an alienation fee called *lods et vente*, which amounted usually to a fifth of the revenue.

**11. Obligations of a Vassal to his Suzerain.**—The vassal owed certain personal services to his suzerain, which were considered noble; the principal ones being military service and judicial service. Military service had to be rendered when demanded by the lord paramount, and at the vassal's expense. The latter was expected to present himself armed and mounted; the horseman was peculiarly the soldier in this régime, so that in the Latin speech of the period *miles* always meant a knight. The vassals soon succeeded in restricting this obligation; for example, the liege man was only required to serve once a year, during a definite time, often fixed at forty days. When the lord administered justice he called his vassals to him, and it was their duty to come to his court—as well to help in rendering judgment as to be judged. They also aided him with their counsels in the administration of the fief. In certain exceptional circumstances the vassal

was required to pay a sum of money as a ransom for his lord taken prisoner in war, on the marriage of his eldest daughter, or when his son was knighted, and later when he went to the Crusades. These obligations were known as "aids."

**12. Obligations of a Suzerain to his Vassal.**—If the vassal failed in one or another of these duties he was considered a traitor, and the suzerain might confiscate his fief; but as long as he was faithful to his obligations, the latter was obliged to support him in his fief and defend him against every enemy.

**13. Hereditary Rights in Feudalism.**—On the death of a lord the inheritance passed to his children. Rules of succession varied in different countries. In one place, male heirs alone could inherit lands; in another, women were allowed to share in an inheritance, although incapable of bearing arms. Most often the principal part of a large fief—the chief town of a barony—was inalienable, passing on to the oldest son. The exclusive rights of primogeniture and male succession speedily became general, and, until the end of the eighteenth century, gave a peculiar stamp to feudal institutions; they tended to give to the French nobility a caste feeling which it was far from having in the beginning.

**14. The Organisation of a Fief. The Domain. Tenants, Noble and Common. Serfs.**—The extent of fiefs varied greatly. Like the Roman and Merovingian *villæ*, they might consist of arable lands, meadows, vineyards, forests, winepresses, mills, churches, or chapels. Usually the lord kept only a part of his lands for his immediate use, known as his "domain," and worked under the system of services, or the *corvée*; the remaining property was parcelled out to persons, more or less dependent, and formed the "tenures." The noble tenants were vassals.

As for the non-noble tenants, they were like our leaseholders or farmers, except that their tenure was perpetual, and the rent or *cens* was fixed. It was often the case also that they were not personally free. Slavery of the old type had been almost universally supplanted by serfdom; serfs had individual rights, but they were attached to the soil which they tilled, both for their own use and for that of the seignior, from father to son. Their condition varied indefinitely, as did the dues which they were forced to pay their lord. The most wretched condition was that of the serfs taxable and workable at their lord's will and pleasure, from whom he might exact heavy labour with no remuneration. They were also termed *mortmain* tenants, since their hand was powerless to transmit property, and the lord took possession of it at their death.

**15. Seigniorial Administration of a Fief.**—In his own domain and over the lands of his tenants the seignior, especially the great baron, was a kind of sovereign. He declared war, coined money, administered justice, and levied taxes in his own name and for his own benefit. In the largest fiefs the functionaries were often invested with the same duties as during the Carolingian period; there were seneschals, constables, cup-bearers, grooms of the chambers, and marshals, all holding hereditary offices. Deeds were drawn up in the chancellor's office of the lord, and bore his seal. Under the seneschal's orders were the *provosts*, or in the south, *baillis*; in villages and cities the lord's peasants were supervised by intendants, or *maires*, who were of the same status as the peasants. Justice was not administered to everyone in the same tribunals; it was a general rule that every man should be judged by his peers, that is to say, his equals; hence all suits were pleaded before a body like a jury. The lord presided over

the assizes of his court, except in non-feudal cases, when he was represented by his provosts, or in Normandy by viscounts, and in the southern provinces by vicars. The same judicial powers were not vested alike in all lords; those who administered high justice might alone judge certain crimes, like murder, arson, and rape; they might condemn a criminal to death by the sword, or hanging, and have him "dragged" before sending him to be hanged. Those who possessed only low justice could not decide questions of life and death.

**16. Revenues of a Fief.**—The lord drew revenues from various sources: (1) Those due him as sovereign with royal rights, such as the aids, judicial fees, the fee of *bris*, or shipwreck, and *épave*, or his claim to all waifs or goods that have no proprietor; of *formariage*, which was exacted of serfs who wished to marry outside of his jurisdiction, and of *aubaine*, which placed at his disposition the property of outsiders who might die on his soil, etc.; (2) The revenues which he received as landed proprietor, which varied extensively. They may, however, be classified, on one hand, as the regular products of the domain, and on the other, as the irregular returns of lands held under feudal and censive tenures.

1. Tenants turned over a part of the crops to their lord, for provisions for himself and family; they also were required at times to lodge and feed him; he chose the finest cuts of meat and the most excellent fish. He required them to till his lands and keep houses and property in repair; he alone had the right to own granaries, bakeries, mills, wine-presses, threshing floors, and to make the peasants pay for threshing, grinding, and cooking their grain, and pressing their grapes, apples, or olives. He levied tolls at city gates, and mileage for highways and waterways, and for market rights; forests, and hunt-

ing, and fishing privileges were mostly reserved for him.

2. Feudal lands brought in the rights of relief, and the dues at sales and exchanges. Yet the revenues from these sources were not great; there was little money struck, and feudal lords rarely accumulated much of it. Riches came immediately from the soil, and produce was at once consumed. This is why the ownership of land was so desired, and benefices were mostly in the form of land-grants, and why fiefs became hereditary. Feudalism took its rise in economic causes as well as in those that were political and social.

**17. Chivalry.**—Chivalry was closely connected with feudalism. It differed in that it was personal and not hereditary: one might be a lord, yet not a knight, in the sense of chivalry, and a knight without even being a noble; it was a system which modified and completed feudalism. It was not an institution, but an ethical and voluntary association shedding a ray of ideal beauty through society corrupted by anarchy.

**18. Requisites of Knighthood. Ceremony of Confering Knighthood.**—Any man who had been given arms, or, who had received the accolade, under certain conditions, and according to a regular formula, was said to be a knight. All men might aspire to knighthood: villeins, singers (*jongleurs*), and comedians—even serfs; but usually the title was only given to nobles. At first the age at which one might become a knight was undetermined; it was about fifteen during the eleventh and twelfth centuries; in the thirteenth it was more often twenty-one, the age of majority according to the common law. Knighthood might be conferred on the field of battle or in any serious or unforeseen circumstance; yet it was more often giving during one of the great Church festivals of

the year, such as Christmas, Easter, or Whitsuntide. Above all the aspirant must be a Christian, brave, true to his promise, liberal, loving the Church and his country. Any knight might bestow knighthood on another. Usually the act was performed by the father of the would-be knight, or by a relative, or his lord. Several of these godfathers in chivalry were allowed if, for instance, the knight were son of a powerful prince or king. Down to the twelfth century the ceremony of conferring knighthood was most simple: the godfather buckled on the young man's sword, which was preëminently his weapon; then he gave him a violent blow with the palm of the hand or the fist, the accolade, a kind of rough confirmation to which he must submit, if not without rejoinder, at least without returning it. Sometimes the godfather added a few words of advice to the blow, which amounted to: "Be a valiant knight!" If the ceremony occurred during a festival or at a leisure time, the newly-made knight was expected to vault upon his horse, without touching the stirrups, and strike down with his lance mannikins or trophies set up on posts; the game was called *quintain*, and it brought out the skill and strength of the knight. This ceremony, which was purely secular and still barbarian, soon became a Church function: the aspirants to knighthood would go to the priests to have the swords blessed which they were to wear, and would pass the night which preceded the ceremony in prayer. Thus it was that Goeffrey Plantagenet, count of Anjou, was armed and knighted in 1120, when he was fifteen years old. Finally, when the Church had definitely acquired control of this act, which up to that time had been a lay ceremony, every part of it was performed at the altar. The priest buckled on the sword and administered the accolade with apostolic sweetness; every phase of the service was imbued

with that symbolism which imparts a charm, though it is somewhat insipid, to the curious treatise in verse of the thirteenth century "On the Order of Chivalry."

**19. Religion of Chivalry: Honour.**—Be a valiant knight! The teachings of chivalry are summed up in these words. They carried the germ of a special religion, the religion of honour, which was to inspire knights not less than the ancient Christian faith. The pious king, Louis IX., knew no more beautiful word in the French language than "prudhomme," which, he said, "fills one's mouth only to pronounce it."

**20. Training for Knighthood. Tournaments.**—War was the engrossing occupation of the feudal baron and knight. He was early trained to it. He was left to the care of women until he was seven. He played marbles, battle-dore, and shuttlecock; he learned "tables," a kind of backgammon, and chess; he also began to ride, for the best horsemen are those who have ridden since childhood. After he was seven he was given over to the training of men. The priests taught him little, yet he was neither unlettered nor ignorant. But his favourite exercises were fencing and hunting. The chase was pursued mainly with birds or dogs; falconry and hunting were perfected arts during the Middle Ages. War was taught in part by theory, but mostly through practice. A treatise on tactics, written by Vegetius in the fourth century, was about all that was known to the Middle Ages of the art of war and siege; and this was very simple. Tournaments were the manœuvres of those times. There were actual combats waged with the weapons of war. In the thirteenth century knights were ordered to use lances without an iron head, and dulled swords; which, however, did not do away with the bloody character of the sport. At a tournament at Neuss, near Cologne, in 1240, more than sixty

participants were killed. One of Saint Louis's sons, Robert of Clermont, head of the Bourbon branch, was so badly hurt in a struggle, by blows on his helmet, that he went mad. He had but just been knighted. Therefore the Church intervened, and Saint Louis forbade these bloody pastimes, yet custom persisted in observing them. However, the presence of ladies to witness these rough encounters gradually did away with their brutality. Battles were nothing more than tournaments on a large scale. As in classic times, they were contests, to which the combatants defied one another with loud shouts, and in which they fought hand to hand. During the Middle Ages there were many warriors of great personal valour, like Richard Cœur-de-Lion; but it is difficult to find any able captains, real strategists, and tacticians.

**21. Valets and Bachelors.**—This somewhat self-denying and extremely virile education was usually completed elsewhere than in the apprentice-knight's home, with some rich baron who liked to have about him and bring up, "nourish," young nobles, and initiate them, by example, into the arduous duties of feudal life. In this condition the young man was called a *valet* or *damoiseau*, or, should he have special services to perform for his master, *esquire*; the term page was only employed in this sense dating from the fourteenth century. Those who were too poor to aspire to knighthood remained esquires. There was in this a trace of the old companionship, which perhaps had not entirely disappeared. Knights who did not own fiefs were called knights bachelors.

**22. Military Costume of a Knight.**—The military dress and the dwelling are inseparable parts of the conception of a feudal lord. Down to the eleventh century knights still wore the armour of the Carolingian soldier, a leathern or heavy linen vest, covered with scales of metal or



horn; but from the preceding century they preferred the hauberk, a long coat of mail which reached to the knees, with sleeves and a hood of mail, the latter called *coiffe* or *ventaille*; the hauberk was fitted tight to the body by means of a belt; knights also wore a leathern belt ornamented with small metal plates; in the thirteenth century legs and arms were protected by greaves and gloves of mail. Often a long sleeveless robe, made of some light rich material, was worn over the hauberk, and is known as the *surcot*. The helmet was put on over the hood. It was made of iron, was conical in shape, with a band of iron or nose-piece to protect the face. Towards the end of the twelfth century the helmet was made rounding at the top, like a cap, and at last became entirely cylindrical. Such was the helmet of Philip Augustus. Under Saint Louis it had the form of a large retort of metal, rounded, and reaching to the shoulders, with holes for the eyes, ears, and nostrils. The short broadsword, with a round hilt, and the wooden lance, tipped with a lozenge-shaped piece of iron, were the offensive weapons. The banner or streamer, with two or three peaks, was nailed below the socket; in the thirteenth century the banner was replaced by a small square flag and by the pennant, a triangular flag bearing the armorial device of the knight. They also carried sometimes a battle-axe. The only defensive arm was the shield, which consisted of a frame-work of wood, covered with heavy leather, and held in place by iron bands, which were more or less ornamented. The iron bands converged, and were held together in the middle by a buckle, which was like the protruding head of an enormous rivet; hence the name of buckler, by which the shield was finally known.

**23. The Shield and Coat of Arms.**—The shield was curved; broad at the top, becoming gradually smaller so

as to end in a point at the bottom; it was often decorated with some pictures, which after the end of the twelfth century were emblematical. Armorial bearings were then significant; their composition and interpretation made up a language whose key was alone possessed by heralds, the masters of heraldic art, or the science of heraldry.


**24. The Feudal Castle.**—The feudal castle was usually built on an easily defended site. The land, surrounded by a wooden paling, was divided into two parts by a moat. The general quarters were on one side, which was known as the courtyard; the master's dwelling or donjon was in the other. It was a kind of wooden blockhouse, several stories high, built on an elevation, often an artificial one. A wooden bridge, supported by buttresses, was approached from the exterior by an inclined plane, and led to the door of the donjon; in case of alarm it might be easily and quickly hewn down. Gradually stone took the place of wood. It was used in building the donjon, always placed high on its elevated ground; the steps, which led from the gate to the courtyard; and the enclosure, which was protected by towers, flat within and round without. In order to protect the quarters of the castle, the storehouses, servants' and workmen's houses, a second enclosure was built, called the bailey. Such were the two main divisions of a feudal castle of the twelfth century. At last a way was invented of protecting the outer doors by means of loop-holes or barbicans; the defenders were protected from arrows by a battlemented walk going the rounds of the enclosure, supplied with loop-holes and roofed with wood, forming a gallery; this projected beyond the perpendicular line of the wall, so that the operations of the enemy might be watched, even at the foot of the ramparts, where blasting and mining were undertaken. Thus built, castles were often considered

impregnable. Yet they were taken, for since the time of the Romans the art of laying siege to a place had constantly improved. It must be remembered, in order to understand the feudal period, that France was covered with strongholds, and that their walls often protected insignificant tyrants, greedy, and eager for vengeance, war, and booty.

**25. Feudalism in the Church.**—Who could suppress their outbreaks? Royalty was powerless. Could the Church do it? It, too, had the feudal spirit. Since the time of Charlemagne it had grown richer and richer. Towards the end of his reign, an abbot of Saint Germain des Prés, Irminon, had an inventory made of his possessions. It appears from this list, or register, that the abbey, before being pillaged by Normans, owned nearly one hundred thousand acres, on which were living about three thousand families, and which brought in at least two millions in revenues. When finally the feudal system was established, abbots continued to be important persons, and were often employed at the king's court. But they were not yet a power—far from it. Although abbeys often received fiefs, they were more often given as a fief. It was different with the secular clergy. Bishops were actual feudal lords, with their *manse*—that is, their land considered as a whole, from whose revenues they lived, they and their clerical household; they held also, in the same way, vassals, from whom they exacted homage and services. Besides their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to which their priests were subject, they exercised also high and low justice over their men. And as they, too, acknowledged feudal obligations, and since the Church forbade military service, it was performed for them by one of their vassals, who was scarcely a disinterested protector, often a dangerous one. He was the advocate (*advocatus*),

or *vidame* (*vicedominus*). He was also entrusted with the lay administration of the Church possessions. Rich and unarmed, bishops were compelled to contribute, besides, to the expenses of the sovereign. In the Middle Ages Church property was a constant and almost inexhaustible source of royal revenue; the weight of extraordinary taxes fell most heavily upon it, and the king exercised his right of demanding free entertainment most frequently in ecclesiastical lands. On the death of a bishop or abbot, while his followers, the advocate leading, pillaged his personal effects (by a right recognised in part of the feudal world), the king laid hands on the vacant see and drew its revenues until a new occupant had been appointed. This was his right of *régale*, or regalian right. Pretexts were invented for burdening the Church. Although a bishop or abbot might die, the Church did not; lands which had been granted her in feudal tenure became property in mortmain, consequently the lord could no longer levy any of the dues for transmission of property, mentioned above. Then the Church was compelled, on acquiring a fief, to pay once for all a large sum down by the right of *amortissement*, often equal to the value of the property, and never less than half; she was also forced to place a man over it to represent her, to live and die for the Church, in the event of whose death the charges on change of property might be collected.

**26. The Church Supports the Royal Power and Restrains Feudal Anarchy.**—On the whole the Church lost nothing by this arrangement. She was under the protection of the king and his officers. Although taxes for the benefit of the king had been done away with, she still collected tithes; a contribution resembling the one paid by the Israelites to the tribe of Levi, whose payment had been considered a pious act by the Merovingians, and made a



# CENTRAL EUROPE

C. 980

- Western Empire
- Karolingia or Western K'm
- Burgundy



50

45

5

0

5

10

15

20

legal one by the Carolingians. In effect the clergy was closely associated with what remained of the government; it provided the king and great feudal lords with educated and able counsellors, who were, moreover, little to be feared, since, on account of the celibacy of the priesthood, there was no danger of their offices becoming hereditary. In addition to this, the Church, inspired by the spirit of discipline and obedience, writing and preaching in the name of a religion of peace and charity, was the natural enemy of feudal anarchy.

**27. Excesses of Private Wars. The Peace and the Truce of God.**—At the end of the tenth century, and under the early Capetians, the state of affairs was pitiable. War weighed heavily on all points of the kingdoms which had sprung from the Carolingian empire. Feudal lords in France waged constant warfare: Anjou against Champagne and Brittany; Normandy against Anjou; Perigord against Poitou; Aquitaine against Toulouse; Flanders against Lorraine; the duchy of Burgundy against the kingdom of Burgundy, etc. The number of great fiefs represented just so many permanent wars. They were rarely sanguinary, but they spread terrible havoc throughout the land. Frequent famines completed the work of destruction begun by armed men. People were in such misery that they even ate human flesh, or revolted, as did the Norman peasants in 997. Therefore the belief in the approaching end of the world was widespread, though not because the year 1000 was more feared than any preceding one; it is true that this was an interpretation of a saying ascribed to Christ, that the world would not last more than a thousand years, but it was not known when this dreaded expiration of time would occur. In the meantime the Church tried to make peace. Councils, partly composed of laymen, partly of eccle-

siastics, were convoked at Charroux (989), at Limoges (994), at le Puy (998), at Poitiers (1000), etc., which decreed: "That henceforth, no man should break into a church; that no one should molest or injure monks and their companions; that no one should dare to take a peasant or peasant woman; nor steal or kill colts, oxen, asses, sheep, goats, and pigs; that no one should interfere with merchants, nor pillage their wares." Those who might break this peace of God would be excommunicated, anathematised, and driven from the sanctuary of the church, until they should be amenable to its commands. The council of Toulouges (1041) promulgated besides, that during certain days of the week, from Wednesday evening to Monday morning, during certain feast days, at Advent and Lent, there should be cessation of private wars; this was the Truce of God. Anathemas and fines were not enough; an armed force was needed, capable of making its decrees and penalties respected. It was with this purpose in view that in certain dioceses associations for the observance of peace were formed, made up of men of all conditions, who swore to observe the decisions of the councils. They were called "peace jurors," or "the peace commune." The well-born members of the order were termed "paissiers," and, in the south of France, a special tax, or "pesade," was levied for the maintenance of the institution.

**28. Impotence of the Church.**—The association was ratified by the Council of Clermont (1095), as well as the Peace and Truce of God, but these efforts bore no apparent results. The strong hand of control was needed to bring order out of this chaos, and this was not the business of the Church. She herself realised it, and expressed her wish for a strong and efficient royal power. She had doubtless contributed to the weakening of the Carolingian



government; but if Hinemar had, in spite of Germany, placed the crown on the head of Charles the Bald in 858, and Adalbero had done the same for Hugh Capet in 987, contrary to Carolingian rights, it was because the Church wished to see the sovereign power exercised independently and with dignity.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### GERMANY AND ITALY (888-1056).\*

**1. The States of Germany in the Ninth Century.**—At the end of the ninth century Germany had not yet become a nation; it was composed of four peoples, clearly defined by name, history, and institutions. They were: (1) The Alemannians or Swabians, former Suevi, dwelling between the Vosges mountains and the Lech; being the direct neighbours of France, the French gave their name later to entire Germany; dating from the eleventh century the land of the Teutons, or Deutschland, became

\* **SOURCES.**—A guide to the chronicles relative to the history of Germany as far as the thirteenth century is furnished by M. Wattenbach: "Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter." 2 vols. (Sixth edition, 1893-4). Concerning these chronicles and all other sources, see the appendices of v. Giesebrecht, in his several volumes of his "Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit." We merely note that the history of Henry I. and Otto I. was written by the monk Witikind of Corvei ("Mon. Germ." iii.); that of the three Ottos and of Henry II. by Bishop Thietmar, of Mersebourg (*Ibid.*).—Bishop Luitprand of Cremona also wrote a "Historia Ottonis" (*Ibid.*), and the nun, Hrotsvita, a panegyric in verse of the great emperor ("Mon. Germ.", volume iv.). For the first half of the eleventh century there are the general chronicles of Hermann of Reichenau, down to 1054 ("Mon. Germ.," v.), and of Lambert of Hersfeld, down to 1074 ("Mon. Germ.," v.). For Conrad II. see his life written by Wipo ("Mon. Germ." xi.). The charters of Conrad I., Henry I., and Otto I. were published by Th. de Sickingel in the "Mon. Germ." (1879-1884).

**LITERATURE.**—W. v. Giesebrecht, as above; Gregorovius, "History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages"; Henderson, "History of Germany in the Middle Ages"; Bryce, as above.

Germany to the French; (2) to the east of the Lech lived the Bavarians; then came (3) the eastern Franks, or Franconians, and (4) on the north the Saxons, who, together with the Hessians and Thuringians, occupied all lower Germany. There was not, therefore, one Germany, but four, until the annexation of Lorraine should add a fifth. Each one was ruled by hereditary sovereigns, who were styled "dukes by the grace of God."

**2. Saxony and Franconia.**—Two especially from among these five nations merit attention: the Saxons and the Franconians. The latter, who were established in the Rhine and Main valleys, where were situated famous cities and dioceses, held the first rank. This was due less to their geographical situation than to their name. For two centuries the elections of the kings of Germany took place in Franconia; the kings were subject to Frankish law, and were crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle. Saxony was still half pagan, especially on the eastern frontier; here alone a nobility by birth had kept its place, although reduced in numbers by Charlemagne, while elsewhere an aristocracy of service, organised by the Carolingian capitularies, was the only nobility, and one which tended to become hereditary.

**3. The Feudal System in Germany.**—However, throughout the land, except among the Ditmarshers, of what is now Holstein, the condition of lands and persons was determined according to the feudal régime; family property had given way to feudal tenure; the peasant proprietor had partly disappeared, to make a place for the peasant holding land under censive tenure. The clergy, grown rich from the gifts of the faithful, had become a part of the feudal hierarchy; the German *Vogt*, like the advocate in France, was entrusted with the defence of bishops and abbots, with the administration, in their

name, of criminal justice, and the performance of military service. But this agent was, as a rule, more powerful in Germany than in France, and played a more important part there. There was neither commerce nor industries; agriculture was the one source of wealth.

**4. Accession of Henry I. the Fowler, 919. The German State Founded.**—At the death of the last Carolingian, Louis the Child (August 20, 911), the nobles assembled at Forchheim to choose his successor. Conrad the Salic, or Franconian, said to be grandson of Arnulf, was elected. His reign of six years was a constant war waged against the pretenders to the throne, and the Hungarians. It is said that on his deathbed he sent to Henry of Saxony, his cousin, the gold bracelets, the cloak, sword, and diadem of the former kings, thus transferring the succession to him; the Frank gave the crown into the keeping of the Saxon. It is also related that Conrad's envoys, on bringing the insignia of royalty to Henry, found him snaring birds. Henry the Fowler was in truth elected "king of the Saxons and Franks" in the assembly of Fritzlar (June, 919). Thus he was recognised by only a part of the Germans. After six years of war and negotiations he gained recognition from them all. The foundation of the German State was accomplished.

**5. Germany Organised and Fortified. The Marches.**—Henry I. took able measures, offensive and defensive, against the foreign foe. In Saxony and Thuringia he built many fortresses to keep in check the Slavs of the Havel and the Spree. He restored the marches of Schleswig, opposed to the Danes, of Brandenburg against the Obotrites, of Meissen against the Bohemians, of Lusatia against the Poles. He took Lorraine from Charles the Simple. He founded, enlarged, or fortified many cities, so that he has sometimes been called the "Founder of

Cities." He introduced in place of the heavy Saxon infantry an army of light horse, made up of experienced cavalymen. He could then make a firm stand against the Hungarians; and beat them at Riade, or Riede, on the Unstrutt, near Mersburg (March 15, 933). This victory attracted great attention; Henry had the principal incidents of the battle painted on the walls of his palace, and he instituted military celebrations in order to perpetuate the memory of the event.

**6. Accession of Otto I., 936. Increased Prestige of the Crown.**—Henry survived this triumph but a short time, dying in 936, after having divided his treasures among his children, and urged the nobles to elect Otto, the oldest of his legitimate sons. The assembly of nobles and bishops met at Aix, and unanimously proclaimed Otto, "proposed by his father, chosen of God, and made king by the princes." He was waited upon by national dukes at the state banquet held after the election. The duke of Lorraine, in whose territory lay Aix, assumed the office of grand chamberlain and master of ceremonies; the duke of Franconia was carver; the duke of Swabia, cupbearer; the duke of Bavaria, marshal. And during this time the imperial city was filling up with crowds of knights, hastening to welcome the new king.

**7. Otto I. Weakens the Ducal Power.**—These festivities are an indication of the lustre shed over royalty by Henry I. Yet the dukes, eager to figure in official ceremonies, intended to remain independent, and it was soon necessary to combat them. Their uprisings were suppressed at the end of the year 941. Otto then took possession of the duchies. He seized for himself Franconia; he married his son Ludolf, who was but nine years old, to the only daughter of the duke of Swabia; his own daughter, Luitgarde, to the duke of Lorraine, Conrad the Red;

and his son Henry was given the daughter of the duke of Bavaria. Two of his sisters, it has been seen, were married in France: Gerberge to Louis IV., Hedwig to Hugh the Great. Somewhat later Ludolf revolted, in his turn (953); he was subdued and his duchy was taken from him. Yet he had found it so easy to secure partisans that Otto I. realised that he must placate the old nobility. He therefore restored the dukes, who were truly national and even hereditary, taking the precaution, it is true, to render them less formidable, by judiciously dividing their possessions. Thus Lorraine was separated into two duchies, Upper Lorraine and Lower Lorraine; the same was done in Saxony, Herman Billing receiving the title of duke over the eastern part alone, the western part, lying on the Weser, being annexed to the crown.

**8. Otto I. Brings the Hungarian Invasions to an End.**—One last victory, still more glorious, sealed the triumph of the king of Germany. The Hungarians, whom the revolted princes had called in to their aid, invaded the valley of the Danube and pushed on into Franconia, and even as far as France (954). The following year they returned to the number of one hundred thousand, and besieged Augsburg. Otto led an army of Germans and Bohemians against them, met and routed them, after a severe fight, on the banks of the Lech (955).—Henceforth the course of Finnish invasion was arrested.

**9. Otto I. Organises a Government Administered by the Crown.**—Otto was an organiser as well as a soldier. He bestowed himself the ducal dignity, which had previously been conferred by popular election, or had been hereditary. At the same time he curtailed its prerogatives; in all provinces, except Franconia, he gradually instituted counts of the palace, or palatine counts (*Pfalzgrafen*), who watched over the royal domains and revenues, dispensed

justice in the king's name, and supervised the dukes and counts. But there was danger that these new agents might also make personal use of their power. Otto sought and found a check to the encroachments of this lay feudalism in the clergy. He distributed the most important ecclesiastical dignities among the members of his own family: the archbishopric of Cologne to his brother Bruno; of Mainz to his son William the Bastard; of Trèves to one of his cousins; of Salzburg to one of his favourites. He reorganised the chancery, or royal chapel, which he found in the greatest disorder. Instead of three chancellors, he created but one, and that one his brother Bruno, whom he had placed at the head of that important branch of service. Learning was again honoured; first at court, and then throughout the land. The chancery became a centre of illustrious men, and also a school for administrators. The greater number of administrative offices were given to bishops, and to the heads of royal abbeys. Yet Otto saw that these priests fulfilled their duties to the state. Since they had fiefs, they were required to send their vassals, at the stated times, to perform military service, and often lead them; they also contributed towards public expenses, and assisted the king in all political matters. The Church was administered for the benefit of the State.

**10. Otto I. Seeks the Support of the Church.**—Since the king depended upon the Church, he naturally felt the need of controlling its ruler. The condition of affairs in Italy soon took Otto to Rome.

**11. Feudal Anarchy in Italy.**—Of all the members of the Carolingian monarchy left without a master on the deposition of Charles the Fat, Italy had been the most disturbed. Great seigniorial domains had formed there also. Among them were the marquisate of Ivrea and the

duchy of Friuli on the north, the marquisate of Tuscany and the duchy of Spoleto in the centre; in the south Lombard princes were still reigning in the duchies of Capua and Beneventum. The duchies of Naples, Gaëta, and Amalfi were dependent on the Empire of the East, whose possessions were endangered by the presence of the Saracens in Tarentum and on the Garigliano River. Elsewhere the powers of the former counts had been generally usurped by bishops. The seigniories which they instituted in their episcopal towns acquired added importance from the fact that many of the cities, especially in Lombardy, had kept their walls, and also some of their former industrial and commercial activity, as well as traces of old municipal institutions.

**12. Feudal Anarchy in Rome.**—Rome typified the curious confusion which reigned throughout the peninsula. In the city, as well as in the territories under the temporal power of the Pope, feudalism was supreme. Counts with hereditary possessions were established on both banks of the Tiber; those of Tusculum held sway among the Latin hills, the Crescentius family were on the Sabine side. Pontifical domains had been granted by the popes to bishops, and abbots, and lay advocates, to the detriment of Saint Peter's patrimony. Power at Rome lay in the hands of the nobility, or "senators," as they termed themselves, although the Senate no longer existed. There was no middle class; the workingmen's guilds (*scholae, artes*), which were still in existence, depended on the nobles, whom they considered their patrons. Popes were elected by the clergy and populace; but more often mobs, excited by an aristocratic faction, forced their candidate on the electors.

**13. Aspirants to the Crown of Italy in the Tenth Century.**—During this time the royal crown was bitterly



contested by Italian and Provençal claimants. Towards the middle of the tenth century two of their number, who had fought each other without either one gaining an advantage, Berengar II. and Lothaire, compromised, and agreed to reign together. Lothaire died in 950, and Berengar wished to marry his son to the widow, Adelheid. She fled to the castle of Canossa and called upon Otto I. for help, since Otto was the protector of Conrad, king of Burgundy, her brother. The king of Germany crossed the Alps, entered Pavia without striking a blow, and married, himself, the rescued Adelheid (December, 951). He planned to go on to Rome, but was recalled by the revolt of his son Ludolf. Finally he returned, ten years later, assumed the iron crown of the Lombards at Milan, in 961, and took possession of Rome, which offered no resistance.

**14. The Empire of the West Revived in Favour of Otto I., 962.**—He had promised to “aggrandise the Church as far as was in his power,” and to restore “all territory of Saint Peter’s which might come into his hands.” He meant to keep his word, but on condition that the Pope should confer on him the imperial crown. No emperor, since Berengar’s death in 924, had been crowned by the Pope. The disappearance of the title, made illustrious by Charlemagne, was felt regretfully. An Italian monk, he may have been Lombard, expressed these regrets about the end of the ninth century in a writing called, “*Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma.*” Perhaps the thought of restoring the empire had already taken form in Otto’s mind during his first Italian expedition; since, being all powerful on both sides of the Alps, protecting the kingdom of Burgundy, exerting dominant influence throughout the kingdom of France, and having revived the Catholic missions among heathen peoples, he seemed

to have taken up the policy and regained the power of Charlemagne. Once in Rome, it seemed natural and imperative that he should renew a title around which clustered so many memories of success and glory. And indeed, on February 2, 962, Candlemas Day, he was crowned with great ceremony, amidst the applause of nobles, clergy, and people. Some days later an act was drawn up, of which a contemporary and authentic copy—it may be the original document—is preserved in the archives of the Vatican. It outlined afresh the territorial extent, constitution, and administration of Saint Peter's patrimony, and defined the relationship between the Papacy and the Empire. Otto confirmed the grants accorded by Louis the Pious in 817, adding the cities of Venice, Spoleto, Benevento, and Sicily, "should God give them into his hands"; but he retained his rights of jurisdiction and sovereignty. The Pope, on his side, was to be elected as heretofore, but he could not be consecrated before having renewed to the emperor or his representatives the promises given formerly by Pope Leo. Should there be complaints brought against the dukes or pontifical judges, the emperor's commissioners should notify the Holy See, which must then take action, otherwise the commissioners themselves would do so. In effect the Roman nobility and the Pope swore fealty to Otto I. Rome became again the universal city, since she was both imperial and pontifical.

**15. Otto I. Paves the Way for the Dominion of his Family in Southern Italy.**—The south of the peninsula was all that remained to be conquered to bring the whole of Italy under Otto's control. The duke of Capua was easily persuaded to pay homage to him; but when he besieged Bari, he was repulsed by the Greek troops of the garrison (967). He then opened negotiations, asking for

his son the hand of the step-daughter of the emperor of the East, Nicephorus Phocas. He refused, but his successor, John Zimisce, whom a revolution had just placed upon the throne (970), was more complacent. He gave him Theophano, daughter of the Emperor Romanus, whom Otto II. solemnly married in the church of St. Peter's at Rome at Easter, 972. It was the last important event of his great reign. Otto I. died somewhat suddenly, in the full vigour of life, May 6, 973; he was sixty-one years old.

**16. Characteristics of Otto the Great. Importance of his Reign.**—This Saxon, who restored the Empire, was a worthy successor of Charlemagne. He established order in Germany, built up an enlightened and faithful administrative body, and imposed his influence on Slavs and Danes. His reign was also distinguished by a literary revival similar to that of the eighth century. He is described as having a red face, a long wavy beard, firm and assured bearing, a powerful figure, with a hairy breast like a lion's, eyes that moved incessantly, opening and closing "as if they were watching their prey." He embodied decision, strength, and greatness. Like Charlemagne, he was justly termed the Great.

**17. Otto II. (973-983).**—Otto II. continued his father's work in Italy. Allied with his vassals, the dukes of Capua, Beneventum, and Salerno, he seized Naples and Tarentum, but he was surprised by an army of Saracens in the service of the Greeks, not far from the sea. He was totally defeated (July 13, 982), and escaped, as if by miracle, from his conquerors; he spent long months in feverishly preparing a fleet at Ravenna and an army at Rome. He was carried off by disease, in the latter city, on December 7, 983. He was but twenty-eight years old, and left as his heir a son who was but

three. As a result the nobles revolted, but the head of the clergy, the archbishop of Mainz, vigorously upheld the legitimate sovereign and established him on the throne. The diet of Quedlinburg, which was assembled at Easter, 985, represented a pacified Germany. The revolution of 987, which transferred the crown of France to Hugh Capet, secured peace on the western frontier, by uniting, more closely than in the past, Lorraine to Germany.

**18. Otto III. (983-1002). His Conception of the Empire.**—From that time peace was established. Guided by his mother and grandmother, a Greek and an Italian, both pious, intelligent, and learned, the young prince was given a brilliant education. He learned Greek, Latin, and German. In the society of monks and bishops, he acquired from them habits of devotion and mysticism. His mother imbued him with her ideas of imperial dignity. Theophano, the Byzantine princess, did not believe that the Empire ended with the death of her husband. She bore proudly the title of *Imperatrix augusta*, and governed Italy as Irene and Theodora had formerly reigned in Byzantium. Otto III. longed to establish a monarchy whose capital should be Rome, and which should dominate the West. As soon as he was of age (996), his personal attention was given to Rome, yet without neglecting German affairs, nor breaking off his struggles against the Slavs and his efforts for their conversion.

**19. Deplorable Condition of the Papacy in the Tenth Century.**—There is no period in papal history more deplorable than that dating from the death of John VIII. (882) to the accession of Gregory VII. (1073). The papacy suffered in the general decline of civilisation. At no other time were there more popes condemned because of their evil lives, nor a greater number who died a

violent death. It is sufficient to recall Formosus, whose body was dragged from the tomb, brought before judges, condemned and thrown into the Tiber (897); Stephen, whose throat was cut; John X., who was strangled in prison; John XII., who died amidst debauchery; Boniface VII., who had two popes, his rivals, killed, and was in turn massacred, drawn through the streets, and cast before the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius of the Lateran (985).

**20. Reign of Crescentius at Rome. A German Emperor and Pope (996).**—After this last scandal the temporal power of the city was held by a Roman of noble family, John Crescentius, who ruled for more than ten years with the title of patrician. Otto III. then interfered. His first act was to choose as successor to John XV., who had just died, his own cousin Bruno, who assumed the name of Gregory V. (May 3, 996). To the men of that time the nomination seemed incredible. Since Zachary, who was of Syrian origin, and during two centuries and a half, there had been, in fact, but two popes out of the forty-seven who were not born in Rome or in the Papal States. After Gregory V., the Papacy broke through the narrow bonds of the city and Roman aristocracy; all nations might concur in giving the sovereign pontiff to the Church, as formerly the provinces would give an emperor to Rome. Thus interpreted, the Papacy answered much better the universal idea of Catholicism. The first act of the new Pope was to crown Otto III. emperor (May 21). It was a great triumph for Germany to have as rulers in the West a German emperor and a German pope. Crescentius dared to fortify himself in the old mausoleum of Hadrian, converted into the fortress of Saint Angelo; he was taken, hanged, and suspended by his feet, with twelve of his companions, on

the summit of a hill near the city, formerly called *Mons gaudii*, to-day Monte Mario (998).

**21. Otto III. and Sylvester II. The Fictitious Donation of Constantine.**—Soon after Gregory V. died Otto selected Gerbert, the first of the French popes, as his successor. Gerbert, it will be remembered, had always been attached to his family. After the deposition of Arnulf, the enemy of Hugh Capet, he had been elected archbishop of Rheims, but he voluntarily relinquished this French office after the rendering of a judgment against him by a German council. From the end of 997 he had been living at the court of Otto III.; the archbishopric of Ravenna had but just been given him, one of the first in Italy, when he was made Pope. He took the name of Sylvester II., which alone implied the ideas of the new pontiff. Sylvester I. (314-335), whose history is mostly legendary, was Pope at the time Christianity became one of the official religions of the Roman Empire. It was to him that the famous donation of Constantine was said to have been made. That Otto III. should be a second Constantine, as gracious as the first to the Church, was the thought of Sylvester II. The memories of imperial Rome appealed to the visionary mind of Otto III.; yet he meant to reign in Rome, hence he must lower the Pope to the simple rank of patriarch. The pretensions of the two powers were irreconcilable; however, Otto and Sylvester were friends, and remained so.

**22. Otto All Powerful at Rome. His Greatness and Illusions.**—Otto III. strove to conceal his control under the many favours which he showered upon the Holy See. In Rome, his true capital, he built himself a palace on the Aventine. He established there the old imperial court, with the court of the sacred palace, and the old administration with its patrician, prefect of the city, and

palatine judges. He spoke in the name of the Senate and the Roman people. He decorated himself with the titles of *Italicus*, *Saxonicus*, *Romanus*, to which was added in assumed humility *servus apostolorum*, and *servus J. Christi*. His military expeditions were varied by periods of rest, which he spent in pilgrimages to the most revered shrines of Italy. But in the midst of these illusions of devotion and power, he lost his grasp on the realities of life, and the force of his government was weakened abroad. The Danes and Slavs began fresh invasions; the Hungarians organised a kingdom and ceased to pay tribute; France won independence under the Capetians; Italy, even, was disturbed—by the claims of the Lombard, Arduin, to the crown. Much wretchedness was, therefore, hidden under the brilliant appearance of a close union of Empire and Papacy. The death of Otto (January 23, 1002), which was almost contemporaneous with that of Sylvester II. (May 12, 1003), almost opened the whole question once more.

**23. Henry II., the Saint, 1002-1024.**—Otto died childless at the age of twenty-two. His cousin Henry took possession of the insignia of royalty, but he too had to spend four years in wars against the German feudal lords in order to retain the power. However, he was worthy of it. In naming him Saint, the chroniclers lead one to believe that he sacrificed his duties as sovereign to his religious predilections. This was not so. He renounced the illusions of Otto III., and loved Germany more than the Empire.

**24. Henry II. Reforms the Church for the Benefit of the State.**—More completely and more resolutely than any of his predecessors did Henry II. turn for aid to the episcopacy; yet he persisted in restraining its independence. He withdrew from some churches the right of

election which the Ottos had granted them. He chose as bishops the most capable clerks of his chancery; yet he transplanted them to other dioceses, where they were strangers by birth and education. There they were constrained to serve the state before everything else. Despite their electoral privileges, he was not afraid to put the royal abbeys in charge of abbots whose spirit of order and reform was known to him. Frequently monks left their houses in a body, as a protest against the violation of their privileges. The king seized this opportunity to diminish the amount of property whose revenues were applied to their support, and to place a larger amount at the disposition of the abbot; the latter would take advantage of this to create new fiefs, increase the number of vassals from whom military service might be required for the abbey, and consequently for the king. This policy was followed by Henry's successors, and forty years after his death the royal abbeys were considered as royal domains.

**25. Henry II. Enlarges the Privileges of the Nobility, yet Restrains It.**—At the same time Henry II. increased the privileges of the nobility. First he recognised implicitly the hereditary of benefices; then he called the great seigniors to his council. He took no serious resolution without consulting them. Gradually the court assemblies of the king (*Hoftage*) became political reunions or diets (*Reichstage*). The change did not then become dangerous to royal prerogatives, since Henry, with his diplomatic ability and wonderful eloquence, could almost always carry his point; yet it was heavy with consequences for the future. On the other hand, he was able to exact from the nobles strict observance of the public peace. Private wars were severely punished. This was the beginning of a special legislation for Germany, which eventually increased in importance.



**26. Henry II. in Italy.**—After this was accomplished Henry wished for the title of emperor. Leading a small army, whose expenses were almost entirely defrayed by the bishops, he entered Lombardy, celebrated Christmas at Pavia (1013), in the midst of a vast concourse of bishops and abbots, and was crowned at Rome by Benedict VIII. (February 14, 1014). Seven years later the Pope calling him against the Greeks, who had just recovered the whole of Apulia, he took Troja, Capua, and Salerno; Naples and Amalfi acknowledged his sovereignty; but fresh difficulties recalled him to Germany. His efforts to conquer Poland and the kingdom of Burgundy were unsuccessful. He died when he had just come to an agreement with the king of France, Robert the Pious, in the conferences at Ivoy on the River Chiers. They had planned to work together towards the reform of the Church. He was the last of the house of Saxony, which gave such glory to Germany, and which almost accomplished the restoration, in all its political and moral greatness, of Charlemagne's Empire (1024).

**27. Conrad II., 1024-1039.**—The course of affairs was in no wise changed by this death and the accession of Conrad of Franconia, who was elected at the diet of Gamba (September 8, 1024). He had to begin again the labour of Sisyphus of his predecessors, in establishing order, which was disturbed at the opening of each new reign. It is sufficient to note that he annexed the kingdom of Burgundy to the Germanic crown, and granted liberties to the vavasours,—that is to say, the lesser Italian nobility,—in the Constitution of Pavia, promulgated in 1037. After an energetic and successful reign of fifteen years he passed over to his son Henry III., the Black, a considerable power, which reached its highest point under this prince.

**28. Alliances of Henry III. His Hegemony in Europe.**—Henry III. was twenty-two on his accession, in 1039, which was uncontested. He was educated in letters and law; he had fought honourably against the Bohemians, and was piously ambitious, as had been the Ottos. Strong through the unanimity of his reception, he wished his supremacy to be acknowledged by all princes and all the neighbouring peoples. In Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary he was successful; his western frontier was assured by his marriage with Agnes of Poitou, daughter of William the Great, duke of Aquitaine, and related to the last national dukes of Burgundy and Italy. He joined in the efforts made, on various sides, towards ecclesiastical reform, and wished to take the direction of it into his own hands, so as to establish his hegemony in Europe.

**29. Henry III. Reforms and Controls the Papacy.**—His first move was towards the reform of the Papacy, which had aroused scandal by a fresh schism. A council, assembled at Lutri, deposed the three claimants to the tiara, and accepted the candidate of Henry III., bishop of Bamberg, who was Clement II. (Christmas, 1046). Clement II. gave his sovereign the imperial crown, who assumed also the title of patrician. When the German Pope died (October 9, 1047) Henry replaced him, without election or advice, by the bishop of Brixen, Damasus II., who reigned a few days only; then followed an Alsatian, bishop of Toul, Leo IX., 1048-1054, and finally the bishop of Eichstädt, Victor II., (1054-1057). Never had the Church been so completely subservient to the state. Unhappily for his work, Henry III. died too soon, when he was thirty-nine years old.

**30. Zenith of Imperial Power.**—The imperial power, restored by the Ottos, reached its highest point during the Middle Ages at this date. Until then it had steadily in-

creased. It had built up an efficient political organisation; it had made of Germany a nation. In this people, whose path across civilisation had been marked by ruins, it had developed a love of learning and arts. But it was now reaching a turning point. Henry III. left one child of six years. Therefore all the elements of civil discord had time to develop. The most momentous fact is that the Church profited by them to shake off the control in which she had been held by the state until that time, and to contest with it the possession of the empire of the world.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### EMPEROR AND POPE—CHURCH REFORM—GREGORY VII.\*

**1. Necessity of Church Reform. Simony and the Marriage of Priests.**—There was immediate and urgent necessity for reform in the Church during the middle of the eleventh century. It was corrupted by two evils: simony or traffic in holy things;† and the marriage of priests. Although marriage had been condemned repeatedly, not only that of bishops and priests, but also of deacons, there was not a single Catholic state in which this rule was rigidly observed. The evil was more extended in Lombardy than elsewhere. Priests lived there publicly

\* **SOURCES.**—Aside from the various monastic annals, the principal sources for this period are the universal chronicles of Bernold ("Mon. Germ.," v.), and Berthold (*Ibid.*), of Ekkehard of Urach ("Mon. Germ.," vi.), of Sigebert of Gembloux (*Ibid.*), the "Historia de Vita Henrici," iv. ("Mon. Germ.," xii.), the "Carmen de bello Saxonico" (edited Holder-Egger, 1889); the lamentations of Bonitho of Sutri over the misfortunes of the Church (edited Jaffé: "Mon. Gregoriana"), and the apology of Henry IV., by Benzo of Alba ("Mon. Germ.," xi.). The life of Gregory VII. will be found in the collection of the Bollandists, in volume vi. of May. The acts and letters of Gregory VII. were published by Jaffé in his "Monumenta Gregoriana." See also the "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum," as before. The sources relative to the quarrel over investitures were published in "Monumenta Germaniæ."

**LITERATURE.**—W. v. Giesebrecht, as above; Declarc, "Saint Grégoire VII. et la Réforme de l'Eglise"; Sackur, "Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit."

† The origin of the word simony is found in the incident recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter viii., verses 9-26.

with their wives, transmitted benefices to their children, and provided dowries for their daughters out of the property of the Church. These lucrative marriages were sought by lay nobles, since they united in a double bond of family and political interest the high clergy and nobility. Simony was widespread, especially in France, where the clergy, less involved in services of the state, was also less closely watched. Protests against these loose habits were not lacking. Among the most eloquent men of those who inveighed against this evil was Peter Damiani of Ravenna, cardinal-bishop of Ostia. He wrote and dedicated to Pope Leo IX. a virulent treatise called: "The Book of Gomorrah." He exhorted the Church to take action against herself. "The reform must come from Rome," he said. Yet reform did not come from Rome at first; it began in Cluny.

**2. Cluny. Its Ideas of Reform.**—The abbey of Cluny, in French Burgundy, was founded in 910; it adopted in all its early severity the Benedictine rule, which had been revived for the third time. It was dominated by a novel spirit of discipline and hierarchical order; the monasteries which it started and those which adopted its rule were closely united under, and blindly followed, the supreme authority of the abbot. Soon the "black monks," as they were called, because of their costume, reached the point at which they wished to introduce a similar hierarchy in the secular clergy; all churches were to be subject to the bishop of Rome, as all Cluniac abbeys recognised the supremacy of the abbot of Cluny. The False Decretals proved valuable documents to them in carrying out their designs. Our monks' conception of the world even was peculiar. They considered it the outcome of two principles: one superior, which was the ecclesiastical power; the other inferior, represented by the secular

power. The latter came from Nimrod, the former from Christ. The Church, therefore, daughter of the spirit of light, should guide and control the world. The greatest Pope of the Middle Ages, Gregory VII., was inspired by these doctrines.

**3. Hildebrand. His Youth.**—His name was Hildebrand. He was born about the year 1020 in the territory of the small Tuscan town of Soana, now depopulated by marsh fevers. His father was neither a poor shepherd, as has been said, nor a carpenter at Rome; he was a peasant of free condition, who lived at Soana on his own property. One of Hildebrand's maternal uncles was abbot of a rich monastery, Saint Mary on the Aventine, where the teachings of Cluny were in favour; there he was brought up. In 1045—he was then twenty-five—he became chaplain to Gregory VI. Hildebrand forsook regretfully the peaceful retreat which left such deep impressions on his mind and heart; born for the world and action, he felt ever a lively pleasure in the cloistered life. Later, as cardinal and Pope, he remained the monk, longing for silence, living in contemplation of the future, which he believed he foresaw, and which he loved to predict. Physically, he was a puny man, with a weak voice, yet he had a fiery soul and indomitable energy.

**4. Hildebrand in Germany and at Cluny.**—As chaplain of Gregory VI. he was faithful to him, even after the latter had been deposed at the council of Sutri (1046). He followed him into exile, to Worms, Speyer, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle; yet he was graciously received by Henry III. and his queen, whose kindness he never forgot. The imperial ideas which he assimilated while with them were added to those gained at Cluny, to build up in his mind the conception of a universal and theocratic monarchy. On Gregory's death he retreated to Cluny, but the abbot

gave him as a companion to the new Pope, Leo IX., and he returned to Italy with him (1049). Made subdeacon and cardinal of the Roman church, entrusted with the direction of municipal affairs and the finances of the Holy See, he soon held the first place after the sovereign pontiff. His political apprenticeship was ended, and his active career begun. Shortly after he was sent as legate to France. He there violently opposed simony. Three years later he was sent to Germany to obtain the consent of Empress Agnes to the hurried election of Stephen IX. (1057). Complete disorder reigned there, and he returned convinced that Church reform could not be accomplished by the Empire, on which he had counted up to that time. Under Nicholas II., whom he had had elected almost forcibly in 1058, he formulated two acts which had the most serious consequences.

#### 5. Decree of the Lateran on the Election of Popes, 1059.

**The Church Freed from the State.**—At first he assembled a council at the Lateran (1059). There it was decreed that henceforth the right of electing the sovereign pontiff should belong exclusively to the cardinals; that is to say, to those who were either bishops in Roman territory, or priests and bishops in the parishes of Rome; the people and clergy should only give their consent. As for the emperor, certain ambiguous phrases accorded him a vague, but illusive, right of confirmation; and lastly the Pope was to be chosen in preference from the Roman Church. Although the famous decree of 1059 does not seem to have been dictated by a feeling of animosity towards the emperor, it opposed the college of cardinals to the aristocratic “senate”; it transferred to the former the rights hitherto exercised by the patrician body, and as this body was a part of the Empire, by the emperor. It freed the Church, without saying so, and paved the

way for the war between sacerdotalism and imperialism. The work of the council of the Lateran did not end here. It renewed the judgments which so many times already had been passed on married priests. But laws are not obeyed unless they are in harmony with habits and customs. Now, just at this time a favourable reaction had set in in certain countries towards the ideas of the Church, especially in Lombardy. The signal was given at Milan. The ragged populace, the "Pataria," as it was called, rose up against the simoniacal and married priests. Social and political ideas inspired the movement as well as religious ones: the lower class, almost ignored by history for several centuries, raised its head to shake off the yoke of its masters, bishops and vavasours, hated for the double reason that they were allies, and that they alone possessed lands and honours and control.

The second service which Hildebrand rendered the Papacy was to obtain for it the support of the Normans.

**6. Establishment of the Normans in Southern Italy.**—At the beginning of the eleventh century mercenaries from Normandy had attained great renown for bravery, cunning, and cruelty in the service of Lombard dukes. Rainulf, one of their chiefs, was successful in obtaining the grant of a fief in a part of fertile Campania; it was raised to a county by Conrad II., with Aversa for capital. Other Normans, led by William of the Iron Arm and his brothers Drogo, Humphrey, Robert Guiscard, and Roger, settled in Apulia. They were soon strong enough to contest the important city of Benevento with Leo IX., who had just seized it. Three thousand of their number totally defeated the small pontifical army near the mouth of the Fortore, on the ruins of the ancient Teanum Apulum, where the Greeks had built a fortress simply called the City, Civitella. The Pope was made prisoner,



but bought his liberty with the town of Benevento (July 10, 1053). He died soon after, not having pardoned them his defeat.

**7. The Normans, Allies of the Holy See.**—With the advice of Hildebrand, Nicolas II. pursued a different course. A treaty, the work of a council held at Melfi, gave them complete absolution for their offences towards the Holy See; Robert Guiscard was granted the title of duke of Apulia and Calabria, under the suzerainty of the Pope; Robert, Count of Aversa, was made prince and invested with the duchy of Capua. The duke of Apulia and the prince of Capua swore fealty to the Pope, and promised not only to furnish him troops against his enemies, but an annual payment of twelve denarii of Pavia for every plough-team. The reform party gained a triple victory. At one time its progress had been threatened by the disorders following on the death of Nicolas II. (June 27, 1061); its cause was now assured by the accession of Hildebrand to the pontifical throne.

**8. Accession of Gregory VII., 1073. His Views.**—The election of Gregory VII. was not in accord with the decree of 1059. He was chosen by popular vote, and was almost compelled by force to assume the tiara, the cardinals merely ratifying the choice of the people (April 22, 1073). On Saint Peter's throne he remained what he had been in the monk's gown or the cardinal's robe. His purpose was to complete the reform begun, place the Church under his sovereign authority, and above all other powers of the world. A Roman by education, if not by birth, his dream was to build up a universal monarchy with Rome as its capital and the Pope as its ruler. He wrote with perfect sincerity: "Human pride invented the power of kings, divine pity established that of bishops." His political maxims were given out at his own dictation: "The Pope

is the only man whose feet should be kissed by all peoples; he is empowered to depose emperors; if he is elected according to the canons, he is a saint by virtue of the merits of Saint Peter." He looked upon his office as that of supreme judge of the earth, and he believed himself the vehicle of absolute truth. "The Roman Church has never erred, and Holy Writ declares that it will never err"; resistance to him meant resistance to God, even, and involved the punishments inflicted by divine justice. He was prodigal of the weapon of excommunication, which banishes the culprit from participation in the sacraments, and of anathema, which cuts him off from the community of the faithful. When it was necessary he did not hesitate to resort to force. "Cursed be the man," said he one day, "who refrains from dipping his sword in blood!" His conception of the duties of his office, and not ambition for absolute power, dictated the course of his actions; and his were the views of the best theologians of his time.

**9. Government of the Church. The Legates.**—To reign is to act; Gregory VII. was preëminently a man of action. He wished to know all and do all. He surrounded himself with advisers, gathering together each year, at Lent and often towards All Saints Day, archbishops and bishops, who were often called from a distance and who were not allowed to delay or excuse themselves from answering his summons. When he had resolved upon any course his orders were given imperiously, and his agents were required to inform him immediately and accurately as to the manner in which they had been carried out. From time to time legates had been employed by his predecessors, and they had been given full authority to conclude the matters entrusted to them; Gregory VII. used them effectively in carrying out his policy. They

were not only high dignitaries of the Church, but sometimes humble deacons, who had to be obeyed. He inspired them with his enthusiasm, but knew also how to restrain their excessive zeal. In order to impose his universal authority, these legates did not hesitate to infringe on the rights of individual churches, to interfere in episcopal elections, and suspend or depose bishops. They were the representatives of the Holy See at foreign courts: with Philip I. of France, William I. of England, for whom Gregory VII. always felt peculiar affection, of Henry IV. of Germany, the kings of Spain, Hungary, Denmark, even the grand-duke of Russia. They demanded everywhere, and often obtained, Peter's pence. Like power had never been wielded by a Pope; he watched over the interests of all Christianity, and, ignoring the schism which separated the Greek and Latin Churches, he thought at one time of sending a large Christian army to defend Constantinople against the Seljuk Turks.

**10. Reform of the Clergy.**—But though he wished to reign, it was in the interests of a transformed, moral, and softened Christian world. Priests were expected to set an example, and he began his reform with them. A first council assembled at the Lateran (March 9, 1074) forbade priests, deacons, and all clerks to “take wives or dwell with women”; he condemned to “the same punishment as Simon the Magician,” any person who might have bought or sold an office whatsoever—namely, of bishop, priest, deacon, or provost, etc. The following year these prohibitions were formally renewed; he condemned five counsellors of the king of Germany, convicted of simony; suspended the archbishops of Bremen, the bishops of Speyer and Strasburg, two Lombard bishops, and deposed the bishop of Florence. Moreover, the right to appoint to bishoprics was denied kings, and they were advised to

“allow all capable persons to enter freely the sacred ministry.” Wishing liberty for the Church, that she might direct the state, was to declare war on royalty. Henry IV., victorious on the shores of the Unstrutt (June 8, 1075) over the German feudal lords, had just completed the restoration of royal authority. Fate willed that the conflict should burst forth between the king and Pope at the precise moment when these two powers, having their forces well in hand, and carried away by the enthusiasm of first success, were the most incapable of making concessions.

**11. Quarrel of Investitures. Henry IV. and Gregory VII.**—Henry IV., the conqueror of feudalism, had in fact wished to be master of his Church; he dispensed ecclesiastical dignities as he saw fit, choosing, however, his candidates worthily; according to custom, he granted them investiture in their office, with crosier and ring. Thus he violated the decree of Gregory VII., yet how could he govern, if he were not master of his functionaries? Gregory VII. protested. Should the son of Henry III. bend the neck at the threats of a priest, in whom he could only recognise a rebellious subject? At a council of German bishops convoked at Worms (January 24, 1076), a violent accusation was brought against the Pope, who was charged with an evil life and baneful ambition; Gregory VII. was then deposed, and royal agents were sent to Rome to persuade the clergy and the people to choose his successor.

**12. Excommunication of Henry IV., 1076.**—Gregory VII. replied by opening in the Lateran (February 24) a council of French and Italian bishops. The insulting letters in which Henry IV. announced to the Romans and the Pope the decision at Worms were publicly read; then he pronounced the anathemá against his adversaries, for-

bade Henry IV. "to govern the German kingdom and Italy," and released all Christians from their oath of allegiance to him. The sentence, an unheard-of one until then, made a profound impression, not only in France, Burgundy, and Italy, but even in Germany, where some abbots and priests, won over to the projects of reform, were valuable papal auxiliaries. What was still more serious was that the political enemies of Henry IV. took heart immediately. An assembly of prelates and princes met at Tribur, an ill-omened spot, declared that the Pope was right in excommunicating the king, and that the latter should no longer reign (October 16). Abandoned by the greater number of his counsellors and partisans, repulsed by the Pope, who refused to receive him, even as a penitent, at Rome, threatened with another council to be convoked at Augsburg under Gregory VII., the wretched prince lost courage, and departed secretly from Speyer, in the dead of winter, to go and prostrate himself at the feet of his sovereign pontiff.

**13. Henry IV. at Canossa, 1077.**—Gregory VII. was then living at Canossa, in a fortress belonging to the Countess Matilda, a devoted adherent of the Holy See. He was not safe in Lombardy, where his decrees against simony and priestly marriage had aroused such furious opposition; but Henry was too eager to obtain absolution to make capital out of this discontent. He reached the impregnable fortress almost alone; the doors remained closed. "During three days," wrote the Pope, "he waited there, despoiled of all the attributes of royalty, barefooted, in a woollen garment, tearfully imploring the aid and consolation of apostolic pity." At last the Pope, yielding to the prayers of his household, admitted the king to his presence. It was a spectacle to move the souls of the multitude, this proud successor of the Ottos, the king full

of strength and youth, "of form and beauty suited to an emperor," prostrate at the feet of the frail man, nervous and slender, who was so exalted above him by his title of prince of the apostles and vicar of Saint Peter. Moved to tears, Gregory VII. in his turn lifted him, gave him absolution, and the kiss of peace (January 28, 1077), yet the menace of excommunication still hung over his head. The struggle was therefore not ended; moreover, the two adversaries could not come to an agreement, for they were moved by irreconcilable principles, and their partisans were too eager in the fight not to urge them to extremes.

**14. Henry IV. Contests his Throne with Other Claimants. He Creates an Antipope.**—Henry IV. reassumed the royal insignia on his return to Germany. His enemies immediately assembled in a diet at Forchheim in the presence of two pontifical legates, pronounced his deposition, and gave the succession to his brother-in-law, Rudolf of Rheinfelden, duke of Swabia and governor of Burgundy (March, 1078). A furious civil war then burst forth. Desperate battles were fought with no result. Henry, deposed again (March, 1080), caused Gregory VII. to be proclaimed in a council at Brixen (May), "false priest, despoiler of churches, and necromancer"; then Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, was proclaimed Pope, and took the name of Clement III. Defeated near Grona, between the Elster and the Saale, in a furious battle in which at least his adversary was killed (October 15), Henry IV. moved on into Italy, took, at Milan, the iron crown, and marched with his Pope on to Rome, there to assume the imperial crown.

**15. Henry IV. at Rome. Sacking of the City by Germans and Normans, 1084.**—The situation was critical for Gregory VII. In the south he was at enmity with the

Normans and their leader, Robert Guiscard; the Tuscan cities of the north, governed by his ally, Countess Matilda, revolted against their sovereign, and received the king of Germany, who showered privileges upon them. Finally Henry IV. entered Rome after a long struggle, enthroned his Pope, who, in turn, crowned him emperor (March 31, 1084). He occupied the two extremities of the city, Saint Peter, and the Lateran; Gregory VII. kept his foothold in the castle of Saint Angelo. Fierce engagements took place between the two parties in the narrow winding streets; the Germans took the capitol by assault. The Pope would have been compelled to yield, if Robert Guiscard, whose success in southern Italy would have been endangered by the emperor's triumph, had not hastily left the siege of Durazzo and flown to his assistance. The Germans dared not await his coming, and he entered the city and delivered the Pope (May 28). However, his followers, beginning to pillage the city, the Romans resisted. The imperial party sought to turn this diversion to their own profit, and again took up arms; but the Normans were the stronger. They overpowered their enemies, and wreaked frightful vengeance upon them; many of the inhabitants were massacred, others put in prison; and women and children were sold into slavery.

**16. Death of Gregory VII., 1085.**—Gregory VII. could not remain in a city whose ruin might be ascribed to his policy and the violence of his partisans. He followed Robert Guiscard to his states, and soon died at Salerno (May 25, 1085). His last words, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore, I die in exile," reveal the bitterness of a soul disappointed in its hopes, but firm in its convictions.

**17. Death of Henry IV., 1106. Significance of his Struggle with the Church.**—After a few years of quiet the

struggle began again with Urban II., a French Pope, who had been prior of Cluny; then with Pascal II. These popes, not content with raising up new claimants against Henry IV., incited his sons to rebellion. The old emperor died at last of privation and sorrow at Liège (August 7, 1106). He was persecuted beyond the tomb, for it was not until 1111 that his son, Henry V., could obtain an authorisation to bury him in holy ground. This was the wretched ending of a reign that was not deficient in greatness. Henry survived Gregory VII. twenty years, and through his obstinate resistance prevented the Church from obtaining a complete victory. The empire had been conquered in his person, yet it was still standing, and by that fact alone it made impossible the establishment of the theocratic despotism dreamed of by Gregory VII. Henry had struggled all his life to defend royal authority, which was first imperilled by the nobles, then by the Church, and lastly by his own sons; and it transpired that he had actually, without wishing it, fought for civil liberty. On one hand the popes had turned to the municipal democracies of Italy to uphold them against the high clergy and nobility; in the same way the emperor called upon the bourgeoisie of the cities to help him. Popular liberty could not but be benefited in this mortal struggle between two powers, both of which tended towards absolute monarchy.

**18. End of the Quarrel of Investitures. The Concordat of Worms, 1122.**—Henry V. was deceptive, greedy, heartless towards his enemies, and pitiless to the poor. During his father's life he had been subservient to priests and complacent with princes; once king, he wished supreme power, as his predecessors had done, and was fatally drawn on into wars with German feudal lords and the Papacy. In 1110 he invaded Italy; pitilessly razed Arezzo, which



had threatened resistance; and marched on to Rome, with fair words on his lips and hatred of the papal power in his heart.

Pope Pascal II. suggested a radical means of ending the quarrel. He offered to renounce all feudal possessions, duchies, counties, cities, and castles that were held by priests in feudal tenure; the right of investiture, which the sovereign assumed, would be eliminated in that way, and the Church, thus relieved, would cease to be an enemy of the state. The plan was feasible in Italy, where the quarrel of investitures tended merely to weaken the power of the bishops for the benefit of the cities; it was impracticable in Germany, whose ecclesiastical principalities were the firmest supporters of the empire. Besides this, the clergy was, throughout, hostile to a plan that would have destroyed its temporal power. The conflict went on more bitterly than ever. The king gained but one advantage,—an illusive one, moreover,—that of being crowned at Rome (1111). He was finally obliged to yield. To disarm his enemies, he gave up their confiscated possessions, and promised to submit to the diet all important political questions; then he began negotiations with the Pope. After long discussions an agreement or “Concordat” was finally concluded at Worms on an equitable basis for both parties. The emperor yielded all right of investiture by crosier and ring, which was henceforth reserved for the Pope or bishop who might have to consecrate the newly elected priest. All churches in the empire were granted freedom of canonical elections and episcopal consecration. The Pope, on his side, acknowledged in Henry the right to be present at the election of bishops and abbots of the empire, yet he might not use simony or violence; “the candidate shall receive from him, with the sceptre, regal rights and shall fulfil exactly

all his duties as vassal" (September 23, 1123). The following year a general council held at Rome announced again all the principles of reform, which was henceforth triumphant. The quarrel of investitures ended in an urgent call to the truce of God and the crusades.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### THE GUELFs AND HOHENSTAUFEN—ALEXANDER III. AND FREDERICK I., BARBAROSSA.\*

1. **The Guelfs.**—Henry V. having died childless (May 23, 1125), the ecclesiastical and lay princes assembled at Mainz in the presence of two papal legates. Three families naturally were suggested to the electors: the Guelfs, Hohenstaufen, and Saxon. The Guelfs were already powerful in Germany at the end of the Carolingian period; their lands were situated in the Allgau, to the north of Lake Constance, in the central valleys of the Iller and Lech. Henry IV. had bestowed the title of hereditary duke of Bavaria on a Guelf; the two sons of the latter, Guelf V. and Henry the Black, married, one Matilda, grand duchess of Tuscany, the other a Saxon princess, who brought him extended domains in Luneburg, Brunswick, and the basin of the Aller.

2. **The Hohenstaufen.**—The Staufen, or Hohenstaufen, were a Swabian family. The constancy of Frederick the

\* **SOURCES.**—Besides the monastic Annals (see Wattenbach and the appendices of v. Giesebrecht), the most important chronicles for this period are that of Otto of Freising, continued by Rahewin and by Otto of Saint-Blaise ("Mon. Germ.," xx.), and that of Godfrey of Viterbo ("Mon. Germ.," xxii.). Godfrey composed, moreover, a poem on the capture of Milan, and Gunther a poem in ten books on Frederick I., called: "Ligurinus" (edition Dümge, 1812).

**LITERATURE.**—W. v. Giesebrecht, as above; Prutz, "Kaiser Frederick I.;" Browning, "Guelphs and Ghibellines"; Scholz, "Beitraege zur Geschichte der Hoheitsrechte des deutschen Koenigs zur Zeit der ersten Staufen."

Old and his sons, Conrad and Frederick of One Eye, to Henry IV. and Henry V. during the quarrel of investitures, made his fortune; the first was given the duchy of Swabia and Conrad that of Franconia. These titles stood for territorial possessions that were even more substantial. Frederick the Old had gradually acquired all the land lying between Basel and Mainz; he was master of the plain and mountain; it was said of him that "he always had a castle tied to his horse's tail." He came to be lord paramount of the nobles on the Rhine and Neckar, and organised a military force able to control the powerful episcopal seigniories of Worms, Speyer, and Strasburg.

**3. The House of Saxony. Election of Lothaire II., 1125.**—The Guelfs and Staufen had been faithful servants of the Empire. In Saxony, on the contrary, a spirit of independence had made rapid and disquieting advances during the minority of Henry IV. and the long war against the Church. The bitterest enemy of the Empire in that country had been Otto of Nordheim. His vast possessions were transmitted to Lothaire of Supplinburg, who carried on his policy. Remaining the real master of lower Germany, he spent the ten years following in constant struggles with the Wends; he increased his power in Brunswick, Misnia, and Lusatia. This ambitious adversary of imperial hegemony was a sincere partisan of ecclesiastical reform; for this reason he was finally chosen as king.\* He was sixty years old, yet he kept, as king, the warlike ardour which had made his fortune.

**4. Election of the Ghibelline, Conrad III., 1138.**—This election dashed the hopes of the Guelfs, and especially the Hohenstaufen, which had been raised by the vacancy in the throne. Lothaire anticipated their designs; he hin-

\* He is known under the name of Lothaire II.; Lothaire I. was the son of Louis the Pious, whom he succeeded.

dered an alliance between them by giving his daughter and only heir in marriage to Henry the Proud, who had just succeeded his father, Henry the Black (1127); then he attacked Frederick of One Eye, and captured Speyer after a heroic resistance. Yet at his death his son-in-law did not ascend the throne, but Conrad of Hohenstaufen, who, born in the castle of Waiblingen, is the first in history to bear the name of Ghibelline. Conrad was hurriedly crowned by the archbishop of Mainz (1138). Thereupon the Welfs, or Guelfs, took up arms. The premature death of Henry the Proud, of a malignant fever, at the age of thirty-five, and the defeat of his brother Welf VI., overcome by the Ghibelline under the walls of Weinsberg, forced them to come to terms. Conrad III. accorded honourable conditions to his rivals. Henry the Proud's widow married the margrave of Austria, twin brother of the new king, who was made duke of Bavaria, and his son, Henry the Lion, received the duchy of Saxony. The first struggle between Guelfs and Ghibellines was so thoroughly settled that Frederick I., nephew of Conrad III., peacefully succeeded him in 1152.

**5. Frederick I. Both Guelf and Ghibelline. Description and Character.**—Frederick I. was at that time thirty-one years old. He had shortly before inherited from his father, Frederick of One Eye, the duchy of Swabia (1147); his mother was a daughter of Henry the Black, duke of Bavaria. In this way he was cousin to Henry the Lion, and both Guelf and Ghibelline. Moreover, he was worthy of the crown, and no other German sovereign reigned more brilliantly. He was intelligent, resolute, and naturally eloquent, especially in German; he knew Latin, but spoke it poorly. He never forgot persons whom he had once seen, for he was gifted with a remarkable memory; he was religious and charitable. Physically, he is de-

scribed as being tall and slender, with regular features, a quiet, placid expression, beautiful hands and mouth, with superb teeth; his eyes were sparkling and light-coloured, complexion white, with beard and hair red, whence his surname Barbarossa. His charming, noble qualities were developed by his participation in important affairs during his youth, which prepared him for the profession of a king. He had helped Conrad III. in his wars and councils; he had fought at his side in the second crusade, and was almost the only one to come out of it honourably. Early in life he chose Charlemagne as his model, and he aspired, like him and Otto the Great, to rule Christian Europe and the Church. He held definite opinions on the rights of sovereigns, which were learned from the juriconsults who taught the Justinian law at Bologna; that is to say, the theory of imperial despotism. Of a generous nature, capable of planning and executing vast projects, he was also proud, cruel, and greedy for power.

**6. Division of his Reign.**—His reign may be divided into three broad periods: in the first he directed his efforts towards the establishment of the authority of the Empire in Europe; in the second he organised Germany, and destroyed the hostile power of the Guelfs; during the third he led a new crusade to the East, where he met his death. In Italy, two serious events rendered the situation a complicated one: the formation of a Norman kingdom in the south of the peninsula, and the Roman revolution.

**7. Formation of the Norman Kingdom of Sicily.**—Robert II., nephew of Robert Guiscard, was a remarkable statesman. Count of Sicily, in the right of his father, Roger I., he dispossessed his cousin William, son of Guiscard, of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria, and thus laid the foundations of political unity for the Norman state (1121). Soon after, there was dissension among the car-

dinals, on the death of Honorius II., and it happened that two popes were elected at once: Innocent II. and Anacletus (1130). <sup>Roger</sup> Roger II. upheld the latter, who was his brother-in-law, while the kings of France and of Germany declared for his rival. Yet he forced him to declare him king of Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia, though under the suzerainty of the Holy See, and subject to an annual payment of six hundred pieces of gold. Shortly after, Innocent II. was brought back to Rome by the victorious German troops; but he fell into the hands of the Norman, who compelled him to ratify the treaty imposed on the antipope nine years before. Henceforth the legality of his royal title was unimpeachable. It was an obstacle to the control which the emperors dreamed of establishing over Italy, and a danger to the Papacy, held in check by the dreaded forces of Germans and Normans.

**8. Revolution at Rome. The Republic, 1143.**—About this same time a revolution broke out in Rome. While most of the Italian cities had established municipal republics, favoured by industrial and commercial activity, and even by the civil wars and crusades, the Eternal City had remained stationary. As the political and religious capital of the Empire, its masters, though rivals, were too powerful to make early emancipation possible; it had, moreover, neither industry nor commerce, and therefore had no source of independent power. It is true that the people, assembled at the Capitol, shared in the election of prefect and Pope and bore the proud title of *Populus Romanus*. But the power was held by the country nobility, or an oligarchy made up of those who styled themselves haughtily *Consules Romanorum*. The nobility of the provinces, holding their fiefs under the Pope, were for this reason almost entirely excluded from the government, as well as the simple knights, vassals of nobles and

churches, who corresponded to the vavasours in Lombardy. However, the establishment of Tuscan and Lombard republics, added to the memories of antiquity revived by the study of the Roman law of Justinian, prepared men's minds for a revolution. It broke forth during the reign of Conrad III., the only one of the German kings, since Otto the Great, who did not wear the imperial crown. In 1143 the people, aroused to violence, took the Capitol by assault and overthrew the power of the consuls, whose place was taken by a municipal council (*Senatus*). The lesser country nobility, hating the consuls, supported the movement; while the provincial nobility gathered under the Pope's standard. From its beginning the young Roman republic was torn by factions, which were kept alive by still another agitator, the celebrated Arnold of Brescia.

**9. Arnold of Brescia.**—Arnold was a disciple of the Frenchman Abelard. After studying with him dialectics and theology, he returned to his native city, where he became a regular canon. He was of austere life and exalted opinions. From his point of view, civil power should be vested exclusively in princes and republics; the clergy should be supported exclusively on tithes, for the possession of land was contrary to the canons of the Church, and non-Christian. Like ideas had inspired the Milanese Patarini, and Pascal II. himself; but times had changed. The bishops of Brescia denounced the author at a council of the Lateran, and had him condemned as a heretic. Arnold then went back to France, where he took an active part in the last struggles in which his master, Abelard, was overcome; but Saint Bernard persuaded the king to expel him. Then he took refuge in Switzerland, then in Rome, whence Pope Eugene III. had just been driven out (1143). Here his preachings made a deep impression on the lower class, the enemies of feudal oli-



garchy; and on the clergy, hostile to the aristocracy of cardinals. He wished to restore the old constitution, with the order of senators, and knights, and the Senate sitting at the Capitol. During nine years he lived in the midst of fruitless agitation; then Frederick came at last, to control the situation which had become unendurable.

10. **Frederick I. at Rome. He Overthrows the Republic. Death of Arnold of Brescia, 1155.**—Leading an army in which, as an exception, there were more lay princes than ecclesiastical banners, he came to pitch his tents in the great plain of Roncaglia, near Piacenza, where the German sovereigns were accustomed to review their troops in their expeditions to Rome. He there called upon his vassals for military service; he cited the deputies of cities, which had complaints to address to him, to appear before his tribunal; he promulgated a new constitution for fiefs; then he passed on to Pavia, to assume the crown of iron, thence marched straight to Rome. Hostilities had already begun there. Since December 5, 1154, the papal throne had been occupied by an energetic Pope, Nicholas Breakspeare, an Englishman, the son of a coarse peasant, who in the course of events had become lay brother at the abbey of Saint Albans. His youth had been one of privation, but by intelligence and work he had gradually risen to the first rank. As Hadrian IV. he had hurled his malediction at Rome, and placed it under an interdict, because of an attack on one of the cardinals. He finally treated with Frederick, promising him the imperial crown, which a deputation from the Roman Senate also offered him. Frederick disdainfully answered the latter: “You boast of your city’s glory, of the wisdom of your Senate, the courage of your young men. Rome is no longer at Rome. Do you wish to see again that ancient Roman glory, that dignity of the Senate, that judicious arrange-

ment of camps, that valour and discipline in the cavalry? It is all in the midst of us, with the Empire! Your chiefs are become my vassals; I am your legitimate master." Taking the Pope with him, he established himself on Mount Mario; his troops took possession of the Leonine city, and ignoring the Romans he was crowned in Saint Peter's one Saturday, while the gates were closed. Made aware, by the acclamations from the Germans, of what had taken place, the Romans rushed to arms, but they were repulsed with great loss, after a violent struggle. Arnold of Brescia, given up to Frederick, was secretly put to death. However, the emperor did not dare attack the main position; malaria seized his army, and he returned after destroying Spoleto, which threatened to interrupt his march. He left nothing but distrust behind him. Through his pride and cruelty he had made implacable enemies.

**11. Distrust of the Emperor in Italy. Milan and Hadrian IV.**—Milan was among the foremost. This city was unquestionably the first in Lombardy, because of her walls, her free constitution, the unity of her citizens, and her alliances. She had everything to fear from a prince whose political maxim was the adage of the Roman law: "All that pleases a prince has the force of law." She prepared boldly for the imminent struggle; first building up the walls of Tortona, which had been razed by Frederick, then destroying Lodi, which lay between her and her allies beyond the river Adda. Moreover, the Pope was displeased that the emperor should have such exalted views of the temporal power. He had not hesitated to make peace with the Romans and to ally himself with William I., the Bad, son and successor of Roger II. in Sicily (1156). The year following, the archbishop of Lund, suspected of having plotted to withdraw the Northern churches from the jurisdiction of the German

primate of Hamburg, was arrested and put in prison by the emperor's order; the Pope complained bitterly about it. Two legates bore a letter to Frederick, then at the diet at Besançon, in which he recalled to his mind his benefits (*beneficia*), among others the imperial crown which he had "conferred" on him. The expressions were ambiguous, perhaps designedly so. The imperial chancellor, Rainald de Dassel, lent to them the most annoying interpretation, as if the Pope had meant that the crown was a fief (*beneficium*) granted by the Holy See. The emperor's followers were loud in their protestations. "From whom does the emperor take his power, if not from the Pope?" exclaimed one of the legates, Cardinal Roland. At this Otto of Wittelsbach, count palatine of Bavaria, one of Frederick's most violent partisans, drew his sword, and would have struck the cardinal, if the emperor had not protected him with his own body. It was fruitless for the Pope to try to prove that he had been misunderstood; nothing could efface the imperious words of the cardinal.

**12. Frederick I. Proclaims the Rights of the Empire at Roncaglia, 1158.**—While at Besançon he issued orders to the feudal army to assemble in the following spring. Thirty thousand men crossed the Alps, and the emperor met a new assembly at Roncaglia in November, 1158. The four most celebrated doctors of Bologna, aided by two judges for each of the cities represented, were empowered to make out a list of the royal powers which had been enjoyed by the princes and cities of Italy. All acknowledged that they belonged to the emperor, and all renounced any further exercise of these powers; however, the emperor allowed those who possessed authentic titles to remain in possession of them. There remained still enough to bring him in thirty thousand pounds a year.

Besides this, he took measures to restore the feudal régime in Italy, and to prevent future development of the cities. On one hand he forbade the parcelling of large fiefs, duchies, marquisates, and counties, since in their integrity they afforded a better vantage ground for the sovereign; for the lesser fiefs, division was allowed, on condition that the joint owners should take the oath of fealty to their suzerain, in order that feudal obligations should always be equally carried out. The emperor placed the cities in Lombardy under the supervision of consuls, or podestas, amenable to his authority. These podestas, whose models were found in the cities of the Romagna, were often foreigners, and, as such, more inclined to defend the rights of the sovereign than the interests of the cities. Then Frederick could proclaim the pacification of Italy, as his predecessors had done, a thousand times, in Germany; quite ready, however, to impose it forcibly on refractory members of the state—namely, on Milan and the Pope.

**13. Milan Refuses to Submit. It Is Razed, 1162.**—Milan declined to receive the podestas. For two years it braved the imperial army, then, for lack of provisions, the heroic city was compelled to surrender unconditionally. Frederick first commanded all inhabitants to depart; they obeyed. That same day the emperor entered the deserted city with his princes, followers, and the militia of the allied cities. From his tribunal he asked what punishment the Milanese deserved. The Lombards answered: "They destroyed Lodi and Como, let their city in its turn be destroyed!" It was the horrible penalty of retaliation which the emperor did not hesitate to execute. He, with his German knights, withdrew beyond the gates. The Italians immediately set fire to the four corners of the city; the walls, towers, even the churches

were torn down; the work of destruction was accomplished in a week! A month later the bishop of Liège was named podesta of the Milanese population, which had been disarmed, scattered among four villages, and condemned to agricultural labours; a heavy indemnity besides made future progress impossible. Then the emperor seized for himself the best lands, from which he formed a vast domain lying between the Yessin and Adda; the castle of Monza, which had been recently built, became its centre.

**14. The Emperor Wishes to Control the Holy See.**—After Milan, Pope Hadrian IV. being dead, the majority of the cardinals, hostile to the emperor, elected the same Roland who had aroused such anger at the diet of Besançon. He took the name of Alexander III. The minority, however, chose Cardinal Octavian, of proved fidelity to the emperor; he called himself Victor IV. Alexander III. excommunicated his rival at once, and, since he feared he might be carried off by the German cavalry, he fled to France, where he was eagerly received by Louis VII. and acknowledged by Henry II. of England. The emperor felt himself shaken by this moral force opposed to him by the two great kingdoms of the West; but he needed his own Pope too much to draw back; therefore, when Victor IV. died (1164), he chose, as his successor, Pascal III.

**15. Canonisation of Charlemagne, 1165.**—The Pope showed his gratitude by canonising Charlemagne, whose remains had recently been found at Aix-la-Chapelle. Frederick, who affected as his model the great emperor, had them placed in a golden urn, enclosed in an altar of wood, which was later surmounted by a crown of light. The festivities in honour of this occasion, the rich presents given the Church at Aix, the privileges

granted the city, appealed forcibly to the imagination of contemporaries, as if the two emperors, the living and the dead, had made a pact to dominate the world.

**16. Alexander III. and the Lombard League.**—In the meantime Alexander III. had gone back to Rome, where the people received him as a liberator; he became at once the centre of the opposition which the emperor had aroused. He allied himself with the king of Sicily and with Venice; the emperor of the East, Manuel, attempted to come to some understanding with him, by promising him the union of the two Churches, if the Pope would agree to crown him emperor of the West. There were leagues forming throughout the country besides. One included Verona and the neighbouring cities. Cremona led another, although it had been loaded with benefits by the emperor. Bergamo and Brescia joined them, then Lodi, Parma, and Piacenza; friends and enemies, now reconciled, united forces against the oppressor of Italian liberties. Even the Milanese were allowed to become members, though with some difficulty, and the ruins of the city were promptly rebuilt. Finally the Lombard league completed an alliance with the Veronese league and with Venice. A general council, composed of rectors taken from each of the sixteen cities of the association, was entrusted with executive power. This was a counterpoise to the decisions of nine years before at Roncaglia. It is true that the cities consented to observe their fealty to the emperor, but this was nothing more than an empty form. Finally, in order to keep the emperor in check, the allies built, in the very country out of which he had carved such vast domains, at the junction of the Tanaro and the Bormida, a fortified city, which was given the name of the Pope, Alexandria (April

24, 1168). "City of Straw," the Germans called it derisively, but it took more than one fire of straw to burn it up. Troubles at home were so serious that the emperor had to wait seven years before beginning the struggle again (1174).

**17. The Emperor Overcome by the League at Legnano, 1176.**—This time the emperor was made aware that his system of extreme oppression had tired his own subjects. It was with difficulty that he gathered together eight thousand men, who were unsuccessful before Alexandria. In spite of reinforcements sent by the archbishops of Cologne and Magdeburg, he could bring but six thousand men into the field of Legnano. There were about eight thousand in the army of the league; in its midst there was a chariot, or *caroccio*, bearing the confederate standards; picked warriors, grouped around them, standing on a platform, made a guard of honour for these flags. The struggle was soon decided, the Milanese infantry secured the victory. The standard-bearer of the Empire was killed, and the emperor unhorsed; his army then became panic-stricken and disbanded.

**18. The Emperor Humbles Himself before the Pope at Venice, 1177.**—Frederick confessed himself conquered, first by suspending hostilities, then by opening secret negotiations with the Pope. They finally met at Venice, where the conditions of peace were solemnly arranged. Frederick gave back to the Roman Church all that he had seized, but kept the possessions of Countess Matilda; he granted the Lombard league a truce of six years, the king of Sicily one of fifteen. On the whole, he formally yielded but one right—that of deciding between two popes named simultaneously. Thereafter the Pope chosen by a majority of the cardinals should be considered legitimate. Yet this decision secured the independence of the

Papacy, since the Empire could no longer dispose of the tiara.

**19. The Emperor Combats the Lay Aristocracy. Trial and Condemnation of Henry the Lion, 1180.**—Free in this direction, the emperor turned against the lay aristocracy, which had been poor supporters in the struggle, and especially attacked its chief, Henry the Lion. For twenty years the power of the duke of Saxony and Bavaria had gone on increasing. He had carried on a successful and bloody war against the pagan Slavs; he had developed commerce in the Baltic by means of his alliance with the king of Denmark and his protection of Lübeck. He had married a daughter of the king of England, Henry II. In 1172 he undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which gained him renown, and on his return he was received as a sovereign in Constantinople. He was on good terms with Frederick, yet refused to take any part in his expeditions outside of Germany; hence he was in none of the Italian expeditions of 1162, 1174, or 1176. In fact, he would not help to build up imperial despotism. Charlemagne's successor could not long brook such pride; yet the Guelf was too strong to be attacked openly; he called in the law. Henry was at war with the bishop of Halberstadt, whom the archbishop of Cologne supported. The bishop laid his grievances before the diet. Summoned three times to appear, Henry refused. Then the nobles, consulted by the emperor, decided that he should be placed under the ban of the empire and deprived of his property and dignities. So read the law. The emperor approved the sentence, yet was willing to make one last effort. Henry did not appear at the fourth summons. Then the sentence pronounced against him was executed. His Saxon duchy was divided: the diocese of Paderborn and southern Westphalia were given to the archbishop of



# CENTRAL EUROPE 1180

- Western Empire
- King of France & Vassal States
- House of Anjou
- House of Austria
- Brabantburg
- Aragon



# CENTRAL EUROPE 1180



Cologne; northern and eastern Westphalia to Count Bernard of Anhalt, and also the ducal rank; Bavaria, less Styria, which was raised to a duchy, was given to Otto of Wittelsbach. The emperor had merely to appear in Saxony to quell Henry's resistance. A month was given his partisans in which to submit, under penalty of losing their fiefs. The month passed by, and they deserted one whom the Empire had cast off. Soon the only course left to Henry the Lion was to seek the emperor's pardon at the diet of Erfurt. But he was a conquered man, and they were bitter against him. The diet condemned him to three years of exile, and the emperor could scarcely save for him Brunswick and Luneburg.

**20. Pacification of Italy. Peace of Constance Advantageous for the Emperor, 1183.**—Having procured peace for Germany, Frederick I. wished to do the same for Italy. The misfortunes of his cousin, Henry the Lion, made him reflect, and he showed more nobility in treating with his subjects than in fighting them. The six years' truce with the Lombards was about to end. Frederick opened negotiations, which resulted in the treaty of Constance. He acknowledged the autonomy of the cities of the League, and conferred on them legal powers in the towns, as well as outside the walls. They, in turn, every ten years, were to take the oath of fealty to the Empire, provide troops, ensure free passage over roads and bridges, billet the soldiers, and require imperial investiture for their chosen magistrates, and send them to the general diets of the Empire. An able, firm policy might secure solid advantages from these stipulations, for the emperor still kept his allies in Romagna and even Lombardy; he possessed the vast domains which he had restored or created between the Tessin and Adda, and in present Piedmont and Liguria; and lastly he could draw from Italy sub-


stantial revenues. His position was still good. Yet, in principle, he was beaten. The arrogant decrees promulgated at Roncaglia were annulled.

**21. Frederick I. Makes New Alliances against the Pope.**—Frederick was a ruler who knew how to turn his reverses to advantage. Beaten by the Pope's alliance with the king of Sicily and the Lombard towns, he could still find allies, even among those of the Papacy, to begin again the inevitable struggle with the Papacy. In 1184 he concluded a marriage between his oldest son, Henry, already crowned king of the Romans, and Constance, heiress to the kingdom of Sicily; moreover, he opened relations with Milan, which he substantially favoured to the detriment of Pavia, the old imperial city. His son's marriage was celebrated there, and his daughter-in-law was crowned queen of Germany (1186). Thus threatened by the coalition between north and south, the Papacy was making ready for the struggle, when the news of the taking of Jerusalem by Saladin startled Christianity. The third crusade was successfully preached in Germany. Frederick set out, leading a numerous army, never to return.

**22. The Work of Frederick I. Its Greatness and Weakness.**—No prince before him had borne the imperial name so haughtily. He styled himself, "Emperor of the Romans, ever august," and in fact assumed to reign over all the Christian world. In order to attach the house of Burgundy more closely to Germany, he married (1156) the countess of Upper Burgundy, Beatrice, the gracious, fair-haired princess, whose numerous children seemed to promise a long future to the Ghibelline house. He wished to assume the Burgundian crown, which no German sovereign had worn before him. The ceremony took place at Arles, with much pomp, in the presence of all the

clergy of the province (1178). Bohemia, on the east, was raised to a duchy, although without gaining its independence. He looked upon England and France as provinces subject to the Empire, and their sovereigns as vassal. His pretensions were futile, yet his power was real. Italy paid in to him great revenues, and the lesser German nobility, protected by him, furnished a numerous soldiery. Thanks to these military and financial forces, he was enabled to dare so much. The brilliancy of letters and arts added lustre to the greatness of his reign. But the emperor was a man of the past; he was hostile to the independence of the Church, of kings, and peoples. After he had gone the Empire was shattered by these united forces.

## THE HOUSES OF HOHENSTAUFEN AND GUELF.



This table shows

1. The descent of the Hohenstaufen from Henry IV.
2. The relationship between Hohenstaufen and Guelphs.
3. The descent of the Guelphs from Lothar II.
4. The relation of the Guelphs with England.

## CHAPTER XX.

### END OF THE HOHENSTAUFEN—VICTORY OF THE PAPACY OVER THE EMPIRE.\*

**1. Sons of Frederick I. Henry VI., 1190-1197.**—Frederick Barbarossa left five sons. The oldest, Henry VI., king already of Germany and Italy, carried on his father's policy with such feverish haste that he compromised his cause. He had to struggle against Henry the Lion in Germany, who had come back to Saxony, in spite of the sentence of the diet. Henry the Lion counted on the support of his brother-in-law, Richard, king of England, but Richard's arrest in Austria, returning from the crusades, his long captivity and the

\* **SOURCES.**—Among the very numerous sources of the thirteenth century (see Wattenbach, volume ii., ch. 5, § 10-24), we cite only the chronicle of Albert of Stade ("Mon. Germ.," xvi.), the "*Chronica regia Coloniensis*" (edition Waitz, 1880), the "*Chronicle of Ursperg*" ("Mon. Germ.," xxiii.), a Saxon chronicle in German (volume ii. of "*Deutsche Chroniken*," 1886). The Italian chronicles of the same period (in Muratori, "*Scriptores rerum italicarum*," 28 vols., 1723-1751) have great value for the history of Frederick II., and the last Hohenstaufen. Potthast: "*Regesta pontificum romanorum*," 2 vols., 1874-1875. Huillard Bréholles: "*Historia diplomatica Frederici II.*," 5 vols. (1852-1859). Winkelmann: "*Acta imperii inedita saec. XIII. et XIV.*" (1885). Élie Berger: "*Les Registres d'Innocent IV.*," 3 vols. (1884-1897; in course of publication). The correspondence of Peter of Vineia is the principal source for the history of Frederick II. (edition Jehim, Basel, 1740).

**LITERATURE.**—Winkelmann on Philipp von Schwaben und Otto IV., and Frederick II. in "*Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte*"; Blondel, "*Étude sur la Politique de l'Empereur Frédéric II. en Allemagne.*"

heavy price he had to pay for his liberty, as well as the difficulties which he met with on his return home, ruined the Guelf cause. In Italy the king had nothing to fear from the timorous popes who succeeded Alexander III., so that he was crowned at Rome, untroubled by the Romans.

**2. Henry VI. Takes Possession of the Kingdom of Sicily.**—In the meanwhile William II., the Good, king of Sicily and Naples, had died, leaving no heir but Constance, the daughter of Roger II. and the wife of Henry VI. A bastard son of William I., Tancred of Lecce, seized the crown, with the nation's aid, which rejected a foreign ruler. Tancred died soon after, leaving a child to succeed him. Then the emperor met no resistance to his invasion; Naples opened her gates, the Sicilian admiral, Margarito, delivered up Palermo and the fleet in exchange for the title of "Prince of Durazzo and the Sea." Henry laid hands upon the royal treasure, which was sent to Germany; one hundred and fifty mules, with a strong escort, carried this precious booty beyond the mountains.

**3. Vast Plans of Henry VI. His Early Death.**—Undisputed master of Germany and Italy, Henry VI. conceived vast plans. He had married a daughter of the emperor of the Orient, Isaac Angelus, to his brother, Philip of Swabia, and when her father was overthrown he wished to interfere. The time had come, he said, to avenge the Latin crusaders, and his father, Barbarossa, for the Byzantine treachery. At the same time he took the cross, hoping to seize Constantinople with the army which was to reconquer Jerusalem. On the other hand, he incited Richard the Lion-Hearted to war with the king of France, who refused to do him homage. Finally he exacted of the German princes the declaration that royalty and the



Empire should be hereditary in his house. In return he promised laymen that their fiefs should be hereditary; and prelates to abandon the regalian rights. It was, indeed, universal dominion to which Barbarossa's son aspired. He was about to set out for the crusades when he was suddenly struck down by disease at Messina (September 28, 1197). He was only thirty. The young child whom he left, named in his cradle Frederick and Roger, in memory of his German and Neapolitan grandfathers, was to be Frederick II.

**4. The German Crown Contested. The Guelf, Otto IV., and the Ghibelline, Philip of Swabia.**—Frederick-Roger was elected king of the Romans before being baptised, even. But the German princes were not inclined to endure a long minority. Some of their number chose the younger son of Henry the Lion, Otto of Brunswick, whose uncle, the king of England, had given him the county of Poitou; the majority, on the contrary, selected Philip of Swabia, uncle of the infant king. A schism now existed in the state, and the quarrel between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines was about to begin again, when a great Pope, Innocent III., ascended Saint Peter's throne (January, 1198).

**5. Innocent III. His Views.**—Innocent III. was the son of a count of Segna in Sabina. He had been carefully educated. He studied grammar and theology in Paris, civil and canonical law in Bologna; he had written treatises on Christian dogma, and on ecclesiastical law and discipline. The most celebrated one was "On the Wretchedness of the Human Lot," in which it was impossible to detect the pontiff who, for eighteen years, guided the affairs of Christendom. This priest, so scholarly in spite of his high birth, so indifferent to the world apparently, even when cardinal, attained the pon-

tifical position when he was thirty-eight years old. He brought to his office youthful enthusiasm, firm religious and political convictions, great tenacity in the fulfilment of his purpose, and an imperfect knowledge of men. This led him into mistakes; for more than once he was deceived in the help they might afford him, and he was compelled to sacrifice them when they threatened to compromise his authority and the prestige of the Church. His views were those of Gregory VII. As, in man, the soul is superior to the body, so, in society, the priesthood was, in his opinion, superior to lay power. "God," he said in his speech, which showed the stamp of mystical pedantry, "placed two great bodies in the firmament, one to light the day, the other the night; even so has he established two orders, one superior, for souls, the other lesser, for bodies; and as the moon receives its light from the sun, so does royal power take its splendour from pontifical authority." Everyone acknowledged that the head of the Church was supreme judge in matters relating to sin; but the conclusion was forced that he had the right to interfere in all worldly questions and in the quarrels of princes. "God," he continued, "has set the Prince of the apostles over kings and kingdoms, with a mission to tear up, plant, destroy, scatter, and rebuild." Events lent themselves strangely to the triumph of these ideas; they made it possible for the Pope to establish the independence of the Papacy in Italy, to dispose of the German crown, and to extend his authority over Europe and entire Christendom, by his diplomacy, wars, and government.

**6. Innocent III. Governs at Rome.**—In Italy he found Rome in the power of the democracy, the Church lands occupied by Germans, the Sicilian kingdom on the eve of being indissolubly united with Germany, to the disadvantage of the rights of suzerainty and even of the

security of the Holy See. He took advantage of the isolation of the Romans, brought about by the death of Henry VI., to persuade the prefect of the city, who represented the emperor, to do him homage. He also forced the senator, head of the municipal administration, to abdicate; the people, won over by his presents, renounced the right of electing the senate. It is true that the Roman commune kept its autonomy, its political assemblies in the Capitol, its finances, its army, and the right of sending podestas to other cities in papal territory; but neither the emperor's lieutenant nor the head of the city commanded, but the Pope.

**7. He Reorganises the Temporal Power.**—At the same time, Spoleto, Ancona, Ravenna, abandoned by the hated Germans, were reoccupied by the Pope. He made an alliance with the Tuscan cities, and with their aid dispossessed the vassals of the emperor of the ever-disputed domains of the Countess Matilda. Finally the widow of Henry VI., in order to secure the crown for her son, Frederick, accepted investiture from the Pope and paid him tribute. By will she gave her son into his care, and when she died (1198), Innocent III. governed by his legates the fair kingdom of Sicily, which had been such a source of trouble to the Holy See.

**8. Innocent III. Upholds Otto IV. in Germany.**—In Germany the struggle between the two kings chosen gave him an excellent pretext for interference. He could scarcely hesitate between the Ghibelline, enemy of the Church, and the Guelf, enemy of the Empire. Besides, Philip, who owned the vast accumulated possessions of the Hohenstaufen, was arrogant; while Otto, supported entirely by the large subsidies furnished by his uncles, Richard and John, kings of England, made the most flattering promises to the Holy See. Therefore, Innocent

III. recognised the latter, and excommunicated Philip. He made a mistake in choosing Otto. Although brave and enterprising, he was treacherous and fickle. He was not resourceful nor talented enough to compel fortune, so that he was soon beaten everywhere by Philip, and relegated to his hereditary states. Moreover, his successful rival gained the confidence of the Holy See; his conciliatory attitude and natural affability made a good impression on the Pope, who began to weary of a burdensome and incapable pensioner. Philip would doubtless have become reconciled with the Church if he had not been assassinated by the palatine count of Bavaria, to whom he had refused the hand of one of his daughters in marriage. This tragic death changed the aspect of affairs at once. All Germany acknowledged Otto; he won back the Pope by granting freedom of papal elections, abandoning the regalian rights, and promising to support the Church in all that pertained to the spiritual domain. He at last went to Rome to receive the imperial crown.

**9. Rupture between Innocent III. and Otto IV., 1210.—**  
“O beloved son,” wrote the Pope to the emperor, his creature, “we are of one soul and heart! Henceforth, who shall resist us, we who bear the two swords, which the apostles once showed to the Lord, saying: ‘Here are two swords,’ and to which the Lord answered: ‘It is enough’! No, nothing can express the immense benefits which will arise from this union.” Events were not long in giving the lie to this unwise rhetoric. Otto had sacrificed the Empire’s rights to secure the Empire. Once legally crowned, he became, like his predecessors, an enemy of the Papacy. It was dishonourable, but inevitable. Germany, Guelf or Ghibelline, could not be resigned to the loss of Italy. Otto IV. so proved it by occupying the cities of Tuscany, by placing his own men

at the head of the march of Ancona and the duchy of Spoleto, by forcing podestas on the cities of Ferrara, Brescia, and Vicenza; by exacting homage from the Roman prefect, and invading the kingdom of Naples. This was going too far. The Pope launched the sentence of excommunication at his former pensioner, and incited enemies against him everywhere. In Italy he aroused the distrust of the Lombard city, in France he made Philip-Augustus fear the alliance between John Lackland and Otto IV., and finally in Germany, where he recognised his ward, Frederick, as king.

**10. Frederick II. in Germany. Supported by the Pope.**—Frederick II. was then seventeen years old. He owed everything to the Church; his brilliant education and the Sicilian crown, which had been kept for him. He expressed his gratitude by going first to Rome to do homage to the Pope for his kingdom; then he boldly entered Germany. Along the valley of the Rhine there were numerous partisans of his house, and he went to Mainz to assume the German crown (1213). The defeat of Otto IV. at Bouvines perfected his budding fortunes, and he was consecrated a second time at Aix-la-Chapelle, before Charlemagne's tomb.

**11. Frederick II. Relieved of his Guardian, 1216, and Rival, 1218.**—At last Innocent III. died (July, 1216) and Otto IV. (May 19, 1218), and thus relieved of the burden of gratitude towards his protector, and the anxieties of an ever-disturbing rival, he was free to act as he saw fit.

**12. Frederick II. King of Germany and Sicily. Union of Kingdom and Empire Forbidden.**—As hereditary king of Sicily and elected king of Germany, Frederick II. wished to be master in the two kingdoms. He needed German military contingents and Italian finances to carry

out his political policy. This was what Barbarossa had wished, but with this difference, that he longed for the revenues of the Lombard and Tuscan cities where imperial authority was so much contested, while Frederick II. wished to exploit, unopposed, a country ripe for despotism. Innocent III. had indeed forbidden the union of the two kingdoms, and Frederick II. was forced to yield. When his former teacher, Honorius III., took possession of the Holy See, the situation was modified in his favour. He took the cross suddenly in 1214; and was then able to make the Pope understand that the peace of Germany was necessary to the success of the expedition, and that he must in advance be assured of the German succession. And in fact his young son, Henry, was elected (1220), and he himself received the imperial crown, but he kept Sicily. His assumption of the title *Imperator et rex Siciliae* aroused no protestations. Doubtless he renewed his oath of allegiance to the Holy See; he confirmed the annual tribute of a thousand pieces of gold paid by Sicily, and promised to employ Sicilians only in the Sicilian administration. In reality he had gained a great diplomatic victory, the most decisive of his reign. He seemed, however, inclined to live amicably with the Pope, for, on the occasion when he renewed his vow to go on the crusade, he promulgated, at Rome, a constitution of nine articles, most favourable to the liberties of the Church and cruel to heretics. These were valuable pledges of his good faith. Honorius believed in them, and the Empire was at peace.

Under favour of this tranquillity, Frederick was enabled to establish and strengthen his power in his two kingdoms.

**13. Organisation of Despotism in Sicily.**—In the south he planned to substitute a strong centralised administra-

tion for the feudal organisation of the Norman kings, an easy task in the classic land of *lazzaroni*. He realised this plan in the constitution of Melfi (1231), which withdrew all authority from prelates, the great lay nobles, and cities, to give it to officials drawn from among the lesser nobility of knights and directly dependent on the crown; the king exercised supreme, uncontrolled power in everything relating to administration and justice; the cities, with the exception of the five largest, lost their magistrates, who were replaced by royal bailiffs, and they were subject to a very severe fiscal régime. He tried to increase the resources, and consequently the taxable strength of the country, by promoting agriculture, favouring industry and commerce, which found a valuable outlet because of treaties made with the Mussulman princes of Africa; but he granted no commercial freedom to his subjects; he kept the monopoly of a variety of products, such as salt and metals. By means of the large sums furnished by these exactions, he was enabled to create a permanent paid army and navy. The owners of fiefs returning military service served merely to fill up the army, for Frederick employed great numbers of Mussulmans. These were descendants of the old conquerors of Sicily. They were still numerous in the island towards the end of the twelfth century, and their frequent uprisings disturbed Frederick's minority. In four campaigns the emperor dislodged them from their fortified heights and transplanted them in mass to the continent, where he distributed them among the camps of Nocera, near Salerno, and of Luceria, between Troja and Foggia on the slope of the Adriatic. However, he respected their language, customs, and religion, and found them to be faithful soldiers, fearing neither God nor the Pope. He was an enlightened prince, a patron of troubadours and minnesinger,

who found skilful imitators at the court of Palermo; interested in sciences and astrology, naturally sceptical; broad-minded, yet not a free thinker; he would not tolerate in others the freedom of manners and language which he allowed himself. His subjects were forbidden to go abroad to complete their studies; he protected the university of Naples, yet watched closely its teachings. Heretics were cruelly persecuted, especially in the cities, and he was accused of pursuing political vengeance under cover of religion. Such a system bore its fruits; the Sicilians were no longer a people, but a troop of taxpayers.

**14. Frederick II. Restores Political Authority in Germany with the Help of the Church.**—A like policy was impossible in the Empire; he could not dream of destroying feudalism, and it would have been dangerous to combat it. Also, with the support of the high clergy, Frederick had won his victory over Otto IV.; therefore its privileges were unassailed. The Teutonic Order was particularly favoured; it was entrusted with the conquest and conversion of Prussia (1226); the first grand master of this order, Hermann de Salza, was a devoted agent of Frederick's policy. He worked with all his power to extirpate heresy, and his decrees of proscription were so rigorously enforced that an inquisitor, Conrad of Marburg, was massacred. The only opposition he encountered was from his son Henry, elected king of Germany, who publicly accused him of infringing on his sovereign rights. It was sufficient for Frederick to appear beyond the Alps, without his army, to end his arrogance (1235). Henry was deposed, then led prisoner to Apulia, where he killed himself, in despair, seven years later.

**15. Frederick II. All-Powerful, 1235.**—Frederick II. was now at the height of his power; he had attained this



position, almost without a struggle, by the sole force of his diplomacy. His power was dreaded abroad. The crusades had taken him to Jerusalem. He had married, in 1235, Isabella, sister of the king of England. This marriage procured him an ally by whom he held the king of France in check. He courted the friendship of Raymond VII., count of Toulouse, by investing him with the marquisate of Provence. But this prosperity was of short duration. It was Italy which aroused the greatest difficulties, and the Papacy plunged him into the abyss.

**16. The Lombard League Reorganised against the Emperor. It is Overcome at Cortenuova, 1237.**—In Italy the Lombard league, justly alarmed at the growing power of the emperor, had reorganised (1226). Frederick declared war, amidst the applause of the diet of Mainz (1235), and leading an army, made up solely of Swabian knights and Mussulman cavalry, he attacked and defeated its army at Cortenuova (April 26, 1237). The leaguers' camp was pillaged; the *caroccio* was taken, and sent to Rome to be borne in triumph to the Capitol. The conqueror divided Lombardy into two parts, at the head of each being a vicar-general; salaried officers were entrusted with the imperial administration and justice; but all these agents were chosen from among the Italian nobility. The centralised monarchical government established in Sicily, and begun in Germany, was imposed on the country which had given impetus to the communal movement.

**17. Italy's Servitude. Gregory IX. Excommunicates the Emperor, 1239.**—Italy enslaved would have meant the end of the temporal power of the Holy See. It withstood the emperor. The gentle, timorous Honorius III. had been succeeded by a fiery old man (1227), a cousin of Innocent III., Gregory IX. A scholarly theologian and eloquent orator, the octogenarian Pope opposed, from the

first, the emperor. Twice he excommunicated him, because he delayed his departure to the crusades, and he followed him with his curses to Jerusalem. It was much worse when Frederick declared war on the Lombard league. The Pope made an alliance with Venice and Genoa, and finally excommunicated the emperor, under the pretext that he kept Sardinia, a fief of the Holy See, and he released his subjects from their oath of fealty.

**18. Triumph of Frederick II., 1241.**—The organisation of Frederick II. had been so skilfully built up, and his prestige was so great, that the pontifical sentence made no impression on Germany. While invading Saint Peter's patrimony, he named one of his natural sons, the beautiful Enzo, his vicar-general in Italy. He was not diverted from his enterprise by a terrible invasion of Mongols, which laid waste Hungary and Silesia, and he was repeatedly successful, in Italy, during two campaigns. Finally Gregory IX. died, almost a centenarian, as the Mongolian invasion was about ending. Celestine IV., his successor, reigned but a fortnight. For two years the Church was without a head, for the cardinals were dispersed, their ranks being decimated by the pest. Before dying Gregory IX. had convoked a council. Most of the prelates who were to be present went to Genoa to set sail, but the boats which bore them were attacked at sea, near the rock of Meloria, by a Pisan and Sicilian fleet. They were captured, and the priests of the council had to await under bolts and bars the emperor's good will.

**19. Frederick II. Changes his Policy. Imperial Despotism.**—The emperor made use of his victory to change the course of his policy. Until 1239 he had remained faithful to imperial tradition by seeking the support of the clergy for the Holy Roman Empire, even as against

the Pope. As soon as Gregory IX. declared against him he broke with the Church. After Hermann de Salza's death (May, 1239), he gradually dismissed from his court the ecclesiastical members of the state; his relations with the Teutonic Order ceased; and he persecuted the mendicant orders. He gathered about him Neapolitan and Sicilian counsellors, and lawyers, like the famous minister, Peter of Vineia, who, brought up on the principles of Roman law, looked at imperial power exclusively from a layman's point of view. For them there was but one chief in Christendom, the emperor; as for Frederick, there was no motive for action other than state reasons. The higher aristocracy would scarcely endure, for a long time, a master who was plainly aiming at absolutism. Frederick foresaw their desertion, and turned to the cities.

**20. Alliance of Frederick II. with the Cities.**—They had developed greatly during the thirteenth century. Commerce, which enriched first the towns in the Rhine valley, penetrated into the northern regions; it had created a highway which passed through the Westphalian city of Soest and Danish Lübeck to Wisby on the Swedish island of Gothland, to Riga and Novgorod in present Russia. A national industry began to appear. Progress, however, was not uniform. The cities belonging to the lesser nobles were held in strict subordination to their masters; episcopal towns, as long as Frederick had to conciliate the high clergy, were restrained, yet they made great progress from the middle of the thirteenth century; but the imperial towns, covered with favours by their sovereign, strode forward on the way which, after some generations, was to bring them to independent republics. For them, the reign of Frederick II., especially the second part, was truly a golden age. The change was coldly cal-

culated by Frederick. This man, bald, thin, and puny, sceptical and studious, declared enemy of the popes, playing off the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords, appears now to us as the first of modern kings.

**21. Election of Innocent IV. The Struggle between Sacerdotalism and Imperialism Revives.**—However, the situation of Christianity brought about by Frederick's lucky audacity could not endure long. The king of France feared, not unreasonably, that its prolongation might give to the theory of imperial omnipotence a control that would threaten the other Catholic states, and he summoned the cardinals to elect a new Pope, and the emperor to release the French prelates taken at Meloria. He was obeyed, and Sinibaldo Fieschi, of the Genoese family of the counts of Lavagna, was elected, who assumed the name of Innocent IV. He was a consummate jurist, and hence seemed most capable of negotiating with the emperor's Sicilian statesmen. The choice was not displeasing to Frederick II., who knew and esteemed Fieschi; however, he did not deceive himself. He foresaw that Innocent IV. would not be his friend for any length of time. "A Pope," he said, "cannot be a Ghibelline!" He was right; so soon as the thorny questions, such as Church lands and Lombard cities, were approached, they realised that they would disagree. The Pope, fearing to fall into the emperor's hands, fled hastily to Genoa, his own country. He there ordered the assembling of the general council, which met at Lyons, an imperial city, but situated on the borders of Germany and France, and really independent (1245).

**22. The Council of Lyons. The Emperor Excommunicated, 1245.**—Three patriarchs and one hundred and forty bishops, mostly French and English, sat in this council, which was called to deliberate on three principal matters:

the schism in the Greek Church, the Kharesmian invasion in Palestine, and negotiations with the emperor. Actually they were engrossed with the last question, for the interests of Christianity faded before those of the Papacy. Through his *chargé d'affaires* the grand judge, Thaddeus of Suessa, Frederick vainly offered "to deliver the Holy Land, at his own expense, to restore to the Church of Rome her possessions, and indemnify the Pope." Innocent IV. refused to listen to anything, and in spite of the emissaries from the kings of France and England, who asked for a delay, he excommunicated the emperor for perjury, sacrilege, and heresy: "for perjury for having violated the immunities of the Sicilian clergy and usurped Church property; for sacrilege, for having abducted the prelates on their way to Rome; and for heresy, for having disregarded papal power, maintained relations with infidels, and treated with the sultan of Egypt during the crusade." Consequently he released subjects from their oath to the king, and asked the German electors to choose another sovereign, while he reserved to himself the right of disposing of the Sicilian kingdom, as a fief of the Holy See. The sentence resounded through Europe, which was, so to say, a witness for the two parties. In fact, while Frederick II. was trying to interest the kings in his cause, was trying to justify his conduct towards the rich and worldly Church and its ministers, "intoxicated with terrestrial joys and caring little for the Lord," was boldly declaring he had done "a work of charity by taking from such men the treasures with which they had gorged themselves to their eternal damnation," the Pope was reasserting the superiority of the tiara over the Empire. "The dominion which Christ founded," he wrote, "is not only sacerdotal, but royal; the power of the sword belongs also to the Church. She gives it to the emperor when she

crowns him, so that he may use it legitimately in her defence."

**23. Frederick II. Holds his Own in Germany. He is Conquered in Italy.**—From words they passed quickly to deeds. Frederick and his son Conrad, whom he had had elected in 1237, resisted successfully in Germany the rivals that were presented by the party hostile to the Empire. It was different in Italy. Parma, having driven out the imperial garrison, and taken a podesta to suit herself, gave the signal for a general insurrection, which broke out simultaneously in Piacenza, Milan, Ferrara, and Mantua (1247). Frederick laid siege to Parma, and to show his resolution to annihilate her, he made his own camp a city which he called Victoria. But one day when he was absent, hunting, the Parmesans invaded the place, set fire to the wooden houses, and put the besiegers to flight. Soon after his beloved son Enzo was beaten and captured at Fossalta. The double check shook to its foundations the emperor's dominion in Italy. He kept his hold on his kingdom of Naples solely by terror. His best servants betrayed him. Peter of Vineia, suspected, not without a motive, of a secret understanding with his enemies, was arrested and blinded. He ended his life by beating his head against a pillar of the church in Pisa (January, 1249). Frederick was preparing to face misfortune on all sides, when he died of dysentery at Castel Fiorentino, near the camp of his beloved Saracens (December 13, 1250).

**24. End of the Hohenstaufen, 1254. Triumph of the Papacy.**—This death did not soften the bitterness of the struggle. The Pope excommunicated Conrad IV., who died prematurely of fever at Lavello (May 21, 1254), leaving as his successor a child of two years, Conradin. The Pope invested Edmund, younger son of the king of Eng-

land, with the Sicilian kingdom, and entered Naples in triumph. But a natural son of Frederick II., Manfred, incited the Saracens of Luceria to revolt, re-entered Naples, which had been hastily evacuated, and took the crown, though promising to leave it to young Conradin. For twelve years he withstood effectually all efforts to overthrow him, but he took no part in German affairs. There the important part played by the Hohenstaufen was forever ended. The union of Italy and the Empire had been made impossible, and the victory of the Papacy was complete.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### THE CHRISTIAN AND MUSSULMAN ORIENT FROM THE SEVENTH TO THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.\*

**1. Place of the Greek Empire in the History of Civilisation.**—During the four centuries which elapsed between the death of Heraclius (641) and the accession of Isaac I. of the Comneni (1057), three principal reigning houses succeeded one another in Constantinople: the Isaurian, Armenian, and Macedonian, founded by Leo III. (717-741), Leo V. (813-820), and Basil I. (867-886) respectively. The beginning and end of these families were sanguinary. They ordered religious persecutions and suffered great military disasters. They seemed to struggle vainly in chaos, and one is inclined, as a rule, to dismiss them with a disdainful word, by calling the institutions and the policy of the Greek Empire, Byzantine. It must, however, be taken into account that the invasions which ended for the West in the eighth, or, perhaps, in the tenth century, lasted in the East down to the fifteenth; also that the Byzantines in the vanguard of the old world met the first attack of pagan and Mussulman invaders, whom they successfully repulsed more than once; and that they in their turn bore civilisation to the barbarians and advanced the frontiers

\* **SOURCES.**—The Byzantine Historians in the Bonn collection and the “Glossarium mediæ et infimæ græcitatæ” of Du Cange.

**LITERATURE.**—Hartzberg and Drapeyron, as above; Schlumberger, “Nicephore Phocas”; Finlay, “History of the Byzantine Empire from 767 to 1453”; Bury, and Bury’s Gibbon, as above.



of Christian Europe. Byzantine history is a record of great accomplishments. Two points especially should be noted in it: the political and administrative system of the empire; and on the other hand its struggle with a foreign foe, whose attacks had to be met simultaneously on two sides; in Europe towards the Danube and the Balkans, and in Asia towards the Euphrates and the Taurus.

**2. The Slavs in Greece.**—On the frontier along the Danube the Slavs established themselves first. They soon spread throughout the Balkan peninsula and into the Peloponnesus. After a terrible pest, which devastated the Empire and decimated Constantinople (749), the emperors re-peopled the desolate countries with Slavic families, so that it has been asserted that Greece became entirely Slavic, and that to-day in the veins of the Hellenes there is not a drop of Grecian blood. The statement is a bold one, for it is certain that, at that period, Athens, for instance, was intact with her national population.

**3. The First Bulgarian Empire, 893-1014.**—The Bulgarians came and settled themselves down in the midst of the Slavs. Tirnovo, Varna, Silistria were their principal cities. At their head was a khan, assisted by chiefs of the six principal tribes of the nation. Like a true Oriental prince, this khan had a harem; at table he always ate alone; his courtiers took their repasts at a distance from him, seated on chairs or crouching on their heels. War was the principal occupation of the people; cowardice, disobedience, and neglect of horses and weapons were punished most severely. Money was so rare, even in the tenth century, that cattle formed the main means of barter. The neighbourhood of the Slavs left an indelible impression upon them, by making them forget their Finnish speech; but it did not alter their savage customs, and for

three centuries they were the terror of the Empire in those parts. After repeated victories, one of their khans, Simeon (893-907), assumed the title of tsar (Cæsar) of the Bulgarians and “autocrat” of the Romans. Another, Boris II., invaded Macedonia and Thessaly, and only stopped before Corinth, which he could not take (981). The Emperor Basil II., surnamed the Killer of Burgundians (*Bulgarochtone*), arrested these dangerous invaders, after having inflicted on them in 1014 a signal defeat at Kimbalougon (Dermirhissar). It is said that in order to frighten the defeated, he had the eyes of fifteen thousand prisoners put out, and then had them led home in groups of one hundred, by one of their number who had lost but one eye. After this exploit he pushed back again the northern frontier of the empire to the Danube.

**4. Hungarians and Russians.**—Under Leo the Philosopher (886-912) the Hungarians lived along the shore of the Black Sea, between the Bug and Sereth rivers. The emperor called in their chief, Arpad, against the Bulgarians. Their reckless courage, which they had learned to control by severe discipline, was renowned. They were not long in replacing the Avars in the midst of the Slavs, who were henceforth divided and powerless. Finally the Scandinavians, conquerors of Russian Slavonia, appeared in their turn, attracted by the renown for splendour which Constantinople shed throughout the Orient. One of their chiefs, Igor, appeared under the walls of the city of the Cæsars,—Tsarigard, as they called it,—and was only stopped by Greek fire, which destroyed his fleet.

**5. Conversion of the Barbarians to Greek Christianity.**—The Empire was not content to combat these ever-increasing enemies; it wished to convert them. Monasteries built towards the end of the ninth century on the summits and in the valleys of Mount Athos provided

zealous missionaries, who continued, on the south of the Balkans, the work of civilisation that Cyril and Methodius had pursued on the north of the Danube in the ninth century. Vladimir's marriage (972-1015) with Anne, sister of Basil II., determined the conversion of this prince and of the Russian people. The metropolitan of Kieff was placed under the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople, and Russia became a dependence of the Empire.

**6. The Greek Empire Endures in Asia Minor until the Eleventh Century.**—Vital changes did not begin in Asia Minor until the eleventh century. The antique terminology was still kept in the tenth century, but the population had gradually changed through an admixture of Goths, Bulgarians, Persians, and Arabs, whom the emperors had received willingly or transported forcibly. Elsewhere the Armenians had yielded to annexation, in spite of the schism which divided them from the orthodox Church, for, in their eyes, the Empire was holy and immortal. But the loss of their independence weakened them and made them incapable of resisting the Mussulmans.

**7. The Maritime Front of the Empire Threatened by Normans and Arabs.**—These Mussulmans were the most dreaded enemies of Byzantium, not only because of their military resources, but more especially because of their defiance of Christianity. In the ninth century, in Spain, Mussulmans conquered the Balearics and Sardinia. A Greek officer in Sicily, disaffected with the court, gave up Palermo to the sultan of Kairouan (827), and one century later the conquest of the island was completed. During this time pirates seized Crete and threatened the maritime front of the Empire; they were not dislodged until 961. Because of the decadence of the caliphate of Bag-

dad, the Byzantines obtained a respite for at least a century from the Mussulmans, but the Normans were as fierce and more successful adversaries. They seized southern Italy entire; even under Robert Guiscard they began repeated expeditions along the Illyrian coast, contending for the possession of the Adriatic with the emperors, so as to open an overland route to Constantinople.

**8. Despotism Imperative for the Greek Empire.**—Such was the situation outside the Empire, which was, moreover, made up of diverse peoples and surrounded by unreliable vassal states. Nature having refused it unity; it sought it in the strength of its government, which necessarily became a despotism. Justinian had drawn up its rules, his successors continued and perfected his work. His Institutes were translated into Greek, the official language of the Empire since the eighth century. A new code, the Basilica, was promulgated by Basil II., who was careful not to take the advice of the senate. These emperors surrounded themselves with a brilliant court, restrained by an etiquette still more complicated than in Justinian's time.

Their despotism, however, was tempered by two principal causes: the uncertainty of the succession and the power of the Church.

**9. The Succession to the Throne Unprovided for. The "Disease of the Purple."**—The law was silent, in fact, on the way in which the crown should be transmitted. Like the consulate in the time of the Republic, the imperial title was, in fact, open to all; but it was more eagerly desired because opportunities were less frequent and possession of power more desirable. What is known as the "malady of the purple" always raged violently at Constantinople. When once established, the new emperor would try to

secure the succession to his own family; the Isaurians followed the old systems of adoption and association with the throne; the Macedonians at once associated all their family with them. After Basil I., the sons of emperors, in order to rule conjointly, must have been born in the palace, in the so-called purple hall (*porphyra*) at Constantinople, and all his descendants took the name of "phyrogenete," which his grandson, Constantine VII., made illustrious. This title raised the imperial dignity. The term apostasy was used to brand both political felony and religious heresy, which were punished with excommunication and anathema. But these spiritual weapons were not sufficient to prevent revolutions, the supreme resource of peoples against despots.

**10. Power of the Church.**—In its sphere the Church was very powerful, and would not allow its customs and usages to be disturbed. The war of the Iconoclasts is a memorable illustration of this fact.

**11. Quarrel of the Iconoclasts.**—There were traces of paganism in popular customs, after it had ceased to be generally practised. Images of false gods had been proscribed, but the churches were filled with images of the Christ, of his mother "the all holy" (*Panaghia*), of saints and martyrs; all reproduced in sculpture, mosaic, or painting. During the sixth century they had disputed the divinity of Christ and his attributes, in the eighth they quarrelled over the worship of images. Leo III., the Isaurian, formally condemned it, and ordered these images (*icones*) to be displaced, then destroyed in the churches (728). The decrees called forth the most violent controversy. To the ever-turbulent factions of the circus two others were added, that of the breakers of images (*iconoclastes*) and that of the adorers of images (*iconodoules*). The superior classes, the functionaries and

the senate, some even of the clergy, upheld the decree; the mass of the people were against it. The government bore heavily on offenders; but after a century of persecutions it had made no headway. Finally the worship of images was reëstablished in 842; the fête of orthodoxy, brilliantly celebrated February 19, ended the quarrel. In reality the state had yielded to the Church.

**12. Administration. Confusion of Civil and Military Powers. The Themes.**—At the same time a great change took place in the administration. The distinction which Diocletian and Constantine made between civil and military functions disappeared. During the wars of the seventh century the military element predominated again, and it triumphed in the eighth century, with Leo the Isaurian. At that time the Empire was divided into many small provinces, or *themes*, with a military administration; at the head of each one of these a *strategus*, directly dependent on the emperor, commanded the legions and the civil administration. With him, the *protonotarii* filled the office of supreme judge and directed the finances; lower in rank were the *turmarchs*, or leader of districts, the *kleisurarchs*, or governors of fortresses, etc. The strategus belonged to the nobility, and bore the title of proconsul or of patrician. The cities lost under Leo VI. the Philosopher the last vestiges of their municipal autonomy.

**13. Finances and Army.**—The finances and the army were, as everywhere else, high public departments. The impost was determined as in the time of the ancient Empire. Byzantine money (the besant) was scattered throughout the Orient, and facilitated business transactions which brought the Greeks into frequent relations with the Mussulmans, Italians, Bulgarians, and Russians. The army was composed of the infantry of the legions, or *themata*, and mainly of mercenaries. These were drawn

from all parts, but especially from the north. By the middle of the tenth century there were at Constantinople troops of Varangians, Danes, and Icelanders, who lent to the Greek Empire an unexpected power of resistance. From a strategic and commercial point of view Constantinople was unquestionably the first city of the Empire, since her ancient rivals, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, had been conquered by the Mussulmans, and Athens had sunk to the grade of a peaceful provincial city. After the twelfth century provincial interests were lost in those of the capital, and the safety of the Empire depended on its preservation.

**14. The Aristocracy Tends to Become Feudal.**—The aristocracy was changed. After the seventh century the large landed interests were modified under cover of the general disturbances, and especially after the suppression of the collective responsibility of the curials. In contact with the West, the nobility gradually assumed a feudal character; yet it never succeeded in playing an important political rôle. Down to the end, the Byzantine Empire remained an absolute and centralised government.

**15. Greek Literature at Byzantium.**—It continued also Roman traditions in literature, art, and teaching. The Byzantines never lost their taste for learning; instruction was always honoured in the great families. Under the Macedonian princes there was an attempt made to simplify its acquirement by condensing the sum total of human knowledge into vast compilations. There were some universal scholars, like Photius, who knew thoroughly the seven arts, jurisprudence, medicine, and even the occult sciences. Emperors won their place in the first rank of scholars; Leo the Philosopher was a pupil of Photius. His son, Constantine VII., was so passionate a lover of study, all his life, that he almost forgot to reign. He re-

organised popular teaching, and revived extensive literary and artistic undertakings. Shut up in his library, he too became an author: he wrote a life of his ancestor, Basil I., an account of the translation of Saint Chrysostom's relics, and valuable treatises, for us, on Byzantine ceremonies, and the themes and administration of the Empire. It was the period when Simeon the Translator made a vast collection of lives of Greek saints; when Suidas compiled a dictionary of biography, history, and geography, which affords us precious information on the men and customs of antiquity; and when the chronicles of Genesios, Theophanes, and George Monachos were taken up and continued. In the eleventh century, in the decline of the brilliant Macedonian dynasty, Constantinople could proudly claim Michael Psellos, an admired professor, a writer incredibly versatile and prolific; and his friend and fellow-student Xiphilin, who has done us the service of acquainting us with the "Histories" of Dion Cassius, in an abridged form.

**16. Byzantine Art.**—Art kept pace with literature and the sciences. Architectural styles varied little from the sixth to the eleventh century, but the art of building was understood. Mosaics were successfully used, which held their own in interior decorations. True artists sculptured on ivory and illuminated manuscripts. However, originality was the one quality lacking in most of the artists, historians, and writers. They worked too much according to the formulæ come down to them from antiquity, instead of looking at Nature and her living examples; and writers spent the better part of their time in compiling from the works of their predecessors. Byzantium is antiquity which has outlived itself, yet has not been rejuvenated.

There were three important events which took place



in the middle of the eleventh century which affected the destinies of the Oriental world: (1) the separation of the Greek and Latin churches; (2) the accession to the throne of provincial aristocracy in the dynasties of the Comneni and Ducas; and (3) the establishment of the Turks in Asia Minor.

**17. The Greek Schism. Photius, 867, and Michael Cerularius, 1054.**—The two churches had had misunderstandings for a long time. They spoke two different languages; they were not imbued by the same spirit; the pretensions of the bishops of Rome and the patriarch of Constantinople to supreme power were irreconcilable. When Leo the Isaurian promulgated his decree against images, Pope Gregory III. protested (732), and the Italians upheld him. A more serious incident took place in the following century. In 861 Bardas, the uncle and all-powerful minister of Michael III., expelled Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, and put Photius in his place. He was a layman, whose science had earned for him the position of first secretary of state. He was hastily ordained, and in six days passed through the degrees of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Ignatius not submitting, an embassy, bearing costly presents, set off to win the consent of the Pope to Photius's elevation. Nicholas I. was then reigning; he declared that Ignatius should be judged by the Pope only, his superior in the hierarchy; and he deposed Photius, who retaliated by condemning, in a council assembled at Constantinople, presided over by the emperor, certain customs and opinions of the Western Church. At last a revolution overthrew the interloper patriarch, and unity was reëstablished. But the "schism of Photius" left a rift in the two churches, which ended in 1054 in a complete break. At this date, the Pope having intervened in the ecclesiastical situation of lower Italy, which Leo

the Isaurian had formerly withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, there was a pretext for a fresh conflict. Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, renewed the quarrels of Photius, but in a more petty spirit. Added to this, papal envoys asserted so haughtily the universal supremacy of the bishop of Rome that the patriarch refused to negotiate with him. Hildebrand's views struck harshly on the ears of those who considered themselves the legitimate heirs of the Roman Empire. From that date the rupture was definite. It isolated Constantinople, which was henceforth easier prey for the barbarians.

**18. Provincial Aristocracy. Comnenus and Ducas.**—Some years later the Macedonian dynasty, which had reigned so brilliantly, died out in vice and intrigues (1056). Isaac Comnenus took possession of the throne. He was of an old noble family which owned extensive property in Asia Minor. He represented the accession of aristocracy to power, but an aristocracy of the same model as Western feudalism, and which, like this, would become an obstruction to the imperial government. Isaac chose as his successor the head of the house of Ducas, as powerful and ambitious as his own. He had associated with him in the throne, it is true, his nephew, Alexis I., but he only succeeded to the Empire by overthrowing the usurper Nicephorus (1081).

**19. Glorious Reign of Alexis I.**—Fresh misfortunes had befallen the Empire during the disorders of those forty years. Alexis I. gloriously retrieved the faults of his predecessors. In the West he held his own with Robert Guiscard, who finally withdrew. From the north the Petchenegs, a people of Turkish origin, had crossed the Danube and invaded the Serb country. He subdued them after six years of warfare, pushed them back to the

north of the river, and reëstablished imperial authority in the Balkan peninsula.

**20. Progress of the Seljuks in Asia Minor. They Take Nicæa.**—The situation was more critical in Asia. Alp Arslan, nephew and successor of Togrul-Beg, took Armenia, whose inhabitants fled mostly into Cilicia, in order to build up an independent kingdom there. Then Malek Shah (1072-1092) settled in the very heart of Asia Minor, and acquired legal possession of his conquests from an insurgent Ducas. Nicæa fell into the hands of the infidels, and from Constantinople could be seen on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus the camel's-hair tents of the Turks. Fortunately, the latter had no navy, and the Empire's capital was not insulted; but the danger was imminent, and Alexis spared no efforts to interest the West in the safety of the Empire. The first crusade brought him opportunely the needed help.

## CHAPTER XXII.

### THE CRUSADES.\*

THE crusades were religious wars. They were the offensive movements of the followers of the Cross against those of the Crescent. At the same time they were defensive wars of the West against the dangers with which Europe was threatened by the Turks.

**1. Sciences and Commerce Bring the Orient and the Occident Nearer Together.**—The two religions and the two worlds clashed for the first time in the seventh century.

Christianity at first drew back before Mohammedanism, master of the entire southern Mediterranean; then, dating from the second half of the eighth century, the perpetual warfare was succeeded by possible intercourse

\* **SOURCES.**—The first collection of historians of the Crusades was published by Bongars: “*Gesta Dei per Francos*” (1611). Most of these texts are better edited in the “*Récueil des Historiens des Croisades*,” published by the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres (in course of publication). Count Riant: “*Inventaire critique des Lettres Historiques de la première Croisade*” (1880). See also the series of publications of the “*Société de l’Orient Latin*.” Reinaud: “*Extraits des Historiens Arabes relatifs aux Guerres des Croisades*” (1829). “*Assises de Jérusalem*”; edition Beugnot (1841–44; 2 vols., folio).

**LITERATURE.**—H. v. Sybel, “*Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzüges*,” second edition; Kugler, “*Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*”; Prutz, “*Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*”; Heyd, “*Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*”; Dodu, “*Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques dans le Royaume Latin de Jérusalem*”; Pears, “*The Fall of Constantinople*”; Gray, “*The Children’s Crusade*.”

between these mortal enemies. Commerce and science drew them together. Through the Arabs the West was brought into touch with antique Greek culture. Elsewhere the Arabs traded with India and China; the wares of the extreme East came over the Red Sea into Egypt, and were thence transported to Italian and Greek ports. Constantinople, admirably situated on the frontier of Europe and Asia, to be an intermediary for the two continents, was, in the time of Haroun-al-Raschid and the decadence of the caliphate, an important international market. The Mussulmans had their mosque in Constantinople in 1049. Rome received the rich woollen and silk stuffs, the hangings and carpets of the Orient.

**2. Development of Italian Cities through Oriental Trade.**—Some of the cities of southern Italy—Bari, Salerno, Amalfi—which were unimportant until then, became amazingly prosperous because of this active trade; but they were soon harmed by the conquests of the Saracens in Sicily and along the Italian coast. Others, whose situations protected them from the infidels,—Pisa, Genoa, and Venice,—were more fortunate. They profited by commerce and war. In the eleventh century Pisa took Sardinia from the Saracens, then Bona and Mehdia, in Africa. Genoa had a similar development.

**3. Venice.**—Venice was founded at the time of the great invasions; the islands in her lagoons afforded safe shelter to the inhabitants driven from the mainland by the barbarians. She was subject to Byzantium, but distance and the fear that the Venetians might acknowledge the suzerainty of Italians, Lombards, Carolingians, or Germans, induced the emperors to allow the city to govern herself as she saw fit. As early as 700 her dukes, or doges, were elected by the people. Some among her citizens wished to keep on good terms with Constanti-

nople, in order to have the markets of the Levant open to them; others advised an alliance with their neighbours, so as to be able to dispose, in Europe, of the wares accumulated in their store-houses. The two policies prevailed alternately. With admirable skill the Venetians negotiated with the one as if they were sovereigns, yet they did not lose their hold on the other; they soon became adepts in diplomacy and commerce. After the destruction of the pirates of Croatia, Venice controlled the Adriatic. She served Alexis I. faithfully against Robert Guiscard, and was given in return extended privileges. Her merchants "could buy and sell in all parts of the Greek Empire unmolested by agents of the custom-houses, finances, and harbours; the latter were forbidden to inspect their merchandise, or to subject them to any tax whatsoever." This measure placed the Venetians suddenly above competition.


#### 4. Disturbances Caused by the Seljuks' Invasions.—

The success of the Seljuks in Syria aroused consternation in business affairs. Besides being masters of Jerusalem (1076), they profaned the holy places, scenes of the birth, and preaching, and martyrdom of Jesus Christ.

#### 5. Pilgrimages to the Holy Sepulchre in the Eleventh Century. Peter the Hermit.—

Until then Christians had been tolerated there; pilgrims had been allowed free access to the place, and they had come in crowds. In 1014 they brought the money necessary to rebuild the Holy Sepulchre, torn down by Caliph Hakim. In 1026 Richard of Normandy came on a pilgrimage, at the head of seven hundred armed pilgrims. Several years later the number of pilgrims was so great that wise men in Europe thought that the Day of Judgment was approaching. As soon as the Turks were masters of the holy places and the routes leading to them, the situation changed;





GREATEST EXTENT  
of the  
**SARACENS' DOMINIONS**







Jerusalem was reached only at the price of great dangers. In 1094 a monk, a native of Amiens, Peter the Hermit, made the attempt, but failed in it. The accounts brought back by the pilgrims in Italy and France, of the persecutions endured by Christians in Palestine, fired the imaginations of their listeners and aroused in them a mad thirst for vengeance.

**6. The Mussulmans' New Advance in Spain. Zalacca, 1085.**—Spain at this same time was the theatre of events which spread terror among the Christians. The kingdoms of Leon and Navarre, and Castile and Aragon, had been formed there at the expense of the Arabs. In 1085 Toledo fell into the hands of the Christians; but then a fresh horde of Mussulmans, the wild Almoravids, came to the assistance of their fellow-worshippers, and in 1087 gained an important victory, near Zalacca. The Christian kingdoms were invaded, and it was feared that the Pyrenees might not prove impassable. The capture of Jerusalem, then of Antioch, by the Turks, in the East, then the battle of Zalacca in the West, are the principal events which determined the crusades. By preaching them the Papacy echoed the feeling of all Christianity.

**7. The Popes and the Crusades. The Council of Clermont, 1095.**—The thought was not a new one. Gregory VII., as has already been seen, planned to lead a Christian army to aid Jerusalem. A French Pope, Urban II., took up the plan in a council which met in Auvergne, at Clermont, in mid-winter (1095). Having settled several important questions and solemnly proclaimed the Peace and the Truce of God, the Pope preached the holy war, in the presence of his prelates and a vast crowd. To the cry of, "God wills it!" all—peasants, citizens, knights, priests and monks, rich and poor—swore to set out to deliver the tomb of Christ. They were promised the

Church's benediction, remission of the penalties of purgatory, relief from debts, and the protection of their property during their absence. Their emblem was a red cross worn on the right shoulder. The enthusiasm spread through France and reached Italy, England, and the Scandinavian countries. The departure was set for the 15th of August of the following year. The bishop of Puy, Adhémar of Monteil, headed the expedition.

**8. The Popular Crusade Fails, 1096.**—Passions may be easily unchained, but it is difficult to control them. Before the lords had completed their preparations, the lower classes set forth. A horde of poor men, with women and children, followed, towards the East, Peter the Hermit, whom they looked upon as a prophet. Another crusader, Walter the Penniless, joined him with a similar troop. They crossed Southern Germany, pillaging the country to subsist, and massacring the Jews, to be pleasing in the eyes of the Lord; but, in Hungary, they were attacked and killed in great numbers by the inhabitants; the remainder barely reached Constantinople. A second horde of pilgrims,—French, Flemish, English, and German,—more than two hundred thousand strong, took the same route under the leadership of the viscount of Melun and Emich, count of Leiningen; it met the same fate. In spite of the advice of the emperor and the prayers of Peter the Hermit, those who remained would not linger for the feudal army; they crossed the Bosphorus and were massacred by the Turks. Only a few thousand succeeded in getting back to Constantinople.

**9. The Crusade of the Princes. Four Armies Meet at Constantinople, 1096.**—In the meanwhile the feudal army moved in four divisions: the first, commanded by Raymond of Saint-Gilles, count of Toulouse, went overland through Lombardy and Dalmatia; the second, under

Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lower Lorraine, and his two brothers, Eustace and Baldwin, passed through Germany, maintaining the strictest discipline, won the King of Hungary with smooth speech, and were unmolested by the Bulgarians; the Normans in Italy then followed with Bohemond of Tarentum, son of Robert Guiscard, and his nephew Tancred, after having passed through Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace; the French embarked at Brindisi and took about the same route as the Normans. They were led by Robert, duke of Normandy, the counts of Brittany, Flanders, and Chartres; their chief, Hugh of Vermandois, brother of the king of France, had preceded them so as to get the standard of Saint Peter at Rome. No king had been willing to take part in the expedition.

**10. The Crusaders Consent to Do Homage to the Emperor Alexis.**—The first comers had been joyfully received by Alexis; but gradually the number of crusaders increased so that he began to be afraid. Six hundred thousand armed men at the gates of the capital seemed to him, not unreasonably, more terrifying than the Turks encamped on the opposite shores of the Bosphorus; however, before getting rid of them he wished to make use of them. He agreed to assist them only on condition that the crusaders, if they were victorious, should give back to him what had belonged to the Empire in Asia Minor, and even in Syria, and therefore he asked the crusaders to take the oath of faith and homage to him. Some of their number agreed at once, but Godfrey of Bouillon refused to perform what he called a cowardly act; he wished to negotiate with the emperor as an equal. Bohemond was more accommodating, he did homage, but let it be understood that he would keep Antioch for himself, should it be taken. The amiable and vain Hugh of Vermandois

succeeded in repressing these premature ambitions, and in settling the differences. Then the crusaders solemnly acknowledged the emperor as suzerain; they promised to give up to him the cities of Asia Minor which the empire had lost. On the other hand the leaders were overwhelmed with presents, then were induced, one after the other, and with difficulty, to cross the Bosphorus; and the Greek Empire was relieved of this new invasion.

**11. Conquest of Jerusalem, 1097-1099.**—It took the crusaders two and one half years to go from the shores of the Propontis to Jerusalem. The capture of Nicæa (June, 1097) and the battle of Dorylæum (July) gave Asia Minor into their hands. They crossed the Taurus at the price of the greatest exhaustion. Antioch was taken by surprise after a long siege and turned over to Bohemond, who had an understanding with some of those in the city. Blockaded in the city by an army of the caliph of Mosul, the Christians were finally delivered by an unexpected victory, and could at last enter the Holy Land, where Jerusalem had just been taken from the Turks by the caliph of Egypt (July, 1098). Of the six hundred thousand men said to have met under the walls of Constantinople there remained scarcely fifty thousand, shattered and ill; but when they came in sight of the city where Christ had lived and died, all their sufferings were forgotten, and they fell on their knees, with an impulse of faith and enthusiasm. The first attack was repulsed. It was necessary to build movable towers to reach the summit of the wall; finally, after a siege of forty days, the crusaders entered the city through a breach, to the cry of, "God wills it! God wills it!" (July 15, 1099). There was a horrible massacre, in which seventy thousand Mussulmans are said to have perished. After another victory at Ascalon, the crusaders thought

they had forever rescued the tomb of Christ from the infidels.

**12. Results of the First Crusade.**—The lives of more than five hundred thousand men and prodigious sums of money had been expended in the first crusade; yet it bore vast results. The eastern shore of the Mediterranean had been almost everywhere wrested from the Mohammedans; the Greek Empire indeed recovered Nicæa and a third of Asia Minor; Bohemond and his Normans were settled in Antioch and Baldwin of Flanders in Edessa; Syria, once more Christian, could thus cover the small Armenian kingdom of Taurus and threaten the Seljuks by way of the Euphrates. Godfrey of Bouillon was given the direction of the newly formed kingdom of Palestine; he refused to wear the crown of gold, there where Christ had been crowned with thorns, and he was content with the more modest title of Advocate of the Holy Sepulchre. In the cities of the coast the Genoese and Pisans opened counting-houses which rivalled those of the Venetians in the Greek Empire. Islamism, that had been a permanent menace to Christian Europe, drew back in its turn, and endured attacks such as it had so often inflicted on others.

**13. Weakness of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.**—Brilliant as it was, the victory of the Christians was fraught with dangers. They had to defend a kingdom more than twelve hundred kilometres long, and some few leagues wide at certain points, and rarely protected by natural barriers. Along this immeasurable battle front there was no hope of enduring peace with these fiery sectaries of Mohammed, whose fanaticism constantly flared up on the arrival of fresh hordes, turned loose on the West by inexhaustible Asia. To hold their own they needed permanent troops and continual reinforcements; and they needed especially to remain united under the flag

of Christ. Unfortunately, the first condition was fulfilled in an intermittent way, and the second was almost always neglected.

**14. History of the Christian States of Palestine. Division of the Subject.**—The history of the Christian states of Palestine covers two centuries and is divided broadly into two periods, the first ending in the loss of Jerusalem (1187), and the second in the ruin of the Latin institutions at the end of the thirteenth century. Two important facts mark the first period: the rivalry of the Greeks and Normans, and the formation of the vast empire of the Atabeks.

**15. Ill-omened Rivalry of Greeks and Normans.**—Robert Guiscard's son was master of Antioch. If the Emperor Alexis had been willing to resign himself to the fact that he was independent lord of that city and the course of the Orontes, Bohemond would willingly have kept peace with the Greek emperor; but instead of restraining themselves in the face of a common enemy their old rivalry was stimulated in Asia. In 1100 Bohemond, having fallen into the hands of the Turks, a new crusade, made up especially of Germans, planned to deliver him, then to march on Bagdad in order to strike at the very heart of the Mussulman power. They were two hundred and forty thousand strong; but the most deplorable reverses cut down their high hopes; having taken Ancyra, they were overcome and almost exterminated by the Turks beyond the Halys. A second army, whose ranks held mostly Aquitanians, was destroyed near Heraclea. Thousands of human lives had been sacrificed with no result; as for Bohemond, he bought his freedom at the price of one hundred thousand pieces of gold, in spite of the entreaties of Alexis, who begged to have him given up to him. Henceforth his one thought was for ven-



geance on his perfidious rival. Leaving the principality to his nephew Tancred, he went to Italy for reinforcements, made an alliance with Pisa and Venice, and besieged Durazzo (1107); but he was completely conquered, and died three years later, desolate and ruined. The son and grandson of Alexis I. continued the struggle with like success; but another Norman, Roger of Sicily, seized Corfu, sacked Corinth, and carried off a large number of silk-weavers,—who then set up their looms in Sicily,—and took Thebes and Eubœa (1147). In order to repel this new invasion, the Emperor Manuel concluded, with the sultan of Iconium, whom he had just conquered, a truce of twelve years, at the very time when Christianity needed all her resources to repel the Mussulmans.

**16. The Atabeks. Capture of Edessa, 1144.**—A new Turkish tribe had, in fact, replaced the Seljuks in Mesopotamia and Syria; its chief at that time was Imadeddin Zenghi, atabek, or governor, of Mosul. He first took Aleppo, which was in a way the highway to Antioch (1128), then Edessa, the advance guard of the Christians beyond the Euphrates (1144). It is true that the latter city was retaken almost immediately, but the son of Zenghi, Nouredin, occupied and destroyed it the following year.

**17. Saint Bernard Preaches the Second Crusade.**—The news dismayed Europe. Saint Bernard had no difficulty in persuading Louis VII., king of France, a knightly and devoted prince, to go to the crusade; he had, moreover, to win his pardon for violences which the Church had condemned. He roused also the zeal of the lesser German nobility, whose enthusiasm overcame the calculating hesitation of their king, Conrad III. (1146).

**18. The German Expedition is Destroyed, 1147.**—Although last convinced, Conrad left first. He took the

land route over Hungary and Dalmatia. He was well received in Constantinople, because he was an enemy of the Normans in Sicily, and Emperor Manuel had married a German, Bertha of Sulzbach, sister-in-law of Conrad III. He would not wait for the Frenchmen, and boldly set off for Asia Minor on the road that had been so fatal to the Germans in 1101. He experienced the same reverses that they did, and came back to Constantinople when Louis VII., was about arriving there.

**19. The French Expedition in Asia Minor, 1148.**—Louis followed neither the route of Conrad III., nor of Godfrey de Bouillon. He marched nearer the Mediterranean coast, so as to avoid Turkish territory; then, tired with that long and painful route, at Ephesus the army turned boldly into the interior. It repulsed the Turks on the banks of the Meander, but when the mountains were reached it underwent the greatest sufferings; it lost its horses and beasts of burden from hunger and thirst. It was in no fighting condition when a Greek port was reached, Satali. The nobles and those who still had some money set sail for Antioch; the poor common men were abandoned, and became a prey to the infidels, who killed many and sold the rest into slavery.

**20. The Crusade Fails Before Damascus, 1148.**—There were still enough crusaders at Antioch to warrant an attempt in the direction of Aleppo and the Euphrates; but the king of Jerusalem had made the mistake of quarrelling with the emir of Damascus, who had called in to his aid Nouredin, until then his enemy. On that side Jerusalem was directly threatened. Louis VII. was persuaded to go on to the Holy City to join the German king, who had just reached there by sea, with a handful of men. They then resolved to lay siege to Damascus, but the crusaders were betrayed by their own allies, and

had to raise the siege without having accomplished anything. This was the end. Conrad III. left at once; Louis VII. only one year later. The only result of the crusade was to draw down upon Jerusalem itself the attacks of the enemy.

**21. Organisation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.**—For half a century the kingdom of Jerusalem had progressed steadily. After Godfrey of Bouillon, who died at the early age of about thirty-eight (1100), the crown was worn successively by his brother, Baldwin I. (1100-1118), by their cousin, Baldwin II. (1118-1131), finally by the latter's son-in-law, Fulk of Anjou (1131-1142). Under these princes the Latins (the name meant all the westerners brought in by the crusades) conquered the cities along the sea-coast, which afforded them direct communication with Europe. The kingdom thus formed was homogeneous enough, because, although there were men from all the countries of Europe, the French element predominated over all others; but the organisation was unstable, since its principles were borrowed from the feudal régime. The king governed, assisted by his high officers and the direct vassals of the crown. Of these latter the two principal ones were the count of Tripoli and the prince of Antioch, who often acted with entire independence. All were required to do military service, and also a certain number of knights and lower-class infantry (*soudoyers*, or sergeants). To this contingent, which was not very large, were added the permanent troops furnished by two celebrated orders, both religious and military, the Templars and the Hospitallers.

**22. Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights.**—The Templars were organised in 1119, by Hugh de Payens, to protect pilgrims and wage incessant war on the infidels; they were lodged at first in a part of the royal

palace at Jerusalem, near the site of the old temple. Hence their name of "knights of the temple," or Templars. The Hospitallers of Saint John of Jerusalem were at first but a charitable association founded half a century before the first crusade; the Templars' example determined them doubtless to help in the duty of caring for sick pilgrims and fighting the infidels; in 1130 the order was definitely established with that double object. The two orders had a similar organisation. This comprised three classes of brothers: the knights, who must be noble; the serving brothers, who were middle-class; and the priests, or chaplains, who were also noble. They were presided over by a grand master, who was aided by the chapter and the high dignitaries. They were divided into provinces, corresponding to as many nations or different languages, and these were subdivided into *bailliages*, made up of a certain number of individual houses or commanderies. The knights lived in common in these commanderies, under the canons of the Augustinian order; they took the triple vow of personal poverty, obedience, and chastity. This permanent militia rendered important services and became very rich. They owned, in the Holy Land, many castles, built according to the best rules of military science, and with the modifications that the nature of the climate demanded. Toward the end of the twelfth century, during the third crusade, another order was formed on the model of the older ones, the German or Teutonic Order (1191); but it did not have time to accomplish much in Palestine, and was soon sent elsewhere on quite a different crusade, directed against the pagan Slavs in Prussia.

**23. Administration of Cities.**—The cities had a population of Europeans and Orientals, who lived peaceably together, as a rule. Intermarriages were frequent

among them; the children born of these unions speedily acquired the customs of the country. They were grouped in communities governed, in the name of the lord, by viscounts. The viscount was responsible for the administration of justice, levied the taxes for the seigniorial revenues, of which he rendered an account every three months, and directed the police. Besides these, the large cities, and especially those of the seaboard, included commercial colonies. These formed so many communes, which were assigned a certain quarter, and had their own administration within the city.

**24. Justice.**—Justice was dispensed in two distinct lay courts: the high court, made up of knights who, under the presidency of the king, judged all feudal cases; and the court of commoners, made up of twelve jurors who, under the presidency of the viscount, judged civil cases. Commercial suits were carried before a tribunal called the *Fonde*, made up of six jurymen, four of whom were natives and two Franks; maritime suits were tried before that of the *Chaîne*. This judicial organisation was more complete than any of those existing in Europe. Legislation, which was based on the purest French law, was revised, especially in the thirteenth century, by learned jurists, whose decisions and books were the foundation of what is known as the Assizes of Jerusalem.

**25. Religious Toleration.**—There was a surprising variety of religions in this state. Representatives of Christian dissenting sects, whom the Byzantine emperors had persecuted, were found in the Holy Land; they were Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, etc. They acknowledged at least the nominal supremacy of the Roman Church, and lived peacefully side by side. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, at Jerusalem, the Syrians owned the so-called Chapel of the Cross; the Jacobites, that of

Saint James; the Greeks had an altar placed between the choir of the Latin canons and the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre. All these different forms of worship seemed reconciled with one another, beside the cradle of the Christian religion. Hence this kingdom of Jerusalem was truly an original organisation. The Franks had adapted themselves very quickly to the customs of the country; agriculture and commerce were favoured callings. A field for prosperous colonisation had opened to the unfortunate and discontented of old Europe. But insubordination among the feudal nobles, a too rapid succession of kings, the successful enterprises of Nouredin and his successors, all tended to cut short this brilliant development.

**26. The Christians Cannot Govern Themselves. Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, 1187.**—Scarcely had the Christian kings of the second crusade returned to Europe, when Nouredin advanced. He subdued the country under the emir of Damascus, and reached the sea between Antioch and Tripoli, thus cutting off the principality from the remainder of the Latin states. Then his nephew, Saladin, made himself master of Egypt after the death of the Fatimate caliph Aladel (1171); the kingdom of Jerusalem was then threatened on all points of her frontier by the same enemy. The situation was becoming critical, and there remained but one mistake to be made. The Latin chiefs committed it. On the death of Baldwin V. (1186) the crown was contested by Raymond, count of Tripoli, and Sibyl, mother of Baldwin V., who had just married her second husband, Guy of Lusignan. Sibyl was at Jerusalem; she hastened to have her husband crowned. Raymond, outraged at what he termed a usurpation, made an alliance with Saladin, and delivered to him the city of Tiberias. The following year

a rich Mussulman caravan, in which was a sister of Saladin, was pillaged by Raymond of Châtillon, lord of Krak. Saladin demanded satisfaction, which the king did not dare exact from his fierce vassal. Saladin thereupon declared that he would seek it himself, and proclaimed a holy war. The two armies met at Hittin, near the Lake of Tiberias (July 4, 1187). It was a disaster for the Christians: more than two hundred Templars were killed; King Guy was made prisoner; the wood of the real Cross, which they had carried with them in the midst of the fight, fell into the hands of the conquerors. Saladin marched straight to the cities on the coast, which opened their gates to him without resistance except Tyre, saved in time by Conrad of Montferrat. Jerusalem, blockaded September 20, resisted but twelve days. Saladin, eager to occupy the city, gave the inhabitants their lives and allowed them to leave with a part of their precious goods. The following year Guy of Lusignan himself was set at liberty, and a truce of seven months was arranged between the Saracens and the Christians.

**27. The Third Crusade. The Saladin Tithe.**—The news of the taking of Jerusalem aroused joy among the Mussulmans and consternation throughout the Western nations. A third crusade was preached by the archbishop of Tyre. Philip Augustus, king of France, Richard the Lion-Hearted, king of England, and Frederick I., king of Germany, took the cross. The Pope granted them a tax of a tenth of all property, even that of the clergy; this is known as the Saladin tithe.

**28. The German Expedition Destroyed. Death of Frederick Barbarossa, 1190.**—The Germans were the first to start. Frederick Barbarossa took the same route that Conrad III. had done, not wishing to incur the dangers of a sea voyage; moreover, he expected to pass quickly

through Asia Minor, since the sultan of Iconium was at war with Saladin. But a revolution had just occurred at Constantinople: a great-grandson of Alexis I., Isaac Angelus, the head of an ancient noble family in Asia, had seized the throne in 1185. He feared the Germans and made an alliance with Saladin, agreeing to harass Frederick I. as much as possible. The latter had to threaten to take Constantinople before Isaac would concede anything. Frederick could at last cross the Hellespont (March, 1190), but the delay in his progress, caused by the Greeks, had compromised the fate of the expedition; the sultan of Iconium had been deposed by his sons. One of them lured the Germans with false promises, then suddenly allied himself with Saladin. From that time on every step forward was at the price of suffering and unheard-of losses. However, they succeeded in taking Iconium, after a great victory; so they could cross the mountains and reach the basin of the Seleph (ancient Calycadnus). The emperor, impatient to cross the stream, urged in his horse, but he was drawn down by the current and drowned. The same waters that had almost cost the great Alexander his life were fatal to the great emperor. His death completed the ruin of the army, which had already lost its horses, baggage, and most of its effective force. It was but the shadow of itself when, under the orders of the duke of Saxony, a younger son of the emperor, it reached Antioch. Some thousands only had courage enough to push on to Acre, which had been in a state of siege since the preceding month of August.

**29. Siege and Capture of Acre by the Crusaders, 1191.**— Those who reached Acre first came from the most distant parts, the Danes and the Frisians. Eighteen months later the king of France appeared, then the king of England. They were allies, but there was no love lost



between them, being full of jealousy and constantly threatening one another. However, they brought essential reinforcements, and the city, hotly besieged, was brought to bay and forced to capitulate. King Richard put twenty-five hundred Mussulman prisoners to the sword. Saladin was less cruel at Jerusalem!

**30. Richard the Lion-Hearted in Palestine.**—Some chiefs felt that this success, so dearly bought, warranted their departure. Philip Augustus, who had weightier cares in France, left the army with Richard's disdainful consent; yet he left him ten thousand men, under the duke of Burgundy. Once alone, the king of England was only more energetic. He lacked diplomacy, but his bravery was unflinching. He recaptured Jaffa and Ascalon, beat Saladin, and marched on to Jerusalem. But he was as prodigal of the lives of his men as he was of his own, and soon he had not enough men to strike a decisive blow. Saladin, moreover, had experienced great reverses. The two great leaders, rivals in courtesy and courage, were reduced to negotiations. A truce was concluded for three years, three months, and three days; Christians were to be allowed to visit Jerusalem without paying tribute, and, besides, they retained the coast from Tyre to Jaffa. Saladin died shortly after (1193). His memory is dear to Mussulmans for his military glory and diplomatic wisdom, and to Christians for his generosity. Richard was taken prisoner, on his return home, as he was passing through the territory of Duke Leopold of Austria, whom he had insulted at Acre. Given over to the Emperor Henry VI., he was thrown into prison and closely guarded.

**31. The Crusade of Henry VI. Fails, 1197.**—On the disappearance of the heroes of the third crusade the Germans again enter on the scene. The Emperor Henry VI.,

all powerful in Germany and Italy, took up, in the eastern Mediterranean, the ambitious projects of the Normans, whose sovereign he had become by marriage. He had barely despatched sixty thousand men to Acre, when death took him and ruined the expedition scarcely begun. Pope Innocent III., young, enthusiastic, and ambitious, revived the plans of Urban II.; the crusades preoccupied him passionately during his reign.

**32. Innocent III. and the Fourth Crusade. It is Diverted towards Zara, 1202.**—Incited by Fulk, priest of Neuilly-sur-Aisne, and Martin, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Pairis, near Colmar, Thibaut III., count of Champagne, his seneschal, Geoffrey de Villehardouin, the count of Flanders and his wife, the count de Saint-Pol, the Sire de Montfort, and others took the cross. Two hundred thousand pilgrims were ready to follow them. The chief command was given to Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, a cunning, greedy leader, who counted on the weakness of the Greek Empire and the Latin kingdom to establish the fortunes of his house in the Orient. This time, distrusting the Greeks, the land route was abandoned. The seneschal of Champagne, Geoffrey de Villehardouin, was despatched to Venice to negotiate with the Republic the terms of transportation. The duke, or doge, was then Henry Dandolo, then more than an octogenarian, but full of vigour, a cunning diplomatist, and ambitious for his country's glory. A treaty, determining the conditions of the contract, was drawn up, but he made the principal clauses purposely ambiguous. Then the pilgrims flowed in. The knights were granted admission to the city, but the lower class stayed outside, penned up on one of the neighbouring islands. The expenses along the route had already eaten into the pilgrims' resources, and they no longer had the wherewithal

to pay the stipulated price. The doge proposed to them to lay siege to Zara, in the interests of Venice. It was in fact a Christian city, and occupied by the king of Hungary, who had taken the cross. However, they agreed to do so, excepting a small number who went on to the Holy Land. Zara could not hold out before this unexpected enemy, and capitulated after a five days' siege. It was sacked and dismantled; then the Venetians took possession of the place as masters of the Adriatic. At the same time another revolution in Constantinople again diverted the crusaders from their object.

**33. The Crusade Turns off to Constantinople.**—Isaac Angelus had usurped the throne; he was driven out ten years later by his own brother, Alexis III., but his son, named also Alexis, succeeded in escaping and went through Europe seeking avengers. He offered to take the Christian army, which was then idle after the capture of Zara, into his service; his conditions were so advantageous that these strange soldiers of Christ undertook once more a war against Christians. In June, 1203, they camped at Scutari. After a brief show of resistance, Alexis III. lost courage and fled. Isaac was released and invested again with the purple, and his son was associated with him on the throne as Alexis IV.

**34. Capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders, 1204.**—The crusaders, loaded down with presents, settled in the outskirts of the city, at Pera, and Galata; but their insolence made them obnoxious to the Greeks, and a revolution set Alexis Ducas, as Alexis V., on the throne. Thereupon the Latin chiefs reaffirmed their alliance by a treaty. Two parties, two groups, with opposing interests confronted each other: that of the Venetians and that of the crusaders. It was agreed that each one should name six electors, empowered after the victory, to elect an em-

ologus, attacked Constantinople and effected an entrance by surprise. He made a solemn entry into the capital of the restored Greek Empire, August 15, 1261.

**38. The Disastrous Fifth Crusade, 1219-1221.**—The crusaders met with an equally decisive check in the Holy Land. The tale of their last struggles against Islamism is lamentable. Innocent III. ordered a fifth crusade, which was sent against Egypt. After much suffering the army succeeded in taking Damietta, the key to the Nile (November 5, 1219). The sultan, who held his position with difficulty in Cairo, in the midst of plots against his throne and person, was so frightened at this that he offered to return Jerusalem to the Christians if they would consent to evacuate Damietta \* (1221). The head of the expedition, the violent and incompetent legate Pelagius, refused these unhoped-for conditions. Then hostilities began again, and the crusaders, poorly led by John of Brienne, were unable to dislodge the Mussulmans intrenched in their camp of Mansourah; cut off from the city and surrounded by conquerors, they could only escape disaster by surrendering Damietta (August 30).

**39. Diplomatic Advantages Gained by Frederick II. in the Sixth Crusade, 1229.**—Emperor Frederick II. of Germany had promised to go to this crusade, but he had been unable to keep his promise. He vowed to start another. His marriage with Maria Yolande, daughter of John of Brienne and heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem, afforded a personal reason for action; but when about to start (1227) an epidemic broke out in his army and in the fleet, which had already put to sea. Before listening to an explanation, Gregory IX. accused the emperor of

\* Greek fire was first used by the Saracens at this siege. Until then the Greeks had made it by a secret process.

having intentionally broken up the expedition, and excommunicated him. Frederick II. set out, in despite of this, the next year, followed by the Pope's curses, who called him a "pirate," not a "crusader," not going to conquer, but to ravish his kingdom of the Holy Land. He had with him ten thousand men, at the most; but discord was rife among the Mussulmans. The sultan of Egypt, Alkamil, threatened by the sultan of Damascus, agreed to treat with Frederick. They concluded a treaty for ten years; moreover, the sultan gave up to the emperor and king Jerusalem, with the right to fortify and administer it, on condition that the mosque of Omar, with its dependencies, should continue to be Mussulman property; he also gave him Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the places located along the pilgrims' route, from Acre to Joppa and Joppa to Jerusalem; prisoners made since the siege of Damietta should be liberated on both sides. And, finally, the emperor pledged himself to defend the sultan against all his enemies, even Christian, and, what was still more grave, to prevent the lords of Antioch, Tripoli, Tortosa, etc., from being reinforced. The treaty was variously judged. Herman of Salza, grand master of the Teutonic Order, acknowledged that Frederick had obtained the maximum of advantages; but the patriarch of Jerusalem looked upon it as shameful and dangerous. So, the day after Frederick assumed the crown at Jerusalem, the archbishop of Cæsarea, in the Pope's name, laid the kingdom under an interdict! When the emperor at last returned to Italy, he had a reconciliation with the Pope, which did not prevent his concluding, to the great scandal of devotees, treaties of alliance and commerce with the sultan of Egypt, and the princes of Tunis and Morocco. A good policy, but too much in advance of the ideas of the times to be justly appreciated.

ologus, attacked Constantinople and effected an entrance by surprise. He made a solemn entry into the capital of the restored Greek Empire, August 15, 1261.

**38. The Disastrous Fifth Crusade, 1219-1221.**—The crusaders met with an equally decisive check in the Holy Land. The tale of their last struggles against Islamism is lamentable. Innocent III. ordered a fifth crusade, which was sent against Egypt. After much suffering the army succeeded in taking Damietta, the key to the Nile (November 5, 1219). The sultan, who held his position with difficulty in Cairo, in the midst of plots against his throne and person, was so frightened at this that he offered to return Jerusalem to the Christians if they would consent to evacuate Damietta \* (1221). The head of the expedition, the violent and incompetent legate Pelagius, refused these unhoped-for conditions. Then hostilities began again, and the crusaders, poorly led by John of Brienne, were unable to dislodge the Mussulmans intrenched in their camp of Mansourah; cut off from the city and surrounded by conquerors, they could only escape disaster by surrendering Damietta (August 30).

**39. Diplomatic Advantages Gained by Frederick II. in the Sixth Crusade, 1229.**—Emperor Frederick II. of Germany had promised to go to this crusade, but he had been unable to keep his promise. He vowed to start another. His marriage with Maria Yolande, daughter of John of Brienne and heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem, afforded a personal reason for action; but when about to start (1227) an epidemic broke out in his army and in the fleet, which had already put to sea. Before listening to an explanation, Gregory IX. accused the emperor of

\* Greek fire was first used by the Saracens at this siege. Until then the Greeks had made it by a secret process.

having intentionally broken up the expedition, and excommunicated him. Frederick II. set out, in despite of this, the next year, followed by the Pope's curses, who called him a "pirate," not a "crusader," not going to conquer, but to ravish his kingdom of the Holy Land. He had with him ten thousand men, at the most; but discord was rife among the Mussulmans. The sultan of Egypt, Alkamil, threatened by the sultan of Damascus, agreed to treat with Frederick. They concluded a treaty for ten years; moreover, the sultan gave up to the emperor and king Jerusalem, with the right to fortify and administer it, on condition that the mosque of Omar, with its dependencies, should continue to be Mussulman property; he also gave him Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the places located along the pilgrims' route, from Acre to Joppa and Joppa to Jerusalem; prisoners made since the siege of Damietta should be liberated on both sides. And, finally, the emperor pledged himself to defend the sultan against all his enemies, even Christian, and, what was still more grave, to prevent the lords of Antioch, Tripoli, Tortosa, etc., from being reinforced. The treaty was variously judged. Herman of Salza, grand master of the Teutonic Order, acknowledged that Frederick had obtained the maximum of advantages; but the patriarch of Jerusalem looked upon it as shameful and dangerous. So, the day after Frederick assumed the crown at Jerusalem, the archbishop of Cæsarea, in the Pope's name, laid the kingdom under an interdict! When the emperor at last returned to Italy, he had a reconciliation with the Pope, which did not prevent his concluding, to the great scandal of devotees, treaties of alliance and commerce with the sultan of Egypt, and the princes of Tunis and Morocco. A good policy, but too much in advance of the ideas of the times to be justly appreciated.

**40. Disaster at Gaza, 1239.**—Hostilities began when the ten years' truce had expired. Alkamil had just died, and his two sons fought for the inheritance with drawn cimeters. The Christians thought it an opportune time to attack Egypt, but they were totally defeated at Gaza. The emir of Krak immediately attacked Jerusalem, which he captured and sacked. A crusade of several thousand knights recruited from England and France was not sufficiently numerous to accomplish anything of importance.

The sultan of Egypt, in his turn, assumed the offensive, and threw into Palestine an army of Kharesmian Turks, who seized Jerusalem and laid hands on the Christians. The Holy City fell at this time finally under the dominion of the Crescent (1244).

**41. End of the Crusades, 1248-1270.**—Then began the death throes of the Latin states in Syria and Palestine. Louis IX., king of France, led the seventh crusade into Egypt. He too seized Damietta and failed before Mansourah. The plague or scurvy decimated the army, which, exhausted, was forced to surrender (1249). He bought his own and his followers' liberty at the price of Damietta and an enormous ransom. Once delivered, he went to Palestine and spent four years in strengthening the defences of places still occupied by the Christians. The Mongols came after him. They captured Aleppo, Damascus, and Sidon. Bibars, their leader, invaded Syria (1263), took Antioch, Joppa, and Krak, the most important fortress of the Hospitallers. When he died (1279) he was able to boast that he had struck the final blow at the kingdom of Jerusalem. An eighth crusade had been started by Louis IX., but against the Mohammedans of Tunis (1270). The plague accomplished more than the enemy in stopping his troops. He himself died of the



scourge, and the inspiration of the crusaders seems to have been buried with him.

**42. Causes for the Failure of the Crusades. Results.—**Such was the deplorable end of these holy wars, undertaken at times with praiseworthy enthusiasm, and which had cost so much gold and blood; and all in vain. They finished in terrible bankruptcy! The causes of this failure were multiple. They were the extreme variety of peoples who furnished warriors for the crusades, absence of adequate authority to keep them united, the excessive pretensions of the Greek Empire in Syria, and its duplicity, which was much exaggerated, often misunderstood, but quite real; the burning rivalries between Christian princes, Pope, and emperor, between Pisans, Genoese, and Venetians; in short, lack of discipline among the crusaders. The setback was especially grievous for France. She had borne the largest share in these wars, she had shed her most generous blood, and she had established flourishing colonies in Palestine; she had transplanted her civilisation, warriors, and jurists; in her speech and by her chroniclers the fate of the crusades has been told, which, it is aptly said, were “the acts of God performed through the Franks”; and she suffered so much the more from the disaster. But other Christian states felt these reverses also. They shook the prestige of the Church and condemned the feudal system, which could accomplish such brilliant conquests, but was unable to preserve them. The heroic and religious era of the Middle Ages ends with the crusades.

One must not, however, be unjust and see only the disastrous side of these intermittent expeditions. Although the burning rivalries of Greeks and Latins may have diminished the force of resistance of Constantinople against Islamism, yet it is probable that the crusades de-

layed the moment when the infidels crossed the Bosphorus and settled in Thrace. The crusades, far from hindering commercial relations between the East and West, promoted them by multiplying the points of contact between the Mussulman and Christian worlds. The influence of the West on the East was slight; but that of the latter on the former was considerable. The introduction and dissemination of new natural products are due to them: sesame, buckwheat, saffron, sugar-cane, maize, limes, apricots, or Damascus plums, pistachio, the shallot (or onion of Ascalon), and the watermelon. The manufactured objects were cotton, calicoes, muslins, damask, satin, velvet, camlet, which was a camel's-hair stuff. In fashions are the caftan, burnoose, hoqueton (a kind of coat), skirts, wearing of the beard, and baths; and in military affairs, tents, Damascus blades, and cross-bows. Even the rosary was not generally used in the West until after the crusades. Arabian architecture and arts exerted an unquestionable influence on the imagination of European artists. In sum, the vast social upheaval induced by the crusades, the variety and breadth of the horizon opened to the thoughts and activities of the men of the twelfth century—were they not a large factor in the powerful intellectual revival which stamps this period, as well as in the social and political changes which then took place?

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### THE COUNTRY DISTRICTS AND CITIES OF FRANCE—EMANCIPATION OF PEASANTS AND BOURGEOIS.\*

1. **Society in two Classes until the Twelfth Century: Priests and Nobles.**—At the beginning of the eleventh century it was freely conceded that men were definitely classed in three categories: the prayers, the fighters, and the workers. Priests and nobles have concerned us until now; in the eleventh century they seem to be the only actors on the stage of life. But the workers—peasants in the country, artisans and merchants in the cities—gradually free themselves and claim in their turn a share in privileges. The emancipation of the Third Estate is a fact of general importance; it influenced the entire do-

\* **SOURCES.**—Chronicles of the eleventh and twelfth centuries collected in volumes x. and xv. of Bouquet. For Charters, "Recueil des Ordonnances des Rois de France," volumes xi. and xiii. "Recueil des Monuments inédits du Tiers État," composed by Aug. Thierry, 4 vols. "Les Layettes du Trésor des Chartes," published under the direction of the national archives, 3 vols. (1863-1875). "Documents sur les Relations de la Royauté avec les Villes en France de 1180 à 1314"; published by A. Giry (1885). The "Livre des Mestiers," by Étienne Boileau; edition Lespinasse et Bonnardot (1880).

**LITERATURE.**—Giry, "Histoire de la Ville de Saint-Omer"; Giry, "Les Établissements de Rouen"; Prou, "Les Coutumes de Lorris et leur Propagation aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècles"; Delisle, "Études sur la Condition de la Classe Agricole en Normandie pendant la Moyen Âge"; Fagniez, "Étude sur l'Industrie et la Classe Industrielle à Paris au XIII<sup>e</sup> et au XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle"; Pigeonneau, "Histoire du Commerce de la France"; Luchaire, "Les Communes Françaises."

mestic history of the large states of western Europe during the two centuries which followed the definite establishment of the feudal system.

**2. Villeins. Conditions of Serfdom Ameliorated.**—The villeins (*villani*), or peasants, were certainly the most wretched of all classes of the Middle Ages; they were mostly serfs, attached to the soil, holding land under mortmain tenure, taxable and workable at their lord's will and pleasure. They it is who suffer most cruelly from the general insecurity. At times their sufferings were so unbearable that they revolted, as in Normandy under Duke Richard II. At last their condition was improved, when the nobles realised that it was to their interest to care for those peasants who supported them. Then in place of the purely arbitrary relationship, the idea of a voluntary contract, entered into by both parties, was substituted. In this way serfs came to pay a lump sum, a stated rent; others had leases, as at the present time, for short terms or long terms; whilst others still bought their freedom at a money valuation. Normandy is, of all the provinces in France, the one which made the most complete and rapid advance; serfdom had disappeared there in the twelfth century.

**3. Emancipation of Serfs on Royal Domains.**—Royalty joined early in the movement. Louis VI. seems to be the first of the Capetians who freed serfs on his domains. Louis VII. went so far as to declare that liberty was a natural right, and that serfdom was a result of divine punishment; it is true, however, he went no farther than words. During the seventh crusade Saint Louis and his mother, Blanche of Castile, emancipated many, and encouraged their vassals to do likewise. Yet these concessions were not always gratuitous. Saint Louis worked more effectively towards ameliorating the fate of peasants

by forbidding private warfare, proclaiming heavy penalties against those who "disturbed the ploughs," and promoting clearings. Favoured by the beneficent peace of his reign, country districts were soon repopled, and in certain districts of Normandy, in the thirteenth century, the number of inhabitants reached almost that of the present time.

**4. Feudalism in the Cities. Entire Disappearance of the Roman Municipal Régime.**—Progress in the cities was startling. In the first place, it must be understood that the Roman municipal régime had entirely disappeared at the Merovingian epoch; at least there is no trace of it during quite four centuries. The former Gallo-Roman cities, even the capitals of city districts (*civitates*) and provinces, as well as the recent cities which were grouped around castles and fortified monasteries, at the time when feudalism was constituted, were owned by seigniors, bishop or abbot, count or king. There were often several lords sharing in one city the land and houses, the revenues, and administrative and judicial power. Their functionaries were the only agents employed throughout the town; *maires* (mayors) to collect the produce of the domain; *scabini*, or, in common speech, *échevins*, to dispense justice to the middle class. The condition of these *bourgeois* was scarcely better than that of the peasants; they were no more masters of their persons and property than were the latter of theirs.

In the eleventh century, after the conclusion of the great invasions, the situation began to change in France, when commerce and industry regained some security. But it did not change in every respect, nor at the same time, nor in the same way. One can distinguish what took place in the south, in the central region, and in the north, where the Capetian influence was felt, and lastly in

the French domains owned by the dukes of Normandy and Aquitaine, kings of England.

**5. Municipal Emancipation in the South.**—The south of France followed the example of municipal emancipation set by Italy. The early start given them there by the Mediterranean commerce enriched the inhabitants; the study of Roman law gave them the principles of communal organisation; and, finally, the ruin of the important feudal lords, both churchmen and laymen, by the emperors, removed the first obstacle to their emancipation. They chose individual magistrates, called dukes, or doges, as in Venice and Genoa, or consuls, as in Milan. The choice of their fellow-citizens, these magistrates governed the town, dispensed justice, and commanded the militia. The principal cities of the south of France, where feudalism was neither very extended nor oppressive, were organised on this model. Arles had consuls in 1131, Montpellier ten years later, Nîmes in 1145, Narbonne in 1148, and Toulouse in 1188. The number of the consuls, as well as the mode of election, varied greatly; there were twenty-four at Toulouse and only eight at Avignon. Their powers were most extended; they were aided by one, and sometimes by two councils. It should be observed that these municipal leaders were taken from among the higher class of bourgeois, or even from the nobles; there was nothing democratic in the cities of the south. Moreover, they enjoyed a generous autonomy, which is not found to the same degree either in the turbulent communes of the north, or, especially, in the towns that were half subject to England.

**6. Municipal Emancipation in Normandy. The Establishments of Rouen.**—The municipal movement did not find so favourable a soil in Normandy. Ducal authority was very firm there. And besides, when William the

Bastard conquered England, and especially when Henry II. had set up the formidable Angevin Empire, the country, drawn into perpetual wars with the Capetian kings, was forced to sacrifice all her resources to defensive measures; and on their side the Angevin kings increased municipal privileges to make sure of the assistance which they looked for from the cities. Hence the advantages benevolently conceded by Henry II. in his Establishments of Rouen. He granted the capital of his duchy a municipal body made up of one hundred "peers," who elected yearly twenty-four *jurés* to dispense justice, having a *maire* named by the king from a list of three candidates; but besides these municipal magistrates the king had his own functionaries, bailiffs, viscounts, or provosts. The Rouen charter was given to several towns in Normandy, Poitou, and Saintonge. When Philip Augustus took possession of this region he found the plan of municipal régime so favourable to royal power that he confirmed the old charters and granted new ones. There were no revolutions there, but they broke out repeatedly and with great fury in the third region—northern France and around the Capetian domain.

**7. Municipal Emancipation in the Capetian Region. The Guilds.**—There were two principal causes leading up to the development of cities there: the terror of Norman invasions, which drove many peasants to seek refuge behind the ramparts and compelled the inhabitants to combine in order to defend their walls; and, later, commercial prosperity, which, in the eleventh century, and especially after the first crusade, enriched the towns situated in the valleys of the Scheldt and the Rhine. In order to protect their manufactures, especially the merchandise which they sent away, artisans and merchants formed associations, named, according to the locality, guilds, conjurations, con-

fréries, charities, hansas; as, for instance, the guild of Rouen, the "water trade" of Paris, the hansa of London instituted for trade in English wools with Flemish cities, etc. The merchant guilds were the most important, because, incurring more risk, they reaped greater profits and also felt more keenly the necessity for association; it was they too who headed the communal movement and who knew how to profit by it most. For a long time artisans comprised a less important part of the population, that was controlled and exploited by the large merchants.

**8. Communal Revolutions.**—How did these commercial societies gain control of the administration of cities? That depended on localities and circumstances. Sometimes it was the result of an agreement between the lord of the city and the bourgeois; but more often it was the end of long disagreements, usurpations, and bloody insurrections. In Flanders the cities took advantage of the assassination of Count Charles the Good, and the kind of interregnum which followed the crime, to organise themselves into communes, and they were either skilful or fortunate enough to make the revolution legitimate. Elsewhere they took by force the right of self-administration, as at Cambrai (1076), Laon (1106), and Vézelay (1152). It is noteworthy that in these latter towns the seignior was either bishop or abbot. It is sometimes stated that the clergy favoured communal emancipation, and it has been credited with a revolution which brought forth the Third Estate. On the contrary, the Church offered the most obstinate resistance, and the change was accomplished most violently when opposed by her.

**9. Communal Organisations.**—The organisation of communal towns was infinitely varied. It was most frequently determined by an official act or charter, extorted by force from the seignior, or granted by him for fixed pecuniary



payments, usually very burdensome to the city. In some places the lords granted no more than personal liberty to the citizens, and the right of being judged solely before city tribunals, or securities for trade, fair, and market privileges; in others they allowed them self-administration, with magistrates of their own choice, yet reserved for themselves certain sovereign rights, as at Saint-Quentin, Laon, and Noyon, where the tribunal of échevins continued to dispense justice in the name of their suzerain, as during the Carolingian epoch; elsewhere he abdicated completely. Usually municipal powers were vested in a body or college of administrators, named variously jurés, pairs (peers), or échevins. Échevins of the commune must be distinguished from seigniorial échevins, spoken of above, for frequently, in the Middle Ages, similar names were used to designate different things. The number of magistrates varied according to the cities; for instance, there were twelve at Péronne and thirty-six at Laon. Elections varied also; in some places the jurés elected members to their own body, and thus it became exclusively aristocratic and tyrannical; elsewhere the mass of artisans—that is to say, the lower class—took an important part in the election. The maire was at the head of the body of jurés or échevins; he was merely the first among them, and could do nothing without their approbation and coöperation. He was elected either by the jurés in aristocratic communes, or by chiefs of corporations of arts and trades; in some towns there were two mayors—or rather the mayor had a lieutenant, corresponding to the present deputy. The office of mayor was no sinecure; in fact, the mayor commanded the militia, represented the city, travelled for it when it was necessary to transact business with the seignior or the king, and he bore the burden, with the jurés—and often more than

they—of the weight of penalties attached to the commune. During the thirteenth century his term of office lasted usually a year. Subject to the under-mayor's and jurés' orders were functionaries of inferior rank, such as the clerk of the commune, a kind of secretary to the mayor, treasurer of finances, sergeants, watchmen, etc.

**10. The Communal City is a Corporation Considered as a Feudal Person.**—The communal body had its tribunal, militia, and revenues; the bell in the *beffroi* rang the bourgeois to arms and the jurés to council; the city seal was placed on all acts which determined its rights and interests; it often controlled the rural districts, where it owned lands and serfs. Thus constituted it was an actual feudal lord; the belfry or bell-tower of the town hall took the place of the seigniorial donjon, and the mayor was often represented on the city seal mounted, and wearing the helmet and hauberk, like a knight. The communal movement tended therefore to place the bourgeois, though collectively, in the ranks of feudalism. Communes, vassals of king or lords, and owning, themselves, vassals, are actual seigniorial lords. It was willingly believed in the Middle Ages that conditions were unchanging. By revolting against their feudal lords cities simply wished to destroy or limit some local tyranny; it was not their ambition to destroy feudal society, but acquire the best place possible in it.

**11. Rural Communes.**—There were rural communes as well as those of cities. It should be understood that peasants aspired to become members of the commune established in their neighbourhood, or to form communes for themselves; but it should also be understood that the lords opposed them violently. Sometimes several villages formed a collective commune, such as Laonnais, which comprised no less than seventeen villages and covered a

territory of about twenty-four square kilometres. However, these communes were short-lived, for they were incapable of resisting for any length of time their feudal lord. The Laonnais commune disappeared in the middle of the thirteenth century, after a troubled existence of three-quarters of a century.

It may now be asked what was the policy of royalty in France towards cities, and how they were treated on royal domains.

**12. Royal Policy Towards Communal Towns.**—The attitude of our kings towards communal towns was not unvarying. It was quite one thing in the twelfth century, under Louis VI. and Louis VII., sometimes different under Philip Augustus, whose reign is in this respect a transition period, and takes on its final form in the thirteenth century, under Saint Louis and his immediate successors. First, it must be remembered, royalty always posed as the protector of the Church, and, as has been seen, it was primarily a disadvantage to the Church that the most turbulent of the communes were established; hence it is apparent that royalty could not favour them, and, in fact, it began by opposing them. On the other hand, the establishment of a commune near an episcopal or abbatial see, or in a large fief, weakened the seignior; now it was evidently to the king's interest to place his powerful rivals in an embarrassing position, and he did not hesitate, according to circumstances, to legalise communal insurrections. Hence the confusion in his course, ever hesitating between what seemed duty and what was certainly to his advantage. It is also a proof that Louis VI. does not merit the title, too long given to him, of "Father of the Communes." Saint Quentin, Beauvais, Rheims, and Amiens had freed themselves long before this prince's accession. Moreover, he would not suffer com-

munes in regions directly subject to his control. Philip Augustus, on the contrary, was very liberal towards them; he confirmed the charters of his predecessors; he respected and even extended the privileges of cities which he acquired by conquest; and he voluntarily created new communes. It was because he believed he should profit by them. Most of the communes lay along the most exposed frontiers of his domains; so, for his purposes, they were just so many strongholds which it cost him nothing to keep up, since the bourgeois bore the expenses of keeping the walls in repair and supporting the militia. It was another matter in the succeeding reigns. Royalty attempted to control the communes and turn them to account. They were closely watched by the king's officers, subject to the restraint of his parliament, and burdened with heavy taxes, which hastened their ruin. After the thirteenth century the autonomy of municipal republics was no more than a tradition.

**13. Royalty Favours the Bourgeoisie in its Domains.**—Although royalty was rather hostile than otherwise to communes, it was a constant protector, in its domains, of cities animated by a more peaceful spirit, the cities of the commonalty, or *villes de bourgeoisie*. They had no elected magistrates; the entire administration was in the hands of royal officers. The king's provost governed and dispensed justice. Naturally it was to the royal interest to favour the inhabitants of cities and villages whence came its subsistence. This was done by granting them freely, although for a sum of money, privileges of every kind. Its "charters of enfranchisement" protected inhabitants from abuses committed by lords or royal functionaries, lessened rents and the rate of penalties, systematised military service, and made it less oppressive by authorising the payment of a sum of money to take the

place of military duty; they protected corporations of artisans and merchants, such as the bow-makers and chandlers of Étampes, tavern-keepers of Orléans, bakers of Pontoise, tanners of Senlis, the "water trade," shoemakers, money-changers, and butchers of Paris, established fairs and market places, and protected individual liberty. The charter granted by Louis the Fat to Lorris en Gàtinais, with the intention of re-peopling the city, and, in that way, of increasing the royal revenues, may be regarded as typical of these royal concessions. It was completely successful, and was adopted, not only in the rest of the royal dominions, but in the territory of the lords of Courtenay and the counts of Sancerre and Champagne. In the same way the "law" granted by the archbishop of Rheims to Beaumont en Argonne (1082) was adopted in more than five hundred places, little and big, in Champagne, Lorraine, and Luxembourg.

**14. The King's Good Cities and Burghers.**—The cities thus favoured by the king became his *bonnes villes*, and the citizens the *bourgeois du roi*. In one sense the condition of these latter was preferable to persons in communes, for their status was personal, whilst the privileges of citizens in communes did not extend beyond the enclosure of their towns or districts; they could escape the jurisdiction of the lord on whose lands they lived by placing themselves under the king's. Therefore subjects of vassals did all they could to acquire the quality of king's bourgeois, and the movement was favoured by royalty, since its authority was extended into the very centre of feudal domains. Finally royalty, imitating the vast abbeys which, from the eleventh century, had opened asylums for homeless men, made an attempt to increase the number of "new cities," in the hope of enriching the domain, and at the same time injuring feudal lords—a

hope that was rarely disappointed. Added to this, it extended its influence over cities belonging to certain nobles, either by taking them under royal protection, or by negotiating with the lord of the city a share in the administration of the town (*pariages*). All means to bring cities within its sphere were legitimate, and the time was not far distant when the maxim, "the communes belong to the king," would hold good. On the whole this policy was followed by all lay and ecclesiastical lords, it was so much in accord with the nature of things.

**15. Formation of the Third Estate.**—If now the whole of the movement which took place in the twelfth century in countries and towns be considered, one cannot fail to be impressed by its strength and extent, and struck by the advantages which it brought in its train. The conditions of serfdom were ameliorated, even condemned in principle; the arbitrary and violent régime of primitive feudalism was replaced by new relations between strong and weak, which were outlined by contracts and defined in charters; by the side of lay and ecclesiastical lords, who had until then assumed all powers in the state as well as all rights in society, cities were learning how to govern themselves. A third class was gradually taking form in the nation. The widespread custom in cities of borrowing from some typical municipality its internal system, such as the law of Beaumont, the customs of Lorris, the establishments of Rouen, the charter of Mantes, Soissons, Saint Quentin, or the treaty of peace of Laon, struck a deathblow at the feudal characteristic of local peculiarity. And finally labour, being protected, paved the way for an increase in comfort such as had not been known since the Roman decadence.

**16. Agriculture.**—In the twelfth century France was still preëminently an agricultural country; the products

of the soil were naturally the same as in our days, since the climate has not changed; it was a country of wheat and wines. In the thirteenth century there was an interest shown in the improvement of the breed of wool-bearing animals, oxen, and horses; some rich proprietors had studs. But crafts and commerce were keeping pace with farming and grazing; the former were the province of the bourgeois, and agriculture was that of villeins.

**17. Industries and Corporations.**—Industries were still in their infancy. They called for manual labour only, and there were scarcely any machines other than the tools employed by workmen from times immemorial in all countries. Moreover, trades were not allowed to develop freely, but were subject to the restrictive measures of guilds.

**18. Industry in Paris During the Thirteenth Century.**—The industrial conditions and the working class in the thirteenth century can best be studied at Paris, because Paris was then the largest city in France, and the statutes of the various incorporated bodies of crafts, collected by Stephen Boileau, have come down to us almost entire. These corporations were responsible bodies—that is to say, the individuals of the trade, taken collectively, could act as one individual: buy and sell, go to law, and receive legacies and inheritances. They had their own revenues, their house, such as the *Parloir aux Bourgeois* of the “water trade,” and their personal seal, like a seignior exercising jurisdiction. Artisan members were also associated in pious and charitable works, until, somewhat later, they should form religious fraternities. They took part as a body in public ceremonies; thus, more than three hundred fullers went out to meet Philip the Bold when he returned with the bones of Saint Louis.

Commanded by the knight of the watch (*chevalier du guet*), they coöperated with the paid guard of the king in policing Paris, by furnishing, in their turn, a quota of men for the citizens' guard. It is true that some trades were relieved of this obligation; for instance, those who worked for the nobility and clergy, such as the hauberk-makers, sculptors; makers of peacock-feather hats. The cement-makers and stone-cutters claimed a like exemption, which they dated from the reign of Charles Martel. The drapers, haberdashers, and jewellers possessed the most prosperous industries of Paris. As a rule, tradesmen of a like profession lived in the same quarter or on the same street; the streets named de la Mortellerie (cement-makers), de la Tannerie (tanners), de la Sellerie, (saddlers), de la Parcheménierie (parchment-makers), and des Lombards (the money-dealers) have kept the tradition of former conditions. Butchers, on the contrary, lived outside of the walls; the principal slaughter-house was near the Châtelet, on the site of the present tower Saint Jacques de la Boucherie; the wall built by Philip Augustus brought it within the city enclosure.

**19. The Industrial Class of Paris.**—There were three classes comprised in a guild: apprentices, workmen, and masters. The term and price of apprenticeship varied greatly—from three to thirteen years, and from twenty sous to six francs per annum. The workman's life and habits must be reputable. His pay was small, but he was lodged and fed at his master's house. He could easily set up for himself, having merely to pass the mastership examination and pay the small initial expenses. Large fortunes, as well as extreme poverty, therefore, were rare. Some corporations of crafts and trades admitted members by right of birth; down to the fifteenth century butchers inherited their trade. The *gardes-jurés*, who



inspected the various trades, were elected by the masters. They visited workrooms and shops, confiscated poor products, even in the hands of foreign tradesmen or buyers. This general oversight of crafts suited the period of infant industries, and tended to good results, since masters and workmen made but one family, and the antagonism between capital and labour, as we call it to-day, did not exist.

**20. Commerce and Fairs.**—Commerce was in close touch with industries. The shop was often alongside of the workroom; but there were also travelling merchants. The cries of the various itinerant sellers of Paris have been gathered into a collection. Some had both a shop in their own quarter and a booth at the market-houses (*halles*). These were built by Louis VI. on the site of the Champeaux (*meadows*), where are the present central market-houses (*Halles centrales*); they were enlarged by Philip Augustus. Added to these were fairs, which occurred at stated times of the year, frequented by merchants from the French provinces, and even foreign countries. In Saint Louis's time the most important ones were the fair of l'Endit (*indictum*), or of Lendit near Saint Denis, of Beaucaire, and especially the six fairs in Champagne. Foreign commerce improved somewhat, although it had scant honour from the Church. It was fostered by the crusades, the formation of great states, the continued peace under Saint Louis, the circulation of gold coins minted under this king's direction, and bills of exchange—which came into use during the thirteenth century. But, as has often been the case among the French, there was a certain disinclination to undertake large business enterprises, which require marked initiative ability. Important commercial undertakings were too often left to foreigners. The French-

men rarely travelled, doubtless because they were fairly comfortable at home.

**21. Extreme Importance of the History of the Twelfth Century in French and European Civilisation.**—Thus everything was moving and changing during these Middle Ages, which are sometimes represented as being held motionless in leading-strings. In this respect, and it is not the only one, the twelfth century was one of amazing productiveness. It was preëminently a creative period; a fact that will be illustrated many times. The parcelling out of feudal domains, under seigniors, whose interests lay in the welfare of their territories, resulted in a material increase in prosperity and population. The double movement of the communes and the crusades is the proof of a real outpouring of life and energy. The great nations of Europe were also taking form at this time. Germany and Italy, absorbed in the struggle for universal dominion, to which each aspired, had no leisure for home development and organisation; elsewhere it was different. Christian unification and diversity of peoples developed at the same time. First among them we should study France, taking up the others later.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### FRENCH ROYALTY (987-1154).\*

**1. Beginning of Capetian Royalty. Weakness of the Royal Power.**—In the beginning, Capetian royalty apparently lacked force and independence. Hugh Capet had been favoured by Germany. He had, moreover, been elected by the nobles of the kingdom; his usurpation justified theirs. The feudal régime was then legalised: instead of one king, there seemed to be more than one hundred. In fact, sovereign power, while expressing itself in the same forms as during Charlemagne's time, was very limited. The ancient national laws, restored by the great emperor, had fallen into desuetude, and had been replaced by an infinite number of local customs over which the king had no hold; and also the requirement that no ordinance should be published without the assent of his vassals, crippled his legislative authority. The judicial

\* **SOURCES.**—See details in the "Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France," by G. Monod (1888). The principal chronicles are of Helgaud: "Vita Roberti regis," in Bouquet, volume x. Raoul Glaber: "Five books of his histories," edition M. Prou (1886). Sigebert de Gembloux: "Chronicon" (381-1112), in Bouquet, volumes x., xi., and in the "Monum. Germ. histor.," volume x. Suger: "Vie de Louis le Gros suivie de l'Histoire du roi Louis VII.," edition of A. Molinier (1887). Letters of Ives de Chartres (died 1117) in Bouquet, volume xv. Charters of Kings Hugh Capet, Robert the Pious, and Henry I., in Bouquet, volumes x. and xi.

**LITERATURE.**—Lot, as above; Pfister, "Études sur le Règne de Robert le Pieux"; Luchaire, "Études sur l'Administration de Louis VII. et Catalogue de ses Actes," and "Louis VI. le Gros, Annales de sa Vie et de son Règne"; Luchaire, "Les Premiers Capétiens"; vol. ii. part i. Lavissee, "Histoire de France."

power of seigniors limited the efficiency and activity of his tribunal, which was composed entirely of the undisciplined leaders of the nobility and clergy. He had at his disposition a force unworthy of the name of army, since vassals owed him but an extremely short term of service. Imposts having disappeared long before, the treasury was replenished solely from the royal domains.

**2. Extent of the Royal Domain.**—The domain was made up of territorial possessions scattered throughout twelve of the present departments of France, and separated from one another by fiefs belonging to the Church and lay seigniors. The king could not go from one to another possession except at the head of an armed force, so that the shortest journey meant to him a military expedition. As for his direct vassals, some, whose fiefs lay within the so-called territory under obedience to the king,—like the counties of Anjou, Maine, Touraine, Chartres, and Blois, Troyes, Corbeil, Dreux, the Vexin, Meulan, the Vermandois, and Ponthieu,—could furnish him, on certain occasions, a brilliant, though small, escort; others, those beyond the rivers Canche and Loire, not counting the duchy of Normandy and county of Brittany, were but loosely attached to him. Under such conditions Capetian royalty was destined to remain hopelessly weak.

**3. Circumstances Favourable to Capetian Royalty.**—However, several causes came to its aid. First, royalty continued. In Germany, for instance, royal families soon passed away; that of Hugh Capet was continued from father to son, uninterruptedly, for more than three centuries. During these centuries there was but one long minority, Saint Louis's, and then France was fortunate enough to have a woman of superior mind for regent, Blanche of Castile. It was sufficient for the early Capetians to take the precaution, followed, moreover, by the

Carolingians, of having their eldest sons crowned, and associated with them on the throne, before dying, so that the transmission of the crown was almost always made peaceably, and royalty gradually became hereditary. This fact led to one natural result. According to feudal laws the king was supreme suzerain; whilst all seigniors in France, directly or indirectly, were under his dependence, he depended on no one, except, as was said later, on God and his own sword. Of feudal origin, but monarchical tendencies, royalty yielded none of the Capetian pretensions to supreme power. It even made use of the rules of feudal society to enlarge, to the detriment of feudal power, and reconquer, one by one, the domains and regal powers that had been lost. Dating from Hugh Capet, the history of France is a tale of the kingdom's conquest by the kings. On the whole, the early Capetians no more failed in their task than did the later Carolingians; but the situation was more favourable, for the latter were upheld by a large force of personal vassals and vast territorial fortune. Unfortunately, they met, at every point, either the inertia or avowed hostility of the feudal aristocracy, and a century and a half were needed to restrain, break up, and control it.

#### **4. Troubles of Hugh Capet and Robert II., the Pious.—**

The facts of domestic history may be rapidly summed up. Hugh was first compelled to defend his crown against Charles of Lorraine, who was supported by Arnulf, Adalbero's successor at Rheims. When this pretender was definitely driven off, he interfered with much energy and skill in his vassals' quarrels. His son, Robert II. (996-1031), attempted, by his marriage with Bertha, widow of Eudes I., count of Chartres, Tours, and Blois, to gain possession of the latter's rich domains; but Bertha was too closely allied to him, according to Church laws of

consanguinity, and, anathematised by the Pope, he was obliged, after long resistance, to give her up (1101). When Duke Henry, his uncle, died, leaving no direct heir, he invaded Burgundy, which he finally conquered, after fourteen years of struggle (1016). South of the Loire he was on friendly terms with William the Scholar, duke of Aquitaine. His marriage with Constance of Arles tended to establish Capetian influence in the south, but for the moment it had unfortunate results. The new queen introduced into northern France the costumes and gentle manners of the south, which aroused disapproval in the clergy; she was ill-tempered and domineering, and finally gained dangerous ascendancy over the mind of her weak husband. On his death, July 30, 1031, she wished to give the crown to a younger son, and dispossess Henry. The attempt was a failure. Henry, victorious over Robert at Villeneuve-Saint-Georges, bought him off with the duchy of Burgundy, and his mother's death (1032) left him in peaceful possession of the throne.

**5. Futile Attempts of Henry I. to Take Normandy.**—The engrossing subject of the reign of Henry I. was Normandy. Since it had been definitely constituted by William I., Longsword, this beautiful duchy had increased in prosperity. The marriage of Richard I. with Emma, daughter of Hugh the Great, gave the Capetians a valuable and often a faithful ally. Richard II., named the Good (996-1027) helped King Robert to conquer Burgundy. His grandson, Robert I., called the Devil, or the Magnificent (1028-1035), helped Henry I. to triumph over his brother and mother. When he died, on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land (1035), he only left one illegitimate son, William, born about 1027, whose mother was the daughter of a tanner of Falaise. An uprising of the Norman barons forced the young duke to take refuge

with Henry I., who immediately came to his assistance. The rebels were beaten at the battle of Val-ès-Dunes, near Caen (1047). A short time after William married his cousin Matilda, daughter of Baldwin V., count of Flanders. Soon, jealous of the growing power of his vassal, Henry I. joined with the counts of Champagne and Ponthieu in the invasion of Normandy. One of his armies was completely routed at Mortemer, and the other, panic-stricken, beat a retreat. The king returned to the charge four years later, but he was surprised at the crossing of the Dive, near Varaville, and forced to retreat over the frontier. Although beaten, Henry I. acquired great renown for his bravery. This was apparent at the coronation ceremonies of his oldest son, Philip, whom he had by his wife, Anne of Russia. There were, in fact, at Rheims, besides many prelates, abbots, and priests, the duke of Aquitaine, the son of the duke of Burgundy; the counts of Auvergne, La Marche, Angoulême, etc.; southern and northern France met. Persons of all classes assented unanimously, exclaiming three times: "We approve, we wish it!" Contemporaries were amazed that there should have been no disorder in such a vast crowd. Nor was there any outbreak of disorder at the time of Henry's death, which left the crown to a child eight years of age.

**6. Philip I., 1060-1108. Importance of the First Four Capetians.**—The new king was, for some time, under the guardianship of his maternal uncle, the count of Flanders, who ruled wisely until 1067. When Philip I. became his own master, he continued the policy of his predecessors. He threw off his natural indolence many times, in order to interfere in the complicated affairs of the Flanders succession, and to keep within bounds the duke of Normandy, who, by a fortunate move, had become master of

England (1066). His successes, like his father's, were indifferent, yet they in no wise lessened the esteem in which the house of France was held. The work of the first four Capetians was therefore not barren; the efforts of the eleventh century paved the way for the progress of the twelfth, while the crusades were diverting into the Orient a good part of the brutal passions of feudalism.

**7. Louis VI. His Character.**—Louis VI., called the Fat, born in 1081, the oldest son of Philip I., was associated with his father, under the title of “future king,” when he was nineteen years old. He was not crowned at that time, but he did not wait his father's death to become actual king; his personal activity made itself felt from the beginning of the twelfth century. He was tall and corpulent; like his father, he loved good eating and pleasure; he resembled his grandfather, Henry I., in his passion for arms. A great hunter and fighter, he flung himself with fool-hardy courage into the midst of danger. He did not cease his activity until, at the age of forty-six, he became too corpulent to mount a horse. As a man he was praised for his frankness and goodness, as a king, for his justice. These qualities took the place of diplomatic ability; and by making him loved and feared they constituted the strength and value of his reign.

His reign was one long struggle against feudalism and for the Church.

**8. Disturbed Situation of the Royal Domain.**—The condition of the royal domains called for energetic action against the petty feudal lords. There were hostile donjons everywhere, inhabited by hereditary chatelains, who supported themselves by brigandage. Louis VI. restored order among them. The chateau of Puiset, the terror of the Beauce, was besieged, taken, and burned three times. Thomas de Marle, sire of Couci, died in



prison, still refusing to give up his stolen property. It took twenty years to subdue the lords of Maule, Montlhéry, Rochefort in Iveline, Crécy in Brie. Yet it was accomplished, and the king, from Paris, could communicate freely with the principal Capetian cities—Dreux, Étampes, Orléans, and Melun.

**9. Louis VI. Struggles with Great Feudal Lords.**—The long struggle of the petty feudal lords was supported by help from the powerful nobles. However, Louis the Fat resisted both. He fought twenty-four years (1111-1135) against Thibaut IV., count palatine, whose dominion extended over Champagne and Blois, and who was besides nephew of the king of England, Henry I., Beauclerc. He disarmed him, at last, by giving him a privileged position at his own court. He tried to take advantage of the death of Charles the Good, count of Flanders, assassinated at Bruges in 1127, by imposing one of his own favourites on the Flemings. This was William Clito, son of Robert Courteuse, duke of Normandy, who aspired to the English throne; but he was unskilful in his candidacy, and soon was obliged to give it up. His ally in the west was Fulk V., count of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine; it was a valuable foothold, as far as Normandy was concerned, but Fulk, having married the daughter of Baldwin II., heiress to the throne of Jerusalem, went to reign in the Holy Land, and his son, Geoffrey Plantagenet, married Matilda, daughter of King Henry I. of England. The latter's death postponed for a time the danger of an Anglo-Angevin alliance. South of the Loire, Louis the Fat directed two expeditions against William VI., count of Auvergne, who had been persecuting the bishop of Clermont; he had with him, on the second (1126), the counts of Flanders, Anjou, and Brittany, some Norman troops sent by Henry I., Amaury de Montfort and many

other barons. The duke of Aquitaine, William IX., the Troubadour, interfered in favour of his vassal the count of Auvergne, but he was frightened by the number of warriors with the king of France, and beat a retreat, after doing homage to the king. His son, William X., when about to die, asked his barons to marry his eldest daughter, heiress of his fief and title, to the successor named by Louis the Fat. The union of the future Louis VII with Eleanor of Aquitaine (1137) at once doubled the domain, and for the first time the authority of a Capetian king extended as far as the Pyrenees.

**10. Struggles of Louis VI. with England.**—The situation in Normandy was more difficult. Louis VI. was completely routed at Brémule in an attempt to take Andelys. An attempted coalition against Henry I. in 1122 resulted in a closer alliance of this king with his son-in-law, Henry V., emperor of Germany. In 1124 two armies prepared to invade the territory of the king of France; the English were to come by way of Normandy, whilst the Germans marched upon Rheims. Louis the Fat faced the danger with manly resolution. As count of the Vexin and vassal of the abbey of Saint Denis, he went, with much solemnity, to take the red-and-gold standard of the monastery, the *oriflamme*, which was only done in exceptional cases. The duke of Burgundy, the counts of Blois, Champagne, and Nevers, sent him their feudal contingents; the counts of Vermandois and Flanders came to the armed camp in person; the archbishop of Rheims, the bishops of Châlons, Laon, Soissons, the abbot of Saint Denis, the provosts of Paris and Étampes, brought him large bodies of infantry. Those among the higher feudal lords who, for various reasons, thought best to remain away, sent excuses. There was a spontaneous outburst of patriotism which united the French in a common feeling. The demonstra-

tion was sufficient, however. The emperor, frustrated by this sudden uprising of an entire people, disturbed by a revolt of the inhabitants of Worms, did not even cross the frontier, and Henry I. was left alone. The two kings continued their intrigues up to the time of their death. Louis the Fat gained no advantage from so doing, but he had the merit of inaugurating the policy followed by his successors in regard to England.

**11. Louis VI. and the Church. Support which He Receives from It and the Services He Expects from It.**—In all these wars Louis the Fat had the support of the Church. She gave him money and troops as well as provided him with clerks for councillors and his principal ministers. The alliance between Church and state, which had so effectively fostered the beginnings of the Capetian dynasty, continued to the great advantage of both parties. But the reform movement in the eleventh century, which had had its centre at Cluny and had reached its culminating point with Gregory VII., had increased the number of monasteries and weakened the feeling of mutual dependence that united the clergy and royalty. While lavishing gifts and privileges on the Church, Louis VI. wished to keep her in his service. More than once he forced bishops and abbots to submit to the jurisdiction of his court; elsewhere he interfered in episcopal and abbatial elections, in spite of papal decrees which had declared them free. The wise and learned Suger, for whom Louis VI. always felt a warm friendship, being elected by the monks of Saint Denis without the king's sanctioning the proceedings, the latter had the monks who brought him news of the election thrown into prison (1122); he relented finally and confirmed the election, but they had trembled before his righteous anger. His conduct was equally firm and politic towards the

head of the Church. In this way he succeeded in preventing Calixtus II. from acknowledging the pretensions of the archbishop of Lyons, who claimed the title of primate of the Gauls, and who wished to place the church of Sens, which was under the dependence of the bishopric of Paris, under Lyons, which was in great part on territory belonging to the Empire.

**12. Favourites of Louis VI.**—Although energetic and fortunate, Louis the Fat had his weaknesses. He had favourites, to whom he confided too much power. Four brothers of the Garlande family enjoyed his favour longest. The oldest, Anseau, was seneschal and died at the siege of Puiset (1118). William succeeded him; he commanded the royal army at Brémule. Gilbert was cellarer for some time. Stephen had still more amazing fortune; he was priest and archdeacon of Paris; he became chancellor, chaplain in chief, and even seneschal after his brothers. It is the only case in all Capetian history of a seneschal wearing the cassock instead of the hauberk. Power thus confided to one person made the favourite haughty and roused up many enemies for him; even the queen turned against him. In 1127 he was suddenly disgraced, despoiled of all his offices, and treated as an enemy. Then he did not fear to revolt, but he was suppressed, and although the king gave him back the chancellorship, he played but a shadowy part.

**13. Suger.**—His place in the first rank was then occupied by the king's cousin, Ralph de Vermandois, and by the abbot of Saint Denis, Suger. Suger was of low extraction; he was sickly and weak, but gifted with high intelligence. He had an unusual memory, and much facility of expression and style. Firm and moderate, he exerted a predominating influence at the king's court during the last ten years of his reign. He did more; he

wrote the life, or, more properly speaking, the panegyric of Louis VI. and contributed largely to establishing his fame of the first of the great Capetian kings.

**14. Religious Policy of Louis VII.**—On the death of Louis VI. (August 1, 1137) his oldest son, Louis VII., already associated with him for six years, ascended the throne. He kept his father's ministers in office. As long as Suger lived he followed his advice in the internal administration of the kingdom. He stamped out feudal anarchy throughout his domains. The families of Montmorency, Beaumont, Clermont, and Dammartin lost their independence and were resigned to serve instead of combating royalty. Through marriage alliances he gained the house of Champagne, which was separated in 1152 from that of Blois. In the south he gained the support of the clergy by lavishing immunities and privileges upon them. Even his pilgrimages were of use to him. The one to Compostella gave him an opportunity to show royal piety and pomp to populations that up to that time had taken slight interest in France; the one to the Grande Chartreuse enabled him to form friendly relations in the kingdom of Burgundy, so closely allied to the Empire, with the bishop of Belley, or the lord de la Bresse. That was good policy, of which Philip Augustus and his successors were to reap the fruits.

But Louis VII. committed two grave errors which jeopardised the Capetian monarchy: he took part in the second crusade, and he had his marriage with Eleanor of Aquitaine annulled.

**15. Louis VII. in the Second Crusade.**—Religious scruples dictated the fatal resolution of Louis VII. to go to the Holy Land. In a war with the count of Champagne he had taken Vitry; and the town church, in which a part of the garrison and many inhabitants had taken

refuge, was burned (1142). In order to gain pardon for this involuntary crime, he abandoned his poorly regulated kingdom. It is true, he confided its affairs to Suger, but what could a monk effect against the insolent and incorrigible feudal lords? A revolution almost deprived the absent king of his crown, to the advantage of one of his brothers.

**16. Louis VII. Annuls his Marriage with Eleanor of Aquitaine, 1152.**—Suger disapproved of the king's absence. Scarcely had he died when the king asked that his union with Eleanor of Aquitaine might be annulled. The husband and wife had never lived amicably together. The queen's misconduct during the crusade, on which she accompanied her husband, estranged her excessively austere and devout husband; moreover, she had borne him only daughters in their fifteen years of married life. Yet no one of these reasons was advanced in the council of Beaugency, to which the question of divorce was submitted, but it was decided that the couple were too closely related by ties of consanguinity, and the Church annulled their marriage.

**17. Danger to France in the Marriage of Eleanor of Aquitaine with Henry Plantagenet.**—Weighty decision it was, since the duchess, as soon as free, hastened to marry Henry Plantagenet, duke of Normandy and count of Anjou, Maine, and Touraine. Nothing was more dangerous for the future of the Capetian house than the union in one hand of so many fiefs. Henry Plantagenet then possessed the entire seacoast from the Channel and the ocean to the Pyrenees. He controlled the harbours and the lower courses of the large French rivers, the Seine, Loire, and Garonne. His accession to the throne of England (1154) doubled his power. The vassal was henceforth more powerful than the suzerain.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### FRENCH ROYALTY (1154-1270).\*

**1. Necessity of Fighting the Angevin Empire. Division of the Subject.**—The foundation of the Angevin Empire laid heavy obligations on Capetian royalty. Until then the kings of France and England had been rivals; they were now enemies, for all serious advance was barred to the Capetians as long as the Angevins reigned both in England and over one-quarter of France. For a century (1154-1259), our kings negotiated, intrigued, or fought to attain their ends. They succeeded with difficulty and chiefly because of their adversary's mistakes; but henceforth this struggle is the point around which

\* **SOURCES.**—G. Monod: "Bibliographie," as above. Rigord: "Vita Phillipi Augusti," 1179-1208; edition Delaborde, (2 vols., 1885). Guillaume le Breton: "Gesta Phillipi Augusti et Phillipidis libri duodecim" (biography of Philip Augustus in Latin hexameters); edition Delaborde (continuation of Rigord). Hélinand; "Chronicon," published in volume viii. of the "Bibliotheca Cluniacensis." Joinville: "History of Saint Louis," edition N. De Wailly. Guillaume de Nangis: "Gesta Ludovici IX.," edition Gérard; 2 vols., 1843. "Chronique de Primat" (translated into French by Jean du Vignay), in Bouquet, volume xxiii. A. Luchaire: "Louis VII.," as above; L. Delisle: "Catalogue des Actes de Philippe-Auguste" (1865) and "Le Plus Ancien Registre de Philippe-Auguste" (1884).

**LITERATURE.**—Petit-Dutaillis, "Étude sur la Vie et la Règne de Louis VIII.," Berger, "Blanche de Castille"; Wallon, "Saint Louis et son Temps"; Bémont, "La Procès et la Condemnation de Jean sans Terre," in the "Revue Historique," vol. xxxii.; Hutton, "Philip Augustus"; Langlois, vol. iii., parts i. and ii., of Lavissee, "Histoire de France."

their history centres. To be or not to be, that was the question.

There are two broad periods of about equal duration in this history: the first including the reigns of Henry II. and Richard the Lion-Hearted, who were able to organise and hold the Angevin Empire together (1154-1199), and the second, marked by the reverses of John Lackland, the successful duplicity of Philip Augustus, and the able moderation of Saint Louis.

**2. Louis VII. Combats Henry II.**—Hostilities began immediately after Eleanor's divorce. Louis VII. declared war on his vassal for marrying without his authority the duchess of Aquitaine, and refusing to appear and vindicate his conduct at his suzerain's court. Henry II. bought his pardon by payment of a war indemnity. Henry, in his turn, wished to subdue Toulouse, to which the duchess, his queen, laid claim. Louis VII. flung himself into the city, and Henry, not willing to combat his suzerain, left the army, which soon raised the siege. The king of France did not lack opportunities for troubling his rival; he was intelligent enough to see them, but too vacillating and timid to make use of them. He received respectfully the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Becket, whom Henry II. had persecuted, and tried faithfully to reconcile them to each other. He gave his daughter in marriage to Henry's oldest son, Henry Court Mantel, who reigned conjointly in England in 1170, and he took up arms to help him, when the young king revolted against his father, but he was conquered at Conches (1173). When he died seven years later (1180), he had not brought the question one step farther towards a solution.

**3. Policy of Philip Augustus towards Henry II. and Richard.**—This son Philip II. Augustus, succeeded him.



He was but fifteen and reigned first under the guardianship of his uncle, the count of Flanders, a control which he soon shook off, for he was not of a character to brook restraint long. His father was justly called "Young" until the end of his days; Philip, on the contrary, was early mature enough to reign. Both enterprising and cautious, he made the struggle against the Angevin Empire the main object of his life, but he changed his policy, according to the circumstances and varying characters of his adversaries. Henry II. was met and held in check by his own sons, Geoffrey, Richard, and John Lackland, whose quarrels he espoused and whose ambitions he flattered. When Henry II. died at Chinon, and Richard the Lion-Hearted received the succession (1189), he began by living at peace with him. The two kings vowed to leave together for the third crusade and kept their oath. But they quarrelled, even before reaching the Holy Land, and after the capture of Acre, Philip hastened to return home. Availing himself of Richard's absence and long captivity, he made an alliance with John, and urged the latter to assume the crown, whilst he took Normandy. The energetic measures of Richard's ministers, added to John's despicable intrigues, and the king's arrival from prison, foiled the plans of the accomplices. Philip, surprised between Blois and Fréteval, was beaten, and lost his money, baggage, seal, and registers (1194). Two other defeats, near Courcelles and Vernon, forced Philip to lay down his arms. The building of the Château Gaillard, rapidly pushed forward by Richard, on a steep hill which overlooks Andelys and commands the course of the Seine, controlled the entrance to Normandy, on this side. The death of the Emperor Henry VI. deprived Philip Augustus of still another ally. Richard hastened to recognise his nephew, the Guelf Otto, elected king by a part of the

German lords, whilst his rival favoured Philip of Swabia, brother of Henry VI. and Otto's opponent. The rivalry between France and England would have perhaps led to a European war if Richard, wounded at the siege of Chalus in Limousin, had not died prematurely (April, 1199).

It was well for Philip, for besides being harassed by the Lion-Hearted, he was at odds with the Pope.

**4. Philip Augustus and Ingeborg.**—Bereft of Isabella of Hainault, by whom he had one son, Louis, he married in 1193, for political reasons, Ingeborg, sister of Cnut IV., king of Denmark. Contemporaries agree in saying that the young princess was a model of virtue and a marvel of beauty. However, on the marriage day Philip took an aversion to her. Three months later he obtained from the tolerant bishop a sentence of divorce, based on the false statement that he was too nearly related to Ingeborg according to the laws of the Church. Then he married a German, Agnes, daughter of the duke of Meran. When Innocent III. was raised to the throne of Saint Peter he did not hesitate to punish this scandalous and illegal union. While acknowledging his indebtedness to the king and his kingdom, where, he said, "he had passed in study the years of his youth and where he had been initiated into all the sciences," he commanded Philip Augustus to take back his legitimate wife. "Whatever confidence your power may inspire in you," he wrote him, "you cannot face God, whose representative we are on earth; your pitiful, transient power would struggle in vain with the supreme force of divine and eternal Majesty." This haughty tone did not conquer the king's obstinacy.

**5. Philip Augustus Excommunicated.**—The legate summoned then at Vienne, on the territory of the Empire, a certain number of prelates, some of them Philip's sub-

jects, and pronounced the excommunication which placed the royal domains under interdict. "All the churches shall be closed; no one may be admitted, unless to baptise infants; Mass may be celebrated once a week, Fridays, very early; on Sundays, the priests, instead of Mass, shall preach the word of God, but outside of the Church, in the porch. Those who come to confess must also be heard in the porch. All sacraments, even extreme unction, are forbidden, except baptism for newborn children and the viaticum for the dying. Priests must warn laymen that it is an error and serious sin to bury the dead in unhallowed ground, but they must refuse them consecrated land." It was unjust to punish an entire people for the fault of one man, but the general discontent made Philip reflect. He reluctantly consented to put aside Agnes of Meran and take back Ingeborg (September 7, 1200).

**6. Ingeborg Queen and Prisoner.**—The return of fortune was not a return to favour for the wretched queen. Philip had hoped that a regular sentence of divorce would separate him from her forever. When he saw that he could not get it, he shut up his wife in prison, where she lacked everything, from the advice of a physician to the consolations of a priest; and, in spite of the intervention of Innocent III., her martyrdom lasted thirteen years. In 1213, when about to leave for the expedition to England, to which he was urged by the Pope, he declared solemnly that he would take back his wife. Perhaps he hoped in that way to revive his alliance with Denmark. This time he kept his promise. Set at liberty after an unjust and cruel captivity of twenty years Ingeborg lived, honoured, at her husband's side. She died in 1236, sixty years of age, after a life of trials, prayers, and almsgiving.

**7. John Lackland Treats with Philip Augustus, 1200.—**

A far-sighted and determined statesman would doubtless have taken advantage of the difficulties which Philip created for himself in this deplorable adventure; fortunately for him, Richard the Lion-Hearted had been succeeded by his brother, John Lackland. John lacked neither intelligence nor courage, but he was guided by his vices. Without moral or religious scruples, he was treacherous and cruel; he was a bad man and a poor king. Philip Augustus lost no time in improving the opportunity afforded him by the change in sovereigns. To Henry II. he had opposed Geoffrey, Richard, and John, then John to Richard; then to John, his ally of a short time before, he opposed young Arthur, count of Brittany, Geoffrey's posthumous son, who might pretend to the throne of England. John was eager to treat with Philip, in order to strengthen his own situation. He yielded to him the county of Evreux, married his niece, Blanche of Castile, to Louis of France, and renounced Richard's alliances in Germany and Flanders; finally he acknowledged himself liege man of the king of France by paying Philip the feudal payment for the right of succession to his fiefs, two thousand pounds sterling. At this price, he was acknowledged king of England and duke of Normandy with homage of Brittany. Arthur was sacrificed.

**8. John Lackland Marries Isabella Taillefer, 1200. His Trial and Condemnation by the Court of Peers of France.**

—Soon after, John had his marriage with one of his cousins, contracted eleven years before, annulled by the Pope, since she was childless. Then he carried off Isabella Taillefer from her betrothed, Hugh of Lusignan, presumptive heir of the count de la Marche, and married her. The Lusignans were his vassals; they felt the affront all the more and revolted; and then refusing jus-

tice which John offered them at the head of an armed band of mercenaries, they appealed to the king of France, suzerain of their suzerain. Philip, enchanted at having the opportunity, summoned his vassal several times to appear before his court, and, all legal delays having been exhausted, the peers of France, according to feudal law, declared John guilty of felony (April, 1202). It was "a good judgment, very just!" Philip hastened to carry it out. He invaded Normandy while he sent young Arthur to Poitou with a small army. Arthur had just taken Mirebeau when John came from Rouen by forced marches, fell upon him unexpectedly, and made him and most of his men prisoners. What was the fate of the unfortunate prince? It is probable that, after making a futile attempt to have him assassinated in the castle of Falaise, John killed him with his own hand at Rouen in 1203; but he was able to cover up his crime so as to evade human justice.

**9. Philip Augustus Executes the Sentence. Conquest of Normandy and Anjou, 1203-1206.**—After this outburst of energy, John fell back into his natural indolence and let his subjects protect themselves as best they could against the French. Therefore Philip carried on the siege of Château Gaillard, and forced his way over the double circle of walls, after violent fighting. Rouen offered a superb resistance, but the citizens obliged the garrison to capitulate before the last resources were exhausted (June, 1204). The rest of the country was easily subdued. In this circumstance John expiated his own and his predecessors' faults. In fact, Normandy had been oppressed by the despotic and military régime of Henry II. and Richard; how could she put any enthusiasm into a defence against an outsider? Anjou hastened to acknowledge the suzerainty of Philip Augustus, which took

in also Poitou, Loches, and Chinan. In 1206, when hostilities were suspended by a truce, the king of England had lost all that he possessed north of the Loire, and the Angevin Empire was definitely overthrown.

**10. Philip Augustus Organises his Conquests.**—Philip organised his conquests at the same time. He confiscated the lands belonging to nobles who were faithful to King John, and rewarded those who rallied about him. He ratified the privileges of cities and churches, or granted them new ones; he gave Rouen her liberty, endowed Pont-Audemer, Poitiers, Saint-Jean d'Angély, and Niort with a municipal organisation borrowed from the establishments of Rouen. So the provinces had no need to feel that they were submitting to a conqueror in accepting the new régime, for this, for the time being, seemed only beneficial.

**11. John Lackland Excommunicated, 1213. Coalition against France.**—John had not exhausted his follies nor Philip his advantages. The tyrannical king of England had incensed the nobility, then, what was more serious, the clergy. Pope Innocent III. excommunicated him and charged Philip Augustus to dethrone him. He was on the point of leaving when stopped by a papal legate. John in fact had even then yielded and acknowledged himself a vassal of the Holy See (1213). Irritated by this piece of ill-luck, Philip threw his army into Flanders, whose count was John Lackland's ally; but his fleet was surprised and burned in the harbour of Damme. John employed the winter in organising a coalition, entered into by several lords of northern France: Ferrand, count of Flanders; Renaud, count of Boulogne, and foreign princes, such as the count of Hainault, and the emperor of Germany, Otto IV. It was decided to attack France simultaneously at two points: on the north, where an English

contingent would join the allies, and on the west, where John would lead the army in person.

**12. John Lackland Conquered at La Roche-au-Moine, 1214.**—John took the offensive. He disembarked at La Rochelle, took Angers, and laid seige to La Roche-au-Moine, a fortress on the road between Angers and Nantes. Louis of France hastened to the succour of the place, but he was not called upon to fight, for the English, panic-stricken, fled, abandoning their baggage and machines of war.

**13. Philip Augustus Victorious at Bouvines.**—In the meantime the allies were massing at Valenciennes. With the chivalry of Brabant, Lorraine, Westphalia, Saxony, and England stood the formidable militia furnished by the Flemish towns. Philip gathered his vassals together at Péronne, with the communal militia of Picardy, France, and Chambord. It seemed like two nations in arms against each other, struggling for their existence. The encounter took place near the bridge of Bouvines, July 27. As in most of the feudal battles, no order was observed in attack; the onslaught was terrible. Philip Augustus, while trying to reach the emperor, was unhorsed and but for the strength of his armour would have been killed; Otto IV. just escaped falling into the hands of William des Barres, the most high-spirited of French knights. At last the count of Flanders on the left wing, and Renaud of Boulogne on the right, were taken in a fierce struggle; Germans, English, and Flemings turned and fled; the men of Brabant, fearless in the general rout, stood their ground and were all massacred. The victory for the French was complete, and the coalition was broken up at once. Great was the enthusiasm in France. In Paris, students, clergy, and people went out to meet the king, singing hymns; and the city was

illuminated for seven nights. Otto IV. lost the German crown; John Lackland brought a truce for five years, paying sixty thousand marks, and went back, twice conquered, to his own kingdom, where he was met by civil war.

**14. Civil War in England. Expedition of Louis of France; Its Failure.**—In truth, the nobility of the kingdom, that is to say, the principal barons and high clergy, aided by the citizens of several large towns, revolted against a control that had resulted in so many humiliations and disasters. They first compelled the king to sign the Magna Charta, then, when the king violated it, they invited to the throne John's nephew by marriage, Louis of France, only son of Philip Augustus. False rumours were skilfully circulated. John, it was whispered, had been condemned to death for the murder of Arthur of Brittany; consequently he had lost his rights to the crown, which devolved legally on Louis of France, husband of Blanche of Castile. The reasons were false, but specious; they lent an appearance of right, so dear to Philip Augustus, to Louis's expedition. Louis disembarked at Stonar, received the homage of his subjects at London, and pursued the wretched king, who finally died in despair (October 19, 1216). He left two sons. The oldest, Henry III., was ten. As the majority of the barons had acknowledged the French pretender, the cause of the Angevin dynasty seemed lost. But the son was innocent of the crimes of the father, and his youth saved him. The papal legate organised the government; the little king was crowned and the Magna Charta confirmed. On the other hand, the Pope excommunicated Louis of France, who was waging an unjust war on his vassal. Henceforth the pretender's partisans gradually abandoned him. Defeated near Lincoln, he was only too



happy to renounce his rights and return to France with the remains of his army (1217).

**15. Expedition of Louis VIII. into Poitou, 1224.**—This blow brought the French kings back to a realising sense of things. They gave up such dishonest and hazardous expeditions to pursue the interrupted execution of the judgment of 1202. Louis VIII., who had just succeeded his father (July 14, 1223), invaded Poitou, which was disturbed by the bitter intrigues of Hugh X. of Lusignan and his wife Isabella Taillefer, widow of John Lackland and mother of Henry III. His interests in the south and his premature death (November 8, 1226), gave England a long respite.

**16. Remarkable Growth of the Royal Domain under Philip Augustus and Louis VIII.**—The reigns of Philip Augustus and Louis VIII. were decisive ones in Capetian history. These kings had increased the crown domains, and consequently royal power, to a large extent. They had acquired or conquered, in the north, the county of Artois, taken from Flanders, and the county of Vermandois; on the south a part of Berry with Bourges and Issoudun, as well as the largest part of Auvergne; they had wrested from England all Normandy, almost all of Anjou, a part of Poitou with Poitiers, Saintes, and La Rochelle. A third campaign, led by Louis VIII. against the Albigenses (*Cathari*) of Languedoc, opened the way for royal control in the south. Louis IX. was to carry out and complete this work by means of a peaceful, manly policy.

**17. Childhood of Saint Louis. His Character.**—He who was to be Saint Louis was born at Poissy, April 25, 1215. He was eleven years old on the death of his father, Louis VIII. His mother, Blanche of Castile, lost no time in having him crowned at Rheims and assuming

the guardianship of the child. In reality, she governed the realm until her son's majority, whilst watching over his education with a tenderness both intelligent and domineering. She did not try to make a scholar of him. She had him taught Latin, the language of holy books and the chancellor's office, so that he might read the Bible and charters; but she provided him with masters capable above all of teaching him how to govern with loyalty, wisdom, and firmness. Of a gentle, devout nature, an upright, good character, a playful wit, slightly tinged with mischief, Louis IX. made good use of his lessons. He was one of the most upright men of his time. His devotion, at times excessive, was tempered by the healthy habits of an exceedingly active life. When grown a man, he became an accomplished knight. It may be said of him that he had all virtues, and those of his own times he possessed in a superlative degree.

His reign comprises two long periods separated by the seventh crusade. (In the first (1226-1248) he had to struggle with great feudal lords among the laity; the second (1254-1270) was given up to the interior reform of his kingdom.

**18. Minority of Louis IX. Struggles for Feudalism, 1226-1234.**—The high nobility looked with a jealous eye on the progress accomplished by royalty within a quarter of a century. It tried to weaken it during the minority of Louis IX. The leader of the dissatisfied nobles was a certain prince of the house of France, Pierre Mauclerc, younger brother of Robert de Dreux. He had married a daughter whom Constance of Brittany, mother of the wretched Arthur, had had by a second marriage with Aimery of Thouars, and through his wife he had become count of Brittany. At four different times he succeeded in uniting against France the king of England, the

Lusignans, the count of Toulouse, and others; but he was poorly supported. The king of England could not or would not help him at the most opportune time, in 1227; he accomplished nothing in the expedition which he did undertake in 1230, and he finally abandoned Pierre in 1234. Mauclerc was obliged to go, with a cord around his neck, to beg pardon of the king of France. He gave up his best fortresses, swore fidelity to the king and regent, and promised to go to the Holy Land for five years. During this same time Thibaud the Singer, count of Champagne, tenderly attached to Blanche of Castile and until then bound to the royal cause, inherited the kingdom of Navarre and assumed the bearing of an independent prince. A half-formed league which he planned was suppressed by the rapid concentration of royal troops; exiled for seven years, he was sent to join Pierre Mauclerc in the Orient. The two counts set off with the most turbulent of their followers and relieved the kingdom of a dangerous element. That same year Louis IX. married Marguerite of Provence. He attained his majority soon after (April 25, 1236) and began to reign alone. Henceforth he followed his own will, and, although his mother exercised a strong influence over the government, he played the leading part.

**19. Louis IX. and the Appanages.**—After Louis IX., his brothers Robert, Alfonso, and Charles attained successively their majority, and the fiefs which Louis VIII. had designated for them were constituted appanages. It was a dangerous precedent, which recalled the process of dismemberment of the kingdom under the Merovingian and Carolingian princes. It is true that the act was less serious. The fiefs with which Louis VIII. endowed his children were all recently acquired, and complete sovereignty was not given with them; besides, by giving

them to princes of France, their absorption into the royal domain was delayed and the individuality of peoples, who were later to blend in extended French union, was flattered. In 1237 Robert, becoming of age, was knighted during the festivities given at Compiègne, and had the county of Artois. Four years later Alfonso was given the county of Poitou, whither he went to receive the homage of his vassals.

**20. War in Poitou, 1242. Termination of the Great Feudal War, 1244.**—Hugh le Brun, Count de la Marche, at first took the oath of fealty to him, but his wife taunted him with this submission as being a cowardly act, and urged him to form a coalition, to which she attracted several princes of the south, as well as the kings of Castile, Aragon, and England. It is said that they sounded Pierre Mauclerc, but he immediately denounced the conspiracy to Louis IX., who gave him lands and the title of marshal. Henry III. led an army into Poitou. Louis IX. intercepted him on the Charente, forced the bridge of Taillebourg by a skilful flank movement, defeated the English near Saintes, where Henry III. was almost made prisoner, and pursued him to Blaye. Autumn and a contagious disease which broke out in the army compelled him to stop. Elsewhere, the kings of Castile and Aragon, occupied at home, did not stir. In Languedoc, the viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne vainly tried to rouse his people to revolt, by turning to account their exasperation against the excesses of the inquisitors for the faith. The count of Toulouse, Raymond VII., was detained by illness and was granted peace only on condition of renewing, at Lorris, the treaty of 1224. Finally Henry succeeded in having a truce proclaimed, which, renewed several times, lasted until 1259. In 1244 the great

feudal war was ended, and the conquests of France were definitely established on every side.

**21. Temperate Policy of Louis IX. The Seventh Crusade, 1248-1254.**—During this time the war raged between the Empire and the Papacy. Frederick II. tried to win Louis IX. to his side by representing to him that his cause was that of all kings; later Innocent IV. tried to drag him into the quarrel by convoking, in France, the assembly in which he intended to denounce the emperor. Saint Louis was able to resist both; he persistently refused to consider the emperor, even excommunicated, as the Antichrist described in the Apocalyp<sup>h</sup>se. He would like to have reconciled the two adversaries and turned their forces to the defence of the Holy Land. In this he was unsuccessful and he had to bear the entire burden of the seventh crusade. Yet his firm, temperate, and conciliating course bore fruit. He carried out leisurely his military preparations, left the government in his mother's hands for a term of six years, exhausted the royal treasure and spilled the best blood of France in a disastrous expedition; all this without the peace of the kingdom being troubled except by a dangerous uprising of peasants, that of the Pastoureaux (1251). Even the death of Blanche of Castile (November 28, 1252), which plunged Louis into mourning, did not shake the throne. On his return in 1254 he was received like a conqueror. He had exemplified in the Orient the ideal of a Christian hero.

**22. Peace with England; Treaty of Paris, December 4, 1259.**—From that time, and during sixteen profitable years, he devoted himself to the maintenance of peace by means of a judicious administration and wise foreign policy. Foreign relations continued to harass him,

especially those with England. Henry III., his brother-in-law, tried to hamper him, either by accepting, for his son Edmund, the Sicilian crown, or by furthering the election of his brother, Richard of Cornwall, to be king of Germany. Fearing a joint attack from the English and Germans, the king inspected his frontiers and organised deliberately a strong defence. But they did not come to extremes. The troops which were levied by the Pope with English gold were beaten at every point by Manfred, son of Frederick II. Richard of Cornwall never possessed more than the shadow of royal power in Germany; finally a new civil war broke out in England. Henry III. therefore decided to negotiate. He renounced forever Normandy, Maine, Anjou, and Poitou; on his side the king of France ceded to Henry his rights as suzerain of Limousin, Quercy, and Périgord. The territory left to the king of England formed the duchy of Guienne, which did liege homage to the crown of France. The conditions were equitable, since they spared English pride yet at the same time demanded the necessary sacrifices; they brought nearer together the kings of the two realms, rivals since the time of William the Conqueror. Henry III. came to Paris to ratify the treaty, in the presence of a host of English and French knights (December 4, 1259). Nothing but a memory of the Angevin Empire remained; the treaty of Paris, sometimes wrongfully called the treaty of Abbeville, has been much discussed, but it laid the foundations for the greatness of the Capetian monarchy, by acquiring rich provinces, free and wide access to the sea; in a word, it secured a territorial and commercial position of the first class.

**23. Peace with Aragon; Treaty of Perpignan, 1258.**—Shortly before this Saint Louis concluded with the king of Aragon the treaty of Corbeil or Perpignan, in which

he gave up the suzerainty of Roussillon and the former county of Barcelona; whilst the king of Aragon renounced his pretensions to several countries subject, before the war against the Albigenses, to the dominion of the count of Toulouse, whose heir was Alfonso of Poitiers, brother of the king of France.

**24. The Eighth Crusade.**—Fortune favoured Saint Louis. The revolt of the English barons against Henry III. forced the latter to abandon his enterprise in Sicily; Charles, count of Anjou and Provence, took it up in the name and with the support of the Holy See. In Germany Richard of Cornwall met with a competitor in the king of Castile, Alfonso X., and reigned without glory or consideration. A cunning politician would doubtless have tried to profit by these favourable circumstances, but Louis IX. refused to recognise any enemies except infidels. In 1254 he had left the Holy Land regretfully; he proclaimed a new crusade in a solemn parliament held at Paris, March 25, 1267. Vainly did the Pope, Clement IV., try to dissuade him from it; vainly was he shown the indifference of his dearest friends, such as Joinville, towards a doomed expedition; his own strength even was so slight that he could scarcely sit his horse, but he was not a man to draw back from the duty of a lifetime, and he went away, March, 1270, for that land of Africa whence he was never to return.

**25. The King's Death Before Tunis, 1270. Canonisation of Saint Louis, 1297.**—He died under the walls of Tunis, August 25, on the very day when his brother Charles, one of the most enthusiastic promoters of the expedition, finally arrived with reinforcements. The news of his death roused deep feeling throughout Europe. Along the route of the funeral train, in Italy and France, miracles took place, it is said. After three solemn sit-

tings, the Church decided to express the popular sentiment by raising Louis IX. to the rank of the saints (1297). In the ideas of the times, this was the highest honour which could be conferred on a man. It was deserved, and it has lent its lustre to the entire Capetian dynasty.



## CHAPTER XXVI.

### INSTITUTIONS OF CAPETIAN ROYALTY.\*

**1. Character of Capetian Royalty.**—Royalty, in passing from the Carolingians to the Capetians, did not change, at least theoretically, in character. The first Capetians looked upon themselves as the legitimate successors of Charlemagne, and aspired to govern in his way, as sovereigns, with the support of the nobility and the Church. They believed that they took their power from God, and in fact the coronation gave a kind of sacerdotal character to their office. But, whilst being and wishing to appear actual kings, they were affected by the new conditions of feudal society. The election which gave Hugh Capet the crown made him the suzerain of all the nobles rather than the sovereign of his subjects. It took three centuries of slow progress to make the royal character of the Capetian monarchy predominate over its feudal character.

**2. The Kingdom Becomes Hereditary.**—In the tenth century the kingdom had ceased to be hereditary. But for more than three centuries fortune favoured the

\***SOURCES.**—To the works noted for the last chapter add: Boileau: “*Le Livre des Métiers de Paris*,” edition of Lespinasse (1888). “*Les Établissements de Saint Louis*,” edition of P. Viollet (4 vols., 1881–1886).

**LITERATURE.**—Luchaire, “*Histoire des Institutions Monarchique de la France sous les premiers Capétiens, 987–1180*,” second edition, and “*Manuel*,” as above; Glasson as above; Vuitry, “*Études sur le Régime financier de la France avant la Revolution*,” vol. i.; Langlois, “*Les Origines de Parlement de Paris*,” in the “*Revue Historique*,” vol. xlii.; Giry, “*Manuel de diplomatique*.”

Capetians in securing them male heirs in the direct line, and the care which the sovereigns took to associate their oldest sons with them on the throne reëstablished the old tradition. Philip Augustus was the last to reign thus conjointly with his father; neither Louis VIII. nor Louis IX. began by being "designated kings." Since the thirteenth century it was an absolute principle that, in France, monarchy was hereditary.

**3. Minority and Guardianship.**—A guardian was appointed if the king were a minor; thus Philip Augustus had the count of Flanders, and Blanche of Castile was regent for Saint Louis; but the age of majority was not fixed for kings. Saint Louis was declared major at the usual age of majority among the nobility, that is at twenty-one.

**4. The Appanages.**—The crown domains were not divided among the several male children of the king, as was frequently the case in the greater feudal families; yet it was not rare for the king to give those of his children who did not reign recently acquired fiefs or *appanages*; in this way Robert, brother of Henry I., had Burgundy, and the three brothers of Louis IX. had Artois, Poitou, and Anjou. There were no unfortunate results from this custom during the thirteenth century, because the princes owning appanages set an example of respect towards the king. In the following century this was no longer the case.

**5. The Queen. Her Place at Court and in the Government.**—The queen filled an important place beside that of the king. She was crowned also, and down to the twelfth century her name appeared at the end of royal diplomas; but she exerted no visible influence in the government. Blanche of Castile wielded authority only after her husband's death. Marguerite of Provence, greatly beloved

by Saint Louis, and who bore him eleven children, was resolutely set aside from public affairs when she tried to create a court party in her favour. This consecrated and holy royalty was virile, because it realised and felt responsible for its rights.

**6. Royal Authority Limited by the Privileges of Feudalism.**—Royalty was restrained in the exercise of its power by the privileges of feudalism. Doubtless the king was recognised throughout the territory limited by the treaty of Verdun, but in fact he governed only his own domains. There solely did he exercise in full his legislative, financial, and judicial rights. Elsewhere he could neither legislate nor levy subsidies, except with the consent of the seigniors. Moreover, the secular and ecclesiastical feudal lords helped him in reigning and governing, by providing his high officers, the heads of his household, and members of his council.

**7. The High Officers of the Crown.**—In the twelfth century there were five chief officers: the seneschal, the cellarer, the chamberlain, the constable, and the chancellor. Their functions were both domestic and political; their names figured usually at the foot of royal charters. They seemed to be the necessary instruments of royalty.

The seneschal (*seniscallus*, *dapifer*) had charge of the king's table, but he was above everything else chief of the feudal army. He directed the royal agents entrusted with the administration of the domain; he dispensed justice conjointly with other high officials. It has been asserted that the office was hereditary in the house of Anjou. This is an error, but it was very important; therefore, after the death of Thibaut V. of Champagne (1191), Philip Augustus refrained from appointing his successor and thereafter the office remained vacant.

The cellarer (*buticularius*, *pincerna*) administered the

royal vineyards and their products; he had cup-bearers under his orders. In the twelfth century the office was hereditary in the La Tour and Senlis families.

The chamberlain (*camerarius*) enjoyed high authority under Henry I. and Philip I.; in the twelfth century his functions were merely domestic, in the interior of the palace, with a stated number of chamberlains under him.

The constable (*constabularius*) had charge of the king's stables. This sphere of action was enlarged after the disappearance of the office of seneschal. After that time he commanded the royal army; the marshals arose to power with him.

**8. The Chancellor and the Royal Seal.**—The chancellor (*cancellarius*) was charged with drawing up, writing, and issuing royal charters. He was also entrusted with the keeping of the royal seal, which was affixed to acts to ensure their authenticity. The chancellor was always a priest, often a bishop. His powers, especially in judicial matters, were so extended that they were more than once suspended, as during almost the entire reign of Philip Augustus.

**9. The Six Departments of the Kingly Household.**—The king's household was divided into six services: the bread-room, wine-cellar, kitchen, fruit storeroom, stable, and chambers. They were supervised by high officials and vast sums were spent in keeping them up. We know indeed that in 1256 the household expenses were 2468 livres in money of Tours, a sum equal to a million of our money.

**10. The King's Court.**—The king's council or court (*curia regis*) stood for the former assemblies of nobles of the Carolingian kings, their tribunal, their council, and the feudal courts of the former counts of Paris and dukes of France. In the thirteenth century there were distin-

guishable in its several elements of varied origin and importance. First there were certain prelates and high feudal lords, under the immediate dependence of the king and called peers ( *pares* ). The number seems never to have been determined, but there were early six ecclesiastical peers: the archbishop (duke) of Rheims, the bishops of Beauvais (count), Noyon (count), Laon (duke), Châlons (count), and Langres (duke), and it may be inferred that there were six lay peers. The king of France was represented as surrounded by his twelve peers, as Jesus, in the Bible, with his twelve apostles; Charlemagne, in the *chansons de geste*, with his twelve peers; and Arthur, in the Round Table, with his twelve companions. But no case has ever been cited in which this court of twelve peers was called together to deliberate. After 1224 the high officers of the crown take their place beside the peers. In the lowest rank, still very subordinate, were the members of the king's household, the palatines, and lawyers drawn from the clerical body (*clerici*), or the lower nobility (*milites*, knights by law). These modest servants were useful workmen; they were always at their posts, while the nobles of the realm often refrained from appearing. They were also the natural defenders of the king's interests, by whose favour alone they could rise, and they worked silently for the strengthening of royal authority.

**11. Jurisdiction of the King's Court. Division of Justice and Division of Finance.**—The king's court was extremely important. It was the supreme council of the government and the centre of royal administration; it was also a tribunal sitting even in the king's absence. However, in Saint Louis's time it had neither fixed days nor places for its sittings; it met wherever the king might be, and when there was need of it. However, at that

time, certain cases were already taken before regular divisions of the council; justice was rendered in the section called Parlement, which usually held its sittings in Paris; another, soon known as the Chamber of Accounts, verified the accounts of royal agents. Two of the most celebrated institutions of old France already existed in embryo in the court of Saint Louis. This court rendered decisions and pronounced judgments; but it made no general laws, nor voted taxes.

**12. Agents of the Domain. The Provost.**—Several kinds of agents were employed by the Capetian kings in the administration of their domains. In some towns, as in Paris, Melun, Corbeil, Etampes, and Sens, there were still viscounts, as during the Carolingian period, but their office was hereditary, and except at Sens they early disappeared. The châtelains were agents of like nature and perhaps of like origin; they built up powerful feudal houses, especially in Flanders. They were put in charge of fortresses, or the main tower of some large city, and held the right of jurisdiction over the territory dependent on the castle. But until the end of the twelfth century the principal agents of royalty were the provosts (*præpositi*) of the free tenant class order (*roturiers*). They were charged with the administration of parts of the domain, dispensing justice and levying taxes. Royalty felt the greatest interest in this last function; the office of provost was sold at auction, which, however, did not always prevent its becoming hereditary. The provosts drew no salary, but had a certain interest in the revenues of their office, so they were tempted to increase the income in every possible way, to the detriment of the taxpayers.

**13. Bailiffs and Seneschals.**—In order to supervise the provost, Philip Augustus made the institution of bailiffs

a general one (1190). Although under a different name, these magistrates were nothing more than the old Carolingian counts. They had, like them, military, financial, and judicial functions; they replaced the high seneschal. They were always chosen from among the nobility. By enlarging the royal domain, Philip Augustus and Louis VIII. increased the number of bailiffs; under Saint Louis there were twenty bailiwicks in the north besides the provostship of Paris, which was an actual bailiwick. In the south and west the term bailiff was replaced by seneschal, but the seneschals were of higher nobility than bailiffs and controlled a larger extent of territory. Under Saint Louis there were five royal seneschalships in the south, not including those which the count of Poitiers had instituted in his vast domains. Bailiffs and seneschals were appointed and removed by the king and as he willed, except the provost of Paris, until the day when Stephen Boileau, able and honest magistrate, was named by Saint Louis with "wages good and great." So that they might not become independent like the former counts, royalty took care to remove them often. Thus Philip de Remi, sire of Beaumanoir, son of a bailiff of Artois, and an eminent administrator and jurist, was successively bailiff of Artois and Clermont in Beauvaisis, seneschal of Poitou and Saintonge, and finally bailiff of Vermandois and Senlis. His average term of office in each one of these positions was three years. For another reason, easily understood, seneschals in the south were always chosen from among the northern nobility. Seneschals and bailiffs came to Paris every year to render an account of their office to the Parliament.

**14. Authority of the Bailiffs outside of the Royal Domain.**—Their authority was not confined within their bailiwicks or seneschalships. Empowered to exact, for

the king, feudal rights and military service, they were necessarily led to interfere in the domestic affairs of the large fiefs. Thus Brittany was, in a way, a part of the bailiwick of Tours, Burgundy of Mâcon, Aquitaine of the seneschalship of Périgord. The bailiwicks and seneschalships became centres ready to engulf and assimilate, little by little, the divisions of France which still escaped the direct action of royalty.

**15. The Inspectors.**—The greater the power of the agents, the greater the temptation to abuse it. Saint Louis watched them closely. By virtue of two celebrated ordinances, promulgated in 1254 and 1256, they were required to swear to do justice to all, without excepting anyone; to preserve intact the kingly rights; and to refrain from any act of corruption or abuse of power. At the expiration of their term of office they had to remain for forty days in their province, so that anyone might present his legitimate claims for settlement. They were besides subject to the restraint of inspectors (*enquêteurs*).

Philip Augustus had already sent throughout the provostships special officers, chosen from his council and empowered to readjust imposts, and conduct inquests into any act whatsoever. Saint Louis made this institution general, and it grew to be one of the benefits of his reign. These inspectors were either knights, simple lawyers, monks, or canons. They resembled the *missi dominici* of Charlemagne, yet possessed more power over the agents to be supervised. They received all complaints against royal officers; they could remove provosts from office and other inferior agents, but not inculpated bailiffs. They gave judgment without appeal, or else sent the case up to the king's court. Saint Louis sent them out especially through provinces which he had recently acquired, to repair the evils caused by the conquest.



**16. Beginnings of French Centralisation.**—At the time of Saint Louis's death, the administration of the royal domains comprised two degrees. In the upper degree were bailiffs and seneschals, noble, salaried functionaries, drawn from the king's court; in the lower degree, beside the provosts, who were the oldest low-born agents of the domain, there were still in Normandy the viscounts, in the south *viguiers* and *bailes*; these various names stood for similar functions. We have therefore the beginning of the centralisation of administrative power, that is to say, what contributed most to bring about French unity.

**17. The Cities of the Domain.**—Dating from Philip Augustus, cities were in the lists of the royal administration. Saint Louis wished to bring a little method into the confused municipal administration. He decided, and promulgated in ordinances of 1256 and 1261, the rule that the election for mayors in all the "good cities" of the domain, should take place, each year, on the 29th of October; that the rendering of municipal accounts should be given also every year, before the king at Paris, the 18th of November, by the new mayor, the ex-mayor, and four notables; it was forbidden the communes to make any loans without the permission of the king, or any present, unless it were "wine in a jug or barrel." There was great need of supervising municipal finances, which were often compromised by the extravagant expenditure of the cities, the incompetency of their magistrates, or the exactions of royalty. The two crusades of Saint Louis, for instance, demanded great sacrifices on the part of cities. Some among them, unable to pay their debts, became insolvent, and their affairs had to be liquidated.

**18. Paris in the Thirteenth Century.**—Paris, that had definitely become the capital of the kingdom since the accession of the Capetians, and one of the favourite resi-

dences of the kings, received no municipal institutions until late, and then they were sparingly given. The corporations were mostly in the dependence of crown officers. Thus, the bakers were subject to the crown baker; the drapers, mercers, tailors, and upholsterers, to the chamberlain; the wine merchants and tavernkeepers to the cellarer; the blacksmiths and other iron workers, to the marshal. The most flourishing of all these corporations was that which had the exclusive right to the traffic by water on the Seine, throughout and beyond the city. The guild of merchants trading by water (*merchants de l'eau*) as it was called, had, in the thirteenth century, échevins and a provost, the provost of the merchants. This was the first municipal body of the city. It met in the *Parloir aux bourgeois*, situated first in the neighbourhood of the Châtelet, and later it was removed to a house just within the city wall, near the gateway of Saint Jacques. It had its heraldic devices which revived memories of the old college or body of *Nautæ parisiaci*. About this same time the king's provost at Paris, Stephen Boileau, had a register made out of the various customs of the tradesmen's guilds. It is known as the "Book of Trades," a work of inestimable value for the study of Parisian industries in the thirteenth century.

The administration, thus systematised, included then but three high public branches: justice, finances, and the army.

**19. Royal Justice.**—Within the royal domain justice was dispensed to the lower classes by the provosts, the viscounts (in Normandy), the viguiers and judges (in the south); to nobles by bailiffs and seneschals, aided by the jurés. The assistant judges (*assesseurs*), were chosen from among men of the same social condition as the suitors, for it was customary for each one to be judged by

his peers, but outside of their family. Saint Louis extended the powers of bailiffs and seneschals by authorising them to give judgment without appeal on sentences already pronounced by provosts or even in seigniorial courts, as well as in the municipal courts of territories under the "obedience of the king." Appealing a case was a new point in feudal legislation, and it was one step forward towards centralisation of administrative power. The king held his tribunal, it might be, as Joinville relates of Saint Louis, seated under an oak in the Vincennes forest, or at the entrance to his palace in Paris, to judge, without delay, expense, and discussion, his subjects' quarrels; or it might be that he called the suitors to appear before his court or Parlement. There were regular sittings of the Parlement of Paris dating from 1254, and from that time, following a custom which Saint Louis had observed in Cyprus, a register was kept of the decisions of the court. The oldest of the registers which have been preserved are called *Olim*, from the first word of the first page of one of them.

**20. Reforms in Proceedings of Law.**—Tribunals in the south judged according to "written law," that is Roman law; in the north and in cities of the south which had acquired communal charters, according to "customary law," or unwritten law. In the thirteenth century royalty introduced new methods in proceedings and new penal laws. In a law-suit, down to that time, the parties in a suit exhausted all the annoying methods of chicanery, each asserted under oath or by witnesses the truth of his statements, and the judge, much perplexed, left it to God to decide; he commanded the duel. Common freemen were armed with clubs and nobles with weapons of war; the suit was decided before the tribunal, in the lists; the vanquished got the blows and paid the fine. Sometimes

one of the parties challenged the other by sending a *gage de bataille*. Saint Louis forbade challenges and duels in his domains (1216). Instead of allowing the suitors to fight, the judge ordered an inquiry to be held, heard different witnesses, and gave judgment according to the testimony. This was more just and reasonable. There was another method still. A judgment once rendered in court was, in pure feudal law, irrevocable; the loser had but one uncertain resource, that is to declare that the sentence pronounced against him was "false and bad," and challenge each one of his judges, in succession, to single combat. In this event, Saint Louis allowed the loser to appeal (*fausser le jugement*) to the tribunal of the suzerain, as was already done when the suzerain refused to show justice to his vassal. Moreover, if this time he refused to accept the judgment pronounced when appealed, he could resort to the *amendement*, or beg the tribunal to correct or amend the sentence. All these measures tended to augment the importance of the Parlement, by increasing the number of cases brought before this court.

**21. Unusual Penalties.**—The punishments meted out to criminals were increased in number as Philip Augustus and Saint Louis were led, through their religious beliefs, to issue penalties against usurers, Jews, blasphemers, and heretics. The Church had always forbidden loans at interest and looked upon usury as a sin; usurers, under the name of Lombards or Cahorsins, the bankers of that time, were expelled in 1268 from the realm. Jews were the most hated. Not only were they accused of exacting high rates of interest on loans, but of profaning the holy vases which priests left with them as pledges; it was even said that on certain feast days they sacrificed Christian children. Philip Augustus drove them out of his do-

mains, confiscated their landed property, and turned their synagogues into churches. Nevertheless they returned. Saint Louis forbade loans at interest (1230); he cut down the Jews to a third of their belongings, in that way believing that he punished usury by diminishing its supposed earnings; finally he commanded them to wear a badge sewed on their clothing; it was a wheel of yellow cloth which distinguished them from Christians and afforded the latter a means of avoiding them. Philip Augustus punished blasphemers with corporal punishment and a fine; Saint Louis added the pillory and prison, branding of the lips with hot iron, and for children, the whip. Extreme rigour was shown heretics after the end of the twelfth century. They were sent to the stake. These extreme penalties were only too much in accord with the spirit of the times.

**22. The so-called Establishments of Saint Louis.**—During this time law, which was taught in various schools, began to be more freely interpreted. With Peter de Fontaines and Beaumanoir it became secular; this was a forward movement. The famous *Établissements de Saint Louis* are not worthy of the fame accorded them. They are a compilation, made soon after the death of the sainted king, by an anonymous jurisconsult of Orléans, whose work consisted merely in piecing together two ordinances of the king's, a collection of customary law of Touraine and of Anjou, and one other of Orléans. This assumed code has therefore no value as an original document, yet this fact did not prevent its being held in much favour during and since the Middle Ages.

**23. The Police. The Quarantaine-le-Roi. Royal Suits.**—What is known as the *Quarantaine-le-Roi* was an attempt on the part of Philip Augustus to suppress private wars by granting to the weaker party a forty days' truce.

Saint Louis renewed and extended it to his vassals' domains, and within his own he completely abolished private wars (1257). He reserved to himself the right of punishing certain crimes such as abduction, rape, and incendiarism. He thus established "royal suits," which were increased in number constantly, so that royalty might interfere in seigniorial courts and draw to itself all important cases.

**24. Royal Revenues.**—The nature of royal incomes did not vary from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. Under Saint Louis, as under Hugh Capet, the revenues from the domain supplied the treasury, but as the domain increased in size the revenues grew in enormous proportions. "Whilst Louis VII.," wrote a chronicler of the time, "levied but 19,000 livres a month (228,000 livres yearly), Philip Augustus left his son a daily income of 1200 livres parisis," (438,000 livres yearly); this was almost double the amount. Outside of his private income, the king levied important sums from ecclesiastical lands; also by virtue of the right of *régale*, which allowed him to collect the revenues of a bishopric or abbey as long as the see was vacant; and *amortissement*, which religious corporations paid on acquiring new property, which came thus into mortmain; without including extraordinary contributions, such as the tax for the second crusade and the Saladin tithe. It was a movement in the direction of modern taxation, although still in its infancy.

**25. Auditing of Accounts.**—Provosts, bailies, and viscounts, bailiffs and seneschals levied the royal revenues. The seneschals were, besides, authorised to pay all expenses of the administration; three times a year they were required to pay the surplus or profits into the royal treasury, with the necessary vouchers to prove the

validity of their transactions. Members of the king's court, "deputies for the auditing of accounts," filled the office of inspectors. In Normandy the kings kept up the court of the former dukes or *Échiquier* (exchequer), which performed the same functions as the Chamber of Accounts.

**26. The Budget of Saint Louis.**—A part of what would now be termed the budget of Saint Louis can be reckoned up for the years 1238 and 1248. In the one case, the known receipts were 235,286 livres parisis and the expenses 80,909 livres; in the other the receipts amounted to 178,630 livres and the expenses were 63,760. The surplus was deposited in the Temple, that is, the fortress in the enclosure owned by the Templars outside the walls of Paris. It was a safe place. The Templars also undertook business transactions such as are carried on by bankers of the present time: they took money on deposit, lent on pledges, and made international payments. A part of the sum promised Henry III. in the treaty of 1259 was deposited in the Temple, and paid out by them according to agreement.

**27. Monetary System of Saint Louis.**—Some words about the monetary system of Saint Louis are necessary in order to understand the figures quoted above. Royal moneys comprised then, not only coins in silver and base metal as during Carolingian and early Capetian periods, but gold pieces as well. Gold pieces contained only ten parts alloy for a thousand parts of pure metal. Two gold coins were minted: 1. the *écu*, which bore as device the shield of France covered with fleurs de lys, and 2, the *agnel*, which bore as an emblem the paschal lamb. The coins equalled 15 sous in silver plus 6 copper farthings, and were worth 14 francs 25 centimes. There were two kinds of coins for silver and base metal, according

as they were minted by the system of Tours or Paris. The value of money *parisis* was a quarter more than money *tournois*. Silver coinage was but one part of alloy to twenty-four parts of pure metal, the so-called "white money": from a mark—about eight ounces—were coined 58 *gros* or *sous*, worth about 90 centimes. There were also minted *half sous* or *oboles*, worth 45 centimes, and *tiers de sou*, thirds of a sou or *mailles*, worth 30 centimes. Base metal was an alloy of copper and silver which was easily oxidised. It was used to make "black money." From one mark of this metal were coined 220 pence *tournois*. Double pence *tournois* and *parisis* were also minted. But in the thirteenth century precious metals, being much rarer than now, had more value, and in order to compare the prices of those days with the present the figures quoted above must be multiplied by five or even six. It is noticeable that in this short table of money the pound (*livre*) does not figure; it was only a term used in counting. It equalled 20 *sous* in silver and consequently counted for about 20 francs in money of Tours and 25 francs in money of Paris, or, in short, at least 100 francs present money. The system was excellent, and although everyone admitted that the king might change as he wished the name and value of money, Saint Louis never altered his.

**28. Feudal Money. The Money-Changers.**—The use of royal money was obligatory throughout the realm after 1262, but each high feudal lord continued to have his own; a fact which necessitated intricate money transactions. In Paris the money-changers were located on the Grand Pont, or Changers' Bridge. From the time of Louis VII. they were forbidden to establish themselves elsewhere, and they had to pay the king twenty *sous* annually for the privilege of having a booth.



**29. The Royal Army.**—The royal army in the sixteenth century was made up of three distinct elements: 1, the knights; 2, the sergeants; 3, the mercenaries.

1. The direct vassals of the crown were required to perform military service, at their own expense, during forty days of each year and furnish a certain quota of men at arms; for instance the count of Champagne, who had more than two thousand noble vassals, sent only twelve banners, which would be about one hundred men. The king could not keep his knights beyond the legal term of service except by paying them; it was thus Saint Louis kept Joinville during the seventh crusade. The summons to arms was made by the bailiffs and seneschals, who assumed command of the troops in their provinces and led them to the field. The knights were always mounted. 2. The sergeants (*servientes*) were the lower class impressed into military service, but their position was not clearly defined, and they fought on foot as well as on horseback. They were drawn from the king's immediate domains, or from churches in the king's domain, or from the communes. Troops from the abbey of Saint Denis took part in the sieges of Puiset under Louis VI. The communal militia appeared later; they are first heard of at Bouvines (1214), where they fought but to run away. 3. The mercenaries were recruited from all sides, but especially from Gascony, Brabant, and Hainault. They were styled *routiers* (stragglers), *cotereaux* (a name probably meaning peasants), and *paillards* (loose fellows), etc. Some among their chiefs became celebrated, as Mercadier in the service of Richard the Lion-Hearted, and Cadoc, with Philip Augustus. They formed regular troops, permanent and capable of discipline, but despised by the knights. The pay was six sous a day for paid horsemen plus the price of their horse; one sou for the infantry crossbowmen.

**30. The Army Leaders.**—The king was the head of the feudal army. Next in rank were the constable, two marshals, created by Philip Augustus, and a master of the crossbowmen, created by Saint Louis. The latter commanded what would be known to-day as the artillery and engineer corps, namely, men employed in conducting a siege. These were the carpenters to build the machines and put up moving towers, which were rolled up under the walls of the beleaguered city, whence the attacking party rushed on to the walls by means of flying bridges; there were also sappers and miners who undermined the besieged ramparts. They propped up the walls by means of beams, and when they had undermined a sufficient distance, would set fire to the supports, and the earth, falling in, would draw down the walls with it.

**31. Public Works in Paris.**—One cannot speak literally of public works or relief, for there was not then any organised service for that purpose in the royal administration. However, there are certain works, undertaken by order of Philip Augustus and Saint Louis, which cannot be passed over in silence. Philip Augustus had the main streets of Paris repaved, which, until then, were disgustingly dirty, furrowed with ruts, in which filth accumulated, and which exhaled pestilential odours in bad weather. About 1210 he had the city walls rebuilt. We know, from the king's accounts, that the part on the left bank cost 7020 livres in money of Tours. What remains of the wall and towers to-day is sufficient to indicate within what narrow limits the capital of the Capetian realm was enclosed. On the right bank, touching the outer wall near the Seine, Philip built the Louvre, in which he shut up his treasures and his enemies. One of the prisoners of Bouvines, Ferrand of Flanders, languished there in captivity for fifteen years. The royal

palace was in the city, on the site of the present Palais de Justice; the two towers along the river bank date from Saint Louis's time. Within the city two of the most beautiful examples of Gothic architecture were built: the cathedral of Notre Dame, begun under Philip Augustus and continued during the entire thirteenth century; and the Sainte Chapelle, built from 1245 to 1248 by Pierre de Montereau to receive the relics of the Passion, presented by the Emperor Baldwin II. to Saint Louis.

**32. Public Charities.**—The foundation of the hospital, Hôtel Dieu, has been sometimes attributed to Saint Louis; it certainly existed before and may date back to the seventh century. But he did institute the *Quinze-Vingts*, an establishment intended to receive three hundred (fifteen times twenty) indigent blind persons. Charitable institutions, however, were oftener under the control of religious communities. Among them the lepers' hospital (*maladreries*) must not be overlooked. The wretched beings, victims of this contagious and then incurable disease, were shut up, for the general safety of the public, and they, with their attendants, were compelled to live a monastic life. According to the greatest of English chroniclers of the thirteenth century, Matthew Paris, the number of these houses or prisons was very large. He affirmed that, at that time there were nineteen hundred of them in Europe. In Paris, the brotherhood of Saint Lazare, or Saint Ladre, was consecrated to the care of such sufferers.

**33. Importance of Royal Reforms. Revival of the State Idea.**—Such political and administrative reforms gradually modified the condition of things instituted by the establishment of the feudal system; it substituted anarchy for order; it revived the conception of the state, and the principles of a strong, centralised government.

The status of persons and lands changed more slowly. Yet the emancipation of the middle classes was much advanced in the thirteenth century; the number of serfs diminished rapidly, and there were none in Normandy, dating from the twelfth century. And the time was not distant when citizens would appear at the king's court beside ecclesiastics and laymen.

**34. Summary. French Royalty from Hugh Capet to Saint Louis.**—When Hugh Capet received the crown from the nobles, lay and ecclesiastic, it might have seemed as if this creation of a new dynasty was only the consummation of the feudal system. A few years later it was apparent that the Capetian monarchy, just because it had sent its roots deep into the very heart of feudal society, was destined to increase, at the expense of the latter. The Carolingian dynasty had been undermined and destroyed by the administrative and military institutions which it had erected for its own defence, and it had suffered, in addition, a series of lamentable disasters in the Norman, Hungarian, and Saracenic invasions, and in the brief reigns of Louis the Stammerer, Louis III., and Carloman, the minorities of Charles the Simple and Louis IV., and the premature death of Louis V. The Capetian dynasty, on the contrary, found, in the feudal institutions themselves, as we have said, a starting point and a continual growth of power; it was favoured by the social movement, the progress of the Church, the creation of communes, the study of law in the universities; in short, it was fostered by a series of fortuitous circumstances. The crusades, the conquests of England and the kingdom of Sicily, in which the monarchy took merely a secondary part, diverted from the kingdom the exuberant energy of the feudal nobles; emigration, the death of many nobles, the excessive expense of these dis-

tant expeditions, offered royalty many opportunities, as it did the bourgeoisie, for growth at the expense of feudalism. The war of the Albigenses transferred Languedoc to the king without his incurring the odium of the accompanying massacres and conquest; the civil struggles in England enabled Philip Augustus to appropriate the continental possessions of the Plantagenets. Capetian sovereigns were fortunate enough, moreover, to be able to transmit the crown from father to son, without interruption, for nearly three and a half centuries, so that hereditary possession, at first uncertain, was established in fact and in law, in the thirteenth century.

Not one of them reigned too long or too short a time. Reigns, either too long or too short, weaken monarchies, because they produce instability, or immobility and decrepitude. The Capetian dynasty numbered but eight kings in two centuries and a half, from Robert to Saint Louis, and not one of them reached old age. The oldest ones, Robert and Louis VII., died at sixty.

In nearly three centuries there were but two long minorities, those of Philip I. and Louis IX.; and both times the regency was in able and firm hands. Blanche of Castile, particularly, governed the kingdom better than her husband would have done; and her administration, almost cruelly energetic, paved the way for the just moderation of Louis IX. She broke down resistance. Her son made the yoke, which she had imposed, an agreeable one.

The first four Capetians contented themselves with strengthening gradually their still precarious situation. With Louis VI. and Suger, royalty appears for the first time as a supreme magistrature which has long arms to enforce its will and maintain justice and peace. Although the thoughtlessness of Louis VII. shook for an

instant the position of Capetian royalty, it suddenly exhibited with Philip Augustus and Saint Louis the life and power that were within. These two kings, the greatest of the Capetian dynasty, each came at the right hour. Philip Augustus, cunning, energetic, and unscrupulous, was the man needed to retrieve the disaster caused by the divorce of Louis VI.; to increase the royal domain, by force as well as by cunning bargains, always, in diplomacy, the most alert and vigilant; to allow the horrible wars against the Albigenses to proceed, and profit by them. He laid the foundations for the administration of crown domains, fortified and beautified Paris, and encouraged the first attempts of letters and arts. Louis succeeded him and through virtue and piety lent dignity to a monarchy that was already formidable because of its strength. It seemed as if he legalised and consecrated the work of his predecessors and the power which they had assumed. This sovereign, whom posterity loves to imagine as seated under an oak tree in Vincennes, dispensing justice, or washing the feet of the poor on Good Friday, realised so well the Church's ideal of a king that his virtues, justice, vigilance, love for his people, and severity towards himself, seemed to justify beforehand all acts of royal authority.

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of Saint Louis's character and personality in the growth of royal power during the thirteenth century. To resist his will was less an act of rebellion than a deed of wickedness or almost impiety, for he seemed to more than one of his contemporaries holier than the bishops and juster than the Pope. He differed from most princes renowned for their piety and goodness, in that he was neither weak in character nor narrow-minded and timid; this fact tended to increase Saint Louis's authority. No king was more

truly a king than he, and his justice is even more striking than his goodness. He was firm, even towards the Church. Although repressing the excesses of the nobles, he was not partial to the Third Estate; and he would punish the faults of his own retainers. This independence of mind and moral poise make him a type that stands almost alone in history. He realised what has remained for centuries the political ideal of Frenchmen: a central power which guarantees safety and peace, governs wisely, dispenses justice to all, and guides everything.

In Saint Louis's time, centralised power controlled more by moral than by material force, for feudalism was still an important factor; the clergy and nobles enjoyed wide autonomy, free initiative, and privileges that were scrupulously respected. In that case, all that royalty can do is to oppose violence, gradually extend the exercise of its justice, and be, in society, supreme arbiter and magistrate. There seemed to be a moment of equilibrium between royalty—which was growing, and feudalism—which was retrograding. It was the zenith of what might be termed feudal monarchy. Dating from Philip the Fair, royal power dominated feudalism, and began to absorb all local and individual powers for its own benefit.

This period of the zenith of feudal monarchy is also, as we shall see, one in which France of the Middle Ages shines the most brightly and exercises the widest influence in Europe. While Saint Louis, arbiter between Pope and emperor, and between Henry III. and his barons, seems invested with a kind of moral jurisdiction, the University of Paris, having drawn to herself the most illustrious doctors and a world of students from all nations, sets the model for the organisation of all great schools; architecture, improperly termed Gothic, a product of the north of France, whose most beautiful examples were

built on royal domains, is extended from one country to another over the continent, and later in England; French literature is read, copied, and imitated everywhere. In no other period did France exercise a like control over minds. Doubtless royalty cannot claim the entire merit of this; the Renaissance of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries owed much to the growth of active centres of prosperity and intellectual life created by the parcelling out of feudal territory. Yet royalty knew how to concentrate all these living forces, and give them an incomparable capacity for expansion.



## CHAPTER XXVII.

### ENGLAND FROM THE NINTH TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.\*

**1. End of the Heptarchy. Preëminence of Wessex.**—As long as the period of the Heptarchy lasted, England remained isolated and outside of Europe. Its history during that time is a tangled web of domestic wars, each one of the kingdoms striving for overlordship. Northumberland was first victorious, in the seventh cen-

\* **SOURCES.**—“*Monumenta historica Britannica medii aevi*,” volume i. (The first volume of this work, which was never continued, comprises the chroniclers prior to the Norman conquest.) “*Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores* (under the direction of “the Master of the Rolls”; the collection comprises nearly three hundred volumes, appearing since 1858). For details see, Gardiner and Mullinger: “Introduction to the History of England” (third edition, 1894; in English), and Gross, “Sources and Literature of English History,” 1900; Rymer: “*Acta, Fœdera, Conventiones*” (a valuable collection of acts since the year 1100). There are several editions of this, and a summary published by D. T. Hardy, entitled “*Syllabus of Rymer’s Fœdera*,” 3 vols., (1869–1885). “The Statutes of the Kingdom of England,” 10 vols. (1810–1828). R. Schmid: “*Gesetze der Angel-Sachsen*,” second edition (1858), and Liebermann, “*Gesetze der Angel-Sachsen*,” 2 parts, 1898 and 1899. “*La Tapisserie de Bayeux, Reproduction d’après Nature*,” J. Comte (1878). Ch. Bémont: “*Les Chartes Anglaises*” (1892).

**LITERATURE.**—Stubbe, “Constitutional History of England”; Freeman, “History of the Norman Conquest,” and “William Rufus”; Round, “Feudal England,” “Geoffrey de Mandeville,” and “The Commune of London”; Ramsay, “The Foundations of England,” vol. ii.; Norgate, “England under the Angevin Kings”; Bémont, “Simon de Montfort.”

tury; then, in the eighth, Mercia; finally, dating from the ninth century, Wessex; but it needed the scourge of a double invasion to bring about political unity and a firm administration.

**2. The Danes in England.**—The first invasion was that of the Danes, as the Northmen were called in England, who subdued Northumberland (870) and Mercia (874). Wessex alone withstood them under Alfred the Great (871-901) and Æthelstan (925-940). The latter is the first who bore, and who had the right to bear, the title of king of England. His supremacy was acknowledged by the British princes and the independent Danish jarls. He allied himself with foreign powers by marrying one of his daughters to Charles the Simple, another to Hugh the Great, and the third to Otto, duke of Saxony and, later, emperor of Germany. Threatened, in his own domains, by a coalition of Scots, Britons, and Danes from Northumberland and Ireland, he destroyed it in the battle of Brunanburh, near the Tweed, one of the most famous in Anglo-Saxon history (937). A statesman and minister under four kings, successors of Æthelstan, Saint Dunstan, bishop of Worcester and London, then archbishop of Canterbury and primate of England (959-988), originated or directed the political and religious reforms which gave England her first national organisation. The Danes took advantage of the disorders which arose at Ædgar's death (975) to begin their invasions. This time Wessex succumbed, and Swend of the Forked Beard remained master of the entire English territory (1013). His son Cnut, a great conqueror and legislator, reigned brilliantly over all England (1017-1035) as well as Scandinavia; he governed so truly in the spirit of the Saxon laws that he did not seem to be a foreigner. But his children were unworthy of him. His kingdom, too extended, fell apart,

and the national king, Edward, surnamed the Confessor, because of his piety, reconquered his realm with the help of the Normans (1042).

**3. Edward the Confessor and Harold. Foundation of English Unity.**—Edward was a better monk than king. He left the power to his ealdormen, or governors of the large shires which represented the former kingdoms of the heptarchy: Siward, north of the Humber; Leofric, in Mercia; Godwin, in Wessex. The latter was the richest, most powerful, and most ambitious of all. He left to his son Harold vast power (1054), and when Edward the Confessor finally died childless (January 6, 1066), Earl Harold's succession was uncontested. Like Ædgar and Cnut, he reigned over the entire country, from the Tamar to the Tweed. National unity was henceforth established.

**4. Anglo-Saxon Institutions. The Aristocracy.**—The characteristics of Anglo-Saxon institutions are the strength of local powers and the weakness of central government. The disorders which had wasted the country for so many centuries brought inevitable results; they led to the establishment of a kind of feudal régime, less powerful than that on the continent, yet a disintegrating force. The class of small freeholders gradually disappeared; they were forced into dependence on a thane or lord of the soil. The villages stood for so many seigniories which the Normans later would term manors. The nobility had its hereditary chiefs, who were almost as powerful as the king. They were the ealdormen and earls, whose rivalries had invited the Danish invasion and facilitated the Norman conquest.

**5. Administrative Divisions.**—The kingdom was divided into counties or shires ruled by a bishop, earldorman, and sheriff. The latter was the king's agent, appointed by him and deputed to execute the laws, administer the royal

domain, and preside over the tribunal of the county. Twice a year he convoked the assembly of the county, composed of noble landholders, public functionaries, and, probably, for each town the reeve and four men; it was a kind of local parliament, where local business was transacted and law-suits pleaded and judged. Likewise, in each of the hundreds, which were subdivisions of the county, there was a monthly meeting of the lords or their representatives, the priest of each parish, and the reeve and four men of each town. Most public matters were transacted in these assemblies of the hundreds, and in the shiremoots.

**6. The King and the Witanagemot.**—The king had extended prerogatives, but little real power. He was the protector of peace; the law, promulgated in his name, was binding on all his subjects, the Anglo-Saxons having always ignored the principle of personal law. He was already considered as the source of all justice. He was at the head of the national army. But his authority was limited by the powers of his council (*witanagemot*); the wise men, or *witan*, having a share in the drawing up of laws, the enactment of extraordinary taxations, all military and diplomatic affairs, and the nomination of the king. They were few in number, it is true; bishops, nobles of the realm called by the king, officers of the royal household, they wielded no truly independent power. On the other hand, the king's power in matters of police, finance, and the army was shadowy.

**7. Public Order and the Army.**—The system of public order consisted in holding individuals responsible for the offenses or crimes of their neighbours. At the age of twelve a man must swear that "he would not be a rogue nor consort with rogues"; he then was a member of a body of ten, all being responsible for one another.

Except for the revenues from his own domain, the king had no taxes except the Danegeld, which was levied to pay tribute to the Danes, or pay them for their services. The army was a militia (*fyrð*), aristocratic, and not a standing army. The king's personal military force only, armed like the Danes, the *huscarls*, represented a standing army. There was no real fleet. On land as well as on the seas, England was unprepared to offer a long resistance to an invader.

**8. William the Bastard Conquers England. Battle of Senlac, 1066.**—This was apparent soon after the accession of Harold, when William the Bastard, duke of Normandy, claimed the throne. He claimed that Edward had named him as his heir; he cited a certain oath, which Harold had taken on some previous relics, promising to respect his rights of inheritance; he enlisted the Pope's interest in his cause, who was the defender of a sacred oath; and he sent embassies to Germany and France to win as wide support for his claim as possible. At the same time he assembled at Lillebonne a large force of adventurers from France, Flanders, Brittany, Aquitaine, and Burgundy, from Apulia and Sicily, a motley horde of crusaders, assembled for the pillage of England. As he was ready to set sail, but detained by contrary winds, a Norwegian invasion led by Tostig, Harold's brother, landed at the mouth of the Humber. Harold marched north to meet the enemy, and defeated the force near York, at Stamford Bridge (September 28). But that same day the Norman fleet landed near Pevensey, on the unprotected coast, an army said to have been of fifty thousand men.\* Harold, although wounded, hur-

\* Mediæval estimates of numbers are all greatly exaggerated. Probably William's army did not contain over five thousand men. See Ramsay, "The Foundations of England," vol. ii. p. 16.—ED.

ried south again, eager to give battle. He did not even await reënforcements for which he had asked, and was defeated and killed near Hastings, at Senlac (October 14).

**9. Legal Spoliation of England.**—The battle of Hastings is one of the decisive victories of history. It gave, almost at once, England to the duke of Normandy, who went to London to be crowned (December 25), amid a crowd that was curious rather than hostile. His consecration by the Church rendered him legitimate sovereign in the eyes of the English. He was pitilessly logical in wielding this legitimate power. The English who had refused to help him before Hastings were declared traitors, and their property was confiscated; they might, however, buy back their lands by becoming the king's men. The property of those who had borne arms against him, especially the rich domains of the Godwin family, was sequestrated. This wide-reaching spoliation was carried out methodically with every show of exact justice. William never departed from this policy. He had to struggle with his revolted subjects, and it was not until 1071 that he overcame the last resistance; he applied to all the same law, cruel yet inflexible. He followed the same course in distributing to his followers the lands taken from rebels, for he also rewarded the English who had at once rallied to his cause. Thus the Conqueror ignored conquerors and conquered; he was king of all, providing all yielded him equal obedience.

**10. Norman Feudalism in England Restrained by Royal Supremacy.**—He was a powerful organiser as well as a skilful and successful politician. Apparently the old order of things remained unchanged. He declared that he would rule according to the laws of Edward the Confessor, adding, it is true, "with the additions he deemed necessary for the good of the English people." He con-

tinued the royal agents of the county, the hundred, and the towns. The outer pomp which he affected was not different from that of the Saxon kings, but he wished to rule as an absolute prince. The vast riches which the spoliation of England had transferred to him gave him a power unknown to his predecessors. While favouring, in England, the system of feudal tenure in force in Normandy, he took care that the Norman nobles should not become too powerful. The fiefs and manors, which he distributed lavishly, were detached territories. In France the count was head of a people, of a state; in England the title was an empty one, except on the exposed frontiers, where he kept up the authority of the vanished ealdormen; the real head of the county was the sheriff, named by the king, and removable at will.

**11. The Domesday Book and the New Forest.**—The condition of Anglo-Norman property was registered in a voluminous land register called the Domesday Book, which was the result of an inquiry lasting seven months. Soon there was not a yard of land, an ox, a cow, or a pig which was not counted; everyone had his account as in the great book of the Judgment Day. This census caused some disturbances. William swelled the general discontent by creating the New Forest, that is, he reserved for exclusive use in hunting a wide stretch of forest and plain in Hampshire. Most stringent laws were enacted against poachers and marauders. The discontent became so great that many Normans were assassinated. William placed under his special protection “those whom he had brought over with him”; he announced that an attack on a Frenchman was an attack on the king, and he promulgated the rule called presentment of Englishry: the body of an assassinated man was assumed to be that of a

Frenchman, unless it could be proved that the victim was English; if the proof were not forthcoming, the village or hundred in which the corpse was found was punished by a heavy fine.

**12. The Clergy Subservient to the King. Lanfranc.**—William was careful to choose among the clergy prelates who were devoted to him so as to oppose them to the lay barons. He appointed to the see of Canterbury a learned prelate, Lanfranc, abbot of Bec in Normandy. He was born at Pavia, and his Italian origin shielded him in advance from the suspicion of favouring either English or Normans. He was William's prime minister. On the other hand, the clergy was developing into a distinct order. It had its own jurisdiction, and its synods apart from the general assemblies of the kingdom; but William forbade them to send any appeal to Rome without his authorisation. Frequent visits from legates kept the English Church in touch with Rome, but no legate could land in England without his permission, and he kept the right to ratify any act of ecclesiastical legislation. Lanfranc undertook vigorously the moral reform of the clergy. Marriage of priests was forbidden; canons were forced to give up their wives, and gradually, as during Saint Dunstan's time, were replaced by monks, from whom the former abbot of Bec expected more obedience. William approved these measures. Being a prince of sincere and rigid devotion, he had decided to preserve amicable relations with the Pope; but when Gregory VII. asked him to pay homage for the crown, conquered with the Church's blessing, he refused. As protector of the national church, he was the more firmly established as king of the English people.

**13. William the Conqueror's Three Sons.**—William the Conqueror died in 1087 during an expedition against the



French king, Philip I., who, being too young in 1066 to disturb the work of conquest, soon realised that it threatened the future of the Capetian dynasty. William had three sons: to the oldest, Robert, he left the duchy of Normandy; to the second, William Rufus, the crown of England; to the third, Henry Beauclerc, five thousand pounds of silver. The new king was intelligent and brave, but greedy and dissolute, and after Lanfranc's death (1089) he grew tyrannical. He persecuted the archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm, a learned theologian and guileless man, and like Lanfranc, his master, an able administrator; he burdened the nobles and people with taxes; and executed the forest laws relentlessly. He died, pierced by an arrow, in the New Forest (April 2, 1100). At that time his oldest brother was on a crusade and Henry seized the opportunity to take possession of the royal treasure at Winchester, the old Saxon capital, and to have himself crowned at London, the new Norman capital. On his return from the Holy Land, Robert would have contested the throne. He was defeated in the battle of Tinchebrai in Normandy, forty years to a day after the battle of Hastings, and passed the remainder of his days in prison. His oldest son, William Clito, sought refuge in France; but the defeat of Louis the Fat at Brémule saved Normandy, and the double marriage of Matilda, daughter of Henry, first with the German emperor, Henry V., then with handsome Geoffrey Plantagenet, count of Anjou, held the French king constantly in check along the eastern and western frontiers.

**14. Domestic Policy of Henry I. Mingling of the Two Peoples.**—The domestic policy of Henry I. was equally wise. He gained English favour by promising to respect the laws of Edward the Confessor; he granted a charter,

the first of the "charters of liberty" in England, in which he agreed to maintain the rights of the Church, the nobility, and the people. He married Matilda, niece of the last Anglo-Saxon prince, and thereby seemed to be the legitimate heir of the former kings. He carried through an exact and severe administration, which brought misfortune on many, but which established peace, at least. Civil war, after his death, between the two contestants for the crown, his daughter Matilda, and his nephew Stephen of Blois (1135-1153), ruined, in this respect, his work, which Henry II. took up again. However, it completed the fusion of the two peoples, conquered and conquerors, whose favour the two rivals courted, and whose services they rewarded by conferring on them like privileges.

**15. Henry II. His Portrait. He Reorganises and Strengthens Royal Power.**—The son of the Empress Matilda and Count Geoffrey of Anjou, Henry II. was thick-set and strong-limbed. He had imperative need of physical activity, was prompt to anger, almost savage in his violence, and loose in his morals. As a far-sighted and selfish statesman, he knew how to anticipate events and choose efficient officers; he had a hatred for disorder, which made him a law-making king; a disdain for empty glory, and a liking for positive results, which, in spite of his passion for war, led him more than once to negotiate instead of fighting. As a foreign king, head of a vast empire made up of the most diverse peoples, inspired by ancient rivalries, and threatened by jealous neighbours, he needed a strong government; he made it despotic. Scarcely had he reached the throne, at twenty-one (1154), when he struck down the feudal nobles who had gained power during the civil war; he checked the spoliation of the royal domain, and annulled many titles of earl which

had been lavishly conferred throughout the preceding reign; he razed the fortresses built since the death of Henry I., and dismissed the foreign mercenaries, reorganised the finances, and placed the administration under the guidance of Thomas Becket, who was given the title of chancellor. He was a minister proud and arrogant, trained in affairs, and served his lord with unbounded devotion during eight years.

Henry was so satisfied with him that he had him elected archbishop of Canterbury, in spite of the advice of his mother, the remonstrances of the nobles, and complaints of the Church (1162).

**16. Thomas Becket. His Opposition and Exile. His Return and Death, 1170.**—He soon repented of this step. The new archbishop suddenly became the obstinate defender of church rights, as he had been the zealous servant of royal despotism. He protested against a contribution levied on the territory of the clergy, which has often, though erroneously, been identified with the old Danegeld. He also opposed a reform in criminal legislation which involved the submission of priests to the jurisdiction of secular tribunals (1163). He was answered by an appeal to the "customs of the kingdom" defined in the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164); he was finally made party to a lawsuit in which he refused to appear, and was declared guilty of treason. It was said that the king wished to disqualify him and have him put to death. Thereupon he fled to France, where, during a voluntary exile of six years, he roused himself to fanaticism by fasting, scourgings, and feverish study of theological writings. At last, soon after Henry II. had raised to the throne with himself his eldest son, also named Henry (June, 1170), the king and prelate were reconciled, (July 22). On his

return, Becket's first act was to excommunicate the prelates who had participated in the crowning of young Henry, who had been anointed by the archbishop of York in defiance of the rights claimed by the archbishop of Canterbury. On hearing this the king went into a rage. "What!" he cried, "among all these cowards whom I have fed, is there none who will rid me of this miserable priest?" He then assembled a council, which judged Becket's conduct a capital offence. Even then he learned that the prelate had just been assassinated at the foot of the steps which led into the choir of the cathedral at Canterbury (December 29).

**17. Penance of Henry II.**—The anger of Henry II. at once gave place to deep despair. Hearing that the Pope was about to excommunicate him, he hurriedly set off on an expedition to Ireland, but returned no less hurriedly to stop the papal legates whom he met in Avranches. He implored pardon, revoked the Constitutions of Clarendon, and had his son recrowned.

**18. Disaffections with Royal Despotism.**—This storm shook the Angevin Empire to its very foundations. The clergy was satisfied with the public penance which Henry II. performed at the martyr's tomb; but the powerful nobles chafed under the severe order restored by Henry II. The reorganisation of justice and finances, from a blessing had grown to be a burden. The lower functionaries thought that with such a master everything would be countenanced; each year they grew more exacting in levying taxes; lawsuits were more frequent and penalties more burdensome. But Henry's most dangerous enemies were among the members of his own family. Although by his marriage with Eleanor of Aquitaine he had eight children within fifteen years, their union was never peaceful; the wife was insubordinate and the husband faithless,

the sons were bad, and they were badly brought up. Henry II. loved them, but selfishly, and as they grew, he made them the tools of his political schemes. He divided his dominions during his life, so as to relieve himself of the burden: Henry had the paternal share, England, Normandy, Anjou, Maine, and Touraine; Richard, the maternal inheritance, Aquitaine and Poitou; but he merely gave them the semblance of power, arousing their greed without appeasing their ambition. And also, when he wished to marry his youngest son, John, to the heiress of the count of Maurienne, he claimed a part of the inheritance of the two elder brothers to make up the dowry of the younger; they refused it, and Henry fled to the court of his father-in-law, Louis VII., who recognised him as sole and legitimate king of England. Eleanor, plotting with her first husband against her second, incited Richard to revolt; she was hurrying to him when she was arrested and thrown into prison.

**19. Coalition against Henry II. It is Stamped out, 1173-1174.**—This was the signal for a general uprising. Several English earls, the bishop of Durham, the king of Scotland, the counts of Flanders, Boulogne, and Champagne, and at last the king of France united in a formidable coalition in which young King Henry and his brother Richard took leading parts. Henry II. outwitted them by the promptness and vigour of his movements. The Scotch were beaten near Alnwick. On the continent the count of Boulogne was killed in battle, the Flemish invasion stopped, and Louis VII. conquered. “God, even, was for him!” sadly said the king of France.

**20. Administrative Reforms Instituted by the King.**—Once victorious, Henry II. eagerly set about reconstructing his empire. He improved the administrative system by instituting a circuit court presided over by circuit

judges, who wielded vast powers; by organising the Court of the King's Bench, to which were brought all cases coming under royal justice; by establishing a militia and compulsory military service for all except priests and Jews. He curried favour with the Welsh, whom he had been unable to subdue, by flattering their vanity; he pretended to believe in the recent legends which celebrated the exploits of Arthur, king of the Britons. He strengthened his foreign relations by marrying his daughter Jane with William the Good, king of Sicily, and Eleanor with Alfonso VIII., king of Castile. Finally, the accession of a king aged fifteen to the throne of France allowed him some respite in his continental domains.

**21. Trials of the Last Years of Henry II. His Death, 1189.**—His sons caused him the last and most cruel mortifications. Young Henry revolted again, but he was seized with sickness and died at Martel, in Limousin, mourned solely by his father and a few devoted partisans, like the warrior poet Bertram de Born (1183). Three years later his second son, Geoffrey, count of Brittany, was drawn into a revolt by Philip Augustus; he died suddenly, in Paris, shortly before the birth of his child, who was to be the unfortunate Arthur of Brittany. Soon after, the news of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin reached the West (1189). Henry II. and Richard the Lion-Hearted vowed to join the crusade. But Richard and John, even, were drawn by Philip Augustus into his party, both wearied of their father's long reign. Worn by fatigue and weakened by fever, the old king accepted the conditions of peace dictated by Philip Augustus; he only asked for a list of the traitors who were serving in the French army. When he heard the name of his son John, the most beloved, he uttered these words: "You have said enough!" His face changed colour; he lost his

memory; for three days he raved, and at last died without recovering consciousness (July 6, 1189).

**22. Luckless Reign of Richard the Lion-Hearted.**—Richard I., the Lion-Hearted, who succeeded him, was twenty-two years old. He had his father's turbulent nature, but not his political ability. He inherited from his mother a great love of display, poetry, and music. He was a chivalrous king in the full sense of the word, meaning bravery and courtesy, but also extravagance and lack of judgment and foresight. Like his father, he was more of an Angevin than an Englishman. It has been estimated that, out of the thirty-five years of his reign, Henry II. passed thirteen in his kingdom, and that only three times did he stay there during three successive years. Although born in England, Richard appeared there but twice; for some months after his coronation, and during several weeks after his captivity. His time was first wasted at the crusades, then in a war against France, and nowhere did he find anything that was lasting.

Under Henry II. and Richard the Lion-Hearted, England spent herself abroad. After the conquests of Philip Augustus she was forced to retire within herself. In the thirteenth century she had no extensive war except to defend her privileges against royal despotism.

**23. The Nation Rebels against the King, 1215.**—In fact no limits had been yet set to royal powers. Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II. had promised to respect the laws of Edward the Confessor, yet the laws were unwritten. Therefore the able English jurist of the thirteenth century, Henry of Bratton or Bracton, did not hesitate to declare that "no one in the kingdom could be more powerful than the king," that he was above ordinary justice, that God alone could punish him if he did ill, and that

he might only be "besought to amend what he had done." Since the reforms of Henry II. all the classes of the nation were affected by this legal despotism; they joined forces against the royal power when the latter was compromised by its own mistakes and weakened by losses on the continent. The clergy began the struggle against John Lackland, persecutor of the archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton; the nobility took it up after Bouvines. They finally wrested from the king the Magna Carta, the Great Charter of English Liberties (June 15, 1215). It did not institute a new condition of affairs, but stated in more precise form what the previous charters had expressed merely in general terms. It fixed the laws of feudal succession, wardship, and marriage; it regulated the procedure in disputes relating to the recent acquisition of landed property, inheritance, and donations to ecclesiastical benefices; it made justice fixed and periodical; it mitigated the arbitrary infliction of penalties; it protected individual liberty by decreeing that no one should be subject to arrest and imprisonment, or injured in person or property, except by the judgment of his peers and according to law. It ensured to merchants freedom to go from place to place, decreed uniformity of weights and measures throughout the kingdom, and confirmed the commercial privileges of London and other cities or ports. It forbade lords to levy any aid except in the three regular cases, and the king to levy a scutage or aid, except in the same cases, without the consent of the common council of the kingdom, that is to say, the assembly of prelates and barons which, from 1239, was called the Parliament. The act affected all classes of the nation, as is seen—the middle classes, as well as the nobility and clergy. It was conclusive proof that the English, whether descended from Norman conquerors or



Anglo-Saxon conquered, were a united people, bent on having their liberties respected.

Two powers confronted each other—the king and the nation. Their struggle filled an entire century; its cause, object, and result was the Magna Carta.

**24. The Parliament Struggles with Arbitrary Government.**—John Lackland had no sooner sworn to observe than he violated the charter. The barons, as has been seen, then attempted to dethrone him by calling in Louis of France. John's death and the youth of his son Henry III. saved the dynasty. During the young king's minority power was exercised by three ministers elected by the barons. When he was of age he suffered no control. Favourites, especially foreigners, surrounded him, and his ministers were chosen from the ranks of obscure office-holders, without the advice of the Parliament. Arbitrary government was in the ascendant, a gay, lavish, adventurous, whimsical rule. Parliament spared neither complaints nor threats. It took advantage of all the predicaments in which royalty was in and mainly through its own fault, to wrest concessions from it; it withheld money at these critical times until it had obtained the solemn confirmation of the Magna Carta. The Sicilian incident, into which Henry flung himself so thoughtlessly and on which so much money was uselessly spent, brought on a revolution.

**25. The Earl of Leicester and the Provisions of Oxford, 1258.**—A foremost figure in this revolution was a Frenchman, Simon de Montfort, son of the conqueror of the Albigenses. Heir to the title of earl of Leicester and the office of seneschal of England, he was at first an intimate friend of the king, who gave him one of his sisters in marriage (1239). He fought bravely for him during the campaign of Poitou in 1242, and ruled in his name

Gascony, during five years of incessant struggles against the revolted population. Then the two brothers-in-law quarrelled, and Simon became imperceptibly leader of the aristocratic party. In his correspondence and conversation with the most revered prelates of his time, he acquired his hatred of arbitrary government and conviction that the Church and state must be reformed, and his resolution to make the projected reform successful, even at the peril of his life. He was an ambitious bigot and fanatic, devoted to a noble cause. The Parliament, having assembled at Oxford (April, 1258), the king, who was brought to bay, was forced to accept a new constitution called the Provisions of Oxford, which established a council of fifteen elected by Parliament; ministers chosen annually; sheriffs, also elected annually from the lesser nobility of the counties and supervised by a committee of four elected knights; and finally, the periodical convocation of Parliament, which should meet at least three times yearly.

**26. The English Revolution, 1264. The Extraordinary Parliament of 1265.**—The triumph of the aristocracy was short-lived. Peace with France and (1259) the abandonment of Sicily retrieved the royal finances. Henry III. attacked his enemies commanded by Simon de Montfort. After two fruitless campaigns the belligerents agreed to arbitrate, choosing the king of France as judge, who gave his decision January 24, 1264. In the assembly at Amiens Louis IX. annulled the Provisions of Oxford, already condemned by two popes, restored to English royalty all its prerogatives, but declared that the privileges, liberties, and statutes prior to the Provisions, and especially the Magna Carta, should be retained. This judgment aroused the discontent of the barons. Leicester, who had not been present at the conferences in Amiens, took up

arms, and by a fortunate move, captured, near Lewes, the king of England, his oldest son Edward, his brother Richard, king of Germany, and his nephew Henry (May 14, 1264). Then he seized the power and instituted a council of nine members, all devoted to his cause. In order to have the new constitution approved, he convoked a great parliament in which, with prelates and barons, sat chosen representatives of the counties, and burgesses of the principal towns of the kingdom (January, 1265). For the first time commoners had seats in Parliament, therefore Simon de Montfort has sometimes been termed the founder of the House of Commons. This is at least exaggerated, for it is certain that he never intended to give the deputies of the lower classes a permanent seat and office in Parliament; but a precedent had been established, and it was on the plan of the extraordinary Parliament of 1265 that later the regular Parliaments were formed.

**27. Death of the Earl of Leicester, 1265. The Results of this Revolution.**—The victory of the earl of Leicester was of short duration. He abused it, and some of his most influential allies deserted him. At Evesham, with a handful of men, he was surrounded by two armies and perished after a heroic resistance (August 4, 1265). His family was scattered, and his friends treated as rebels and their goods confiscated; but many of the people of the lower classes looked upon him as a saint, and miracles were performed, they say, on the spot where he fell. The king, freed, reassumed his entire power; the reforms promulgated by the barons during seven years were revoked; the Magna Carta at least endured. Therefore, on the death of Henry III. (1272) the situation was the same as at his accession, but the aristocracy was conscious of its strength, and in time

was to restrain the royal power. It found its centre of action in Parliament.

**28. Composition of the English Parliament.**—This assembly, made up of prelates (archbishops, bishops, and abbots), and nobles (earls and barons), was convoked nearly every year during the reign of Henry III. and often several times in the same year. It could not meet, unless specially convoked by the king and according to forms laid down by the Magna Carta. Attendance was compulsory, and members could not withdraw without the king's consent, for it was a strict feudal obligation. The competence of Parliament was undefined, but it had no authority over ministers and royal officers; its functions consisted in giving advice and voting imposts.

**29. The King and His Ministers.**—The king governed with his ministers: the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Chancellor, and the Justiciar. During the twelfth century the Justiciar was in a way viceroy, governing the state in the king's absence. Henry III. took this important office from him, and the others were shorn, in as far as was possible, of their authority.

**30. The King's Court.**—He was still further assisted by his court, or *Curia*, which resembled in many ways that of the Capetians. Like the latter, it was divided into three sections: the Exchequer, for the financial administration; the Court of Common Pleas, established at Westminster since King John's time, and cognizant, in general, of all suits relating to landed property; and finally the King's Bench, which took cognizance of all other cases, especially criminal suits. Under Henry III. the officers of the king's court were used indiscriminately in one or the other of these three sections.

**31. The Counties and Local Administration. Self-Government.**—The kingdom was divided into thirty-five

shires or counties administered by sheriffs, who collected the royal revenues and accounted for them to the Exchequer. Each county had besides its own assembly, comprising, in addition to the nobles and prelates of the shire, chosen representatives of the lesser nobility, the middle class, and even the peasants. These county courts assumed the principal administrative functions, dispensed justice, and insured the execution of police regulations. It was there that the circuit or itinerant judges came to oversee the sheriff's conduct, empty the prisons by trials, and make royal justice felt in connection with local justice. The hundreds had their courts as well, so that the Englishman, accustomed to manage his own personal affairs, was prepared to direct those of the state in the general Parliament of the realm. This was known as self-government.

**32. The Cities. Why there was no Communal Revolution in England.**—With a few exceptions, like London, Bristol, and the Cinque Ports of the Channel, the towns were still of small importance, for England was essentially an agricultural country. It raised large quantities of wool, but disposed of it on the continent, and foreigners were masters of the London market. The villages and many of the towns were within the lords' domains. The most privileged nobles had extended rights in judicial matters, especially the exclusive right to enforce administrative acts without the interference of royal agents in their "liberty." Their rights, regulated by custom, were, however, rarely arbitrary; nobles, even the most important ones, had but scant political power; they could only act as a body, which accounts for the fact that the feudal uprisings of the thirteenth century always began with parliamentary insurrections. Cities were not oppressed by their lords, who lacked sovereign power; they knew

but one enemy, the king; hence there took place in England nothing that resembled the communal movement.

**33. Why the English Third Estate Joined with the Nobles against the Kings.**—This explains the tendency of the commons to join forces with the nobles against the king, and not, as in France, with royalty against the nobles. It follows, from this, that England was the first country in Europe which organised political liberty for the three orders of the nation represented in Parliament.

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### CONTINENTAL EUROPE.\*

#### *I. Northern Europe; the Scandinavian States.*

**1. Formation of the Scandinavian Kingdoms.**—The Norse invasions acquainted the rest of Europe, not very favourably, with the peoples of the north: Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes. They belonged to the Indo-European race and spoke a language akin to German; their customs, institutions, and primitive beliefs much resembled much those of Germany. In the ninth century they still lived a tribal life and were pagans. The head of the tribes were princes or hereditary kings, and military chiefs or jarls; the council of freemen was the supreme tribunal and the diet. But at this time there were also certain chiefs who tried to found vast kingdoms. Gorm the Old (936) was the actual founder of the Danish monarchy, for he subdued the islands, Jutland, even Swedish Blekinge, and made himself master of all the

\* LITERATURE.—Lavissee and Rambaud: "Histoire Générale," volume ii. Freeman: "Historical Geography of Europe"; Allen: "History of Denmark"; Geoffrey: "Histoire des Pays Scandinaves"; L. Leger: "Études Slaves"; Rambaud: "History of Russia" (second edition); "La Chronique dite de Nestor," translated by L. Leger; E. Sayous: "Histoire des Hongrois"; Al. D. Xénopol: "Histoire des Roumains"; L. de Mas Latrie: "Histoire de l'Île de Chypre sous la Règne des Princes de la Maison de Lusignan," 3 vols. (1857); Burke, "History of Spain," 2 vols.; Bryce: "The Holy Roman Empire"; P. Fournier: "Le Royaume d'Arles"; Gregorovius, as above.

passes of the Baltic. Eric the Victorious reigned in Sweden, and Harold of the Blue Tooth in Norway, with absolute power. Cnut the Great was for a time (1014-1035) sole master of three kingdoms. Christianity was then definitely established in the Scandinavian countries, although the worship of Odin persisted into the fourteenth century. At the same time, the social condition was modified. A nobility grew up around the throne to the detriment of the freemen; however, its growth into a hereditary class was slow, and simple freemen kept an important place in the state. Cities were few, and commerce was in the hands of the Germans; Wisby, on the rocky island of Gottland, was the great trading centre of the Baltic, as Bergen, on the Norwegian coast of the North Sea, owed its sudden prosperity to its constant relations with the Netherlands and England.

**2. The Scandinavian Kingdoms Acquire their own Religious Jurisdiction.**—In the thirteenth century the three Scandinavian kingdoms were definitely established as regarded political and religious matters. The archbishoprics established since Cnut were first suffragans of Bremen; this tie was loosened by the creation of the archbishoprics of Lund in Scania for Denmark (1104), Drontheim for Norway (1152), and Upsala for Sweden (1164).

**3. Peaceful Growth of Scandinavian Iceland.**—Denmark, on the other hand, having been a tributary of Germany in the eleventh century, cast off this suzerainty under Waldemar I. (1157-1188) and his sons. In the first half of the thirteenth century, he successfully extended his sway over the entire southern coast of the Baltic, from Mecklenburg to Esthonia. The Norwegians spread through the islands of the northern ocean. They founded a flourishing state in Iceland, a Scandinavian



republic "free of kings and despotism." There were preserved better than among their continental brothers the ancient traditions of the race, recorded in the Eddas. Later, when Christianity penetrated into the island, it struggled ably with the old pagan poetry by arousing a taste for chivalric poetry. The legends of Charlemagne, translated into Icelandic, were a potent means of propaganda amid a people who had the long winters to while away, and who, in their proud independence, kept alive their hero-worship. The Scandinavians went still farther and settled on the southern coast of Greenland, and even beyond, among the natives of Vineland. There they reached the soil of North America, long before Columbus, although their adventurous expeditions bore no relation to the discovery of America.

## *II. Eastern Europe: Hungarians and Slavs.*

### **4. Political Organisation of the Kingdom of Hungary.**

—The history of the kingdom of Hungary begins with Stephen I. the Saint (997-1038) who was the first Christian chief of the Arpad dynasty, and he imposed Christianity on all his subjects. He enriched the growing church so that it was soon the most powerful body of the state. In order to control the tribal chiefs, he divided the territory into districts ruled by a count who levied and commanded troops, guided the administration of domestic affairs, and collected crown revenues. The lesser nobility was subject to the counts, but the higher depended on the king alone. Finally the king united the bishops, magnates, and high officials in one supreme assembly, and, with their co-operation, made laws and ordinances to combat the ancient customs of the Hungarian hordes. This Christian and monarchical organisation, imitated from Germany, did not alter the customs of

the country, which for a long time retained their patriarchal character, but it gave the kingdom a cohesiveness which facilitated its development and growth by the acquisition of the kingdom, "triple and one," of Slavonia, Croatia, and Dalmatia; by the submission of the great Roumanian people, scattered over the two slopes of the southern Carpathians; and by the subjection of Bosnia and Servia, which acknowledged the Magyar suzerainty. At the end of the thirteenth century, the Hungarian monarchy extended from the eastern Carpathians to the Morawa, and from the Adriatic to the Pruth and Dniester.

**5. Aristocratic Constitution of Hungary.**—Progress was more than once endangered by internal discord, and especially by rival claims to the throne, caused by the uncertainty of the electoral law. Civil war having broken out between King Andrew II. (1205-1235) and his son Bela, the nobles took advantage of it to exact of the king the Golden Bull of 1222, by which they acquired entire possession of their lands with a hereditary title, exemption from all obligations other than military service, and protection from condemnation to death, and confiscation, unless by virtue of a regular trial. A diet was to meet each year at Weissenburg in which any noble might appear and state his grievances. Additions to this Golden Bull, which in certain points is like the English Magna Carta, gave similar guarantees to the lower nobility and clergy. Should the king violate the constitution, the archbishop of Gran might cite the law to him, and should he refuse to submit, excommunicate him (1231). For several centuries, Hungary was the European country in which the aristocracy held power most firmly.

**6. The Slavs.**—The Slavs, much more numerous than the Hungarians, were weakened by separating from one another. The Slovenes (Carinthia and Carniola), and the

Croats settled in the valleys of the Muhr, Save, and Drave; and the Serbs south of the Danube. In the northern part of Austria were the Moravians, converted to Christianity by Cyrill and Methodius, then the Czechs of Bohemia, their brothers. Under various names they peopled the entire country which is to-day German, situated east of the Elbe and Saale, as well as the valley of the Vistula and the upper basins of the Dniester, Dnieper, and Volga. From the midst of this confusion three peoples stand forth as interesting to general history: the Czechs, Poles, and Russians.

**7. The Slavs of Bohemia or Czechs.**—In the beginning the Czechs were in the dependence of Germany, even after Philip of Swabia had definitely granted the title of king to their prince Ottocar I. and his heirs (1198). Bohemian kings figure in the German diets with the electoral hat and the dignity of arch-cup-bearer of the Empire. For this reason German influence was dominant in the country. Germans came in crowds to the court, the monasteries, and the clergy; they settled an entire quarter in Prague; they cleared the forests, and founded villages and cities. They initiated the Czechs into the literature and arts of the West. On the extinction of the Perzemslides (1306), Bohemia had, henceforth, only foreign kings. Although this foreign influence was dangerous to the originality of the country, it was not harmful; on the contrary, it opened the way for the brilliant period of the fourteenth century.

**8. The Slavs of Poland.**—Poland ranks among the European nations after the conversion to Christianity of Mieczyslav, prince of the family of the Piasts (962-992); but its early history is a succession of civil or foreign wars, broken by some brief intervals of splendour. Anarchy favoured the development of the nobility. Originally

there were but two classes among the Slavs, the free and the un-free; land was held jointly by families. They had the patriarchal customs of wandering tribes; these were lost, when, with the appropriation of land, riches began to accumulate. There then arose an inferior class, subject to the nobility, but all those who enjoyed full liberty, even the humblest, ranked as noble. The nobility was the kernel of the nation; it alone bore arms, it chose for itself princes to whom military service was due. In this way Poland escaped royal despotism, only to be lost in anarchy.

### **9. The Slavs of Russia Conquered by the Scandinavians.**

—The Slavs of Russia owe their first notions of an organised state to foreigners; not to Germans, as was the case in Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland, but first to the Scandinavians, then to the Greeks. The Scandinavians, those Varangians or Rous, settled about 862 on the shores of Lake Ladoga and the White Lake, soon occupying Novgorod, Smolensk, and Kieff; and they were soon bold enough to undertake expeditions to Constantinople which have made the names of Oleg, Igor, and Sviatoslav illustrious. They then controlled the wide basin of the upper Dnieper.

There was soon added to this military conquest from the north the ecclesiastical conquest from the South. Olga, the wife of Igor, had already received baptism at Byzantium; so her name is venerated in the Russian calendar. Her grandson Vladimir (972-1015), husband of a Greek princess, was converted by Greek missionaries, and he, in turn, forcibly imposed his religion on his subjects. The chief of pagan idols, Peroun (the thunder), was scourged at Kieff and thrown into the river.

### **10. Russians Civilised by German and Especially by Byzantine Influence.**—Vladimir has been compared to

Clovis. One of his sons, Yaroslaff the Great (1015-1044), was the Charlemagne of Russia. He waged successful warfare against his neighbours, and through foreign relationships made Russia truly a European state. He married his three daughters to Harold, king of Norway; Henry I., king of France; and the youngest to Andrew I., king of Hungary. He collected the laws of his people in a code named the "Russian Truth." He wished Kieff, his capital, to rival Constantinople. Greek artists created on the banks of the Dnieper another Saint Sophia, which still exists, and which still preserves the mosaics of Yaroslaff; several hundred churches soon peopled this metropolis, to which came merchants from Germany, Hungary, Scandinavia, and Greece. Byzantine influence triumphed here. Greek priests brought with them the conception of an absolute and centralised government, which the czars of Kieff could not, it is true, put into practice, but which survived to reappear later with formidable strength in Moscovite Russia.

**11. Decadence of the First Russian State.**—On the other hand, Russia did not receive from Western Christianity, at critical moments, the help lavished, for instance, on Spain against the Moors, Germany against the Slavs, and Hungary against the Turks. This was soon apparent. The empire of Yaroslaff disintegrated more rapidly than Charlemagne's; it sank amid frightful domestic wars. Kieff, taken by assault and sacked in 1169, lost its rank as capital. Finally a quadruple foreign invasion completed the work of destruction begun by the princes and Russian boyars themselves. From the northwest came the Germans, merchants, missionaries, or soldiers. Then came the "brothers of the militia of Christ" or order of "Brothers of the Sword," founded in 1201, who were all that both names imply. They settled in Livonia,

Esthonia, and Courland. They allied themselves in 1237 with knights of the Teutonic Order in Prussia, and closed to Russians access to the Baltic, as their allies did to the Poles. On the west, the Lithuanians, from the middle of the thirteenth century, constantly troubled Russia on its European frontier.

**12. The Mongolian Invasion. Russia is Separated from Europe.**—But the most serious event was the inroad of the Mongols, whom Jenghiz-Khan had gathered into a national body. After several victories when Russians shed rivers of blood, the Golden Horde conquered (1224-1240) the major part of Slavic Russia, which remained for three centuries under their yoke. The conquered were compelled to pay a heavy tribute and furnish the Horde a military contingent; the princes, to reign, were obliged to receive its investiture, and its authorisation to declare war. Thus Russia was no more than a dependency of Asia, and had no relations with Europe except through Novgorod, a prosperous and powerful republic of merchants which the invasion had left untouched.

### *III. Southern Europe: the Greek Empire and Spain.*

**13. Incomplete Restoration of the Greek Empire.**—After the emperor of Nicæa, Michael VIII., Paleologus, entered Constantinople, he was far from having established the Byzantine control as it was before the fourth crusade. In fact, at first he only reigned over Thrace, south of the Hemus, in that part of Macedonia which had formed the transient kingdom of Thessalonica, and over several cities of the Peloponnesus. In the north the Serbs were independent, under princes of the house of Nemanja, and the Bulgarians had formed again an empire whose growth had been marked by Latin

disasters. Of the Latin states, born of the crusade of 1204, there remained but two important ones after 1261: the duchy of Athens, which comprised Attica and Bœotia, and the principality of Achaia, which occupied the entire Peloponnesus. Venice, on her side, profiting by everyone's misfortunes, added to the territory acquired in 1204, which moreover, she never entirely possessed, Crete, Modon, Coron, part of the island of Eubœa, without counting the island of Naxos, which, though not belonging directly to the republic of Saint Mark, had been, however, occupied by Venetians since 1207. Added to this loss, Sicilian princes took from the Greek Empire other scattered bits. Manfred owned Durazzo and Corfu, with the title of Prince of Romania, which was handed on to his conqueror, Charles of Anjou. The empire of Trebizond, in Asia, which covered the entire southern coast of the Black Sea, east of the Sangarius, existed until the middle of the fifteenth century, but without advantage to anyone.

**14. Importance of Byzantine Civilisation.**—Even in its decline the Greek Empire's security was still a factor in civilisation. Athens was but an insignificant provincial city and Constantinople could not cure the wounds inflicted by the barbarous Latin occupation; art, enriched in the West by Roman and Gothic artists, could now do without models and ignore Byzantine methods. Yet Byzantium was still the repository of Greek antiquity, and in the succeeding centuries its professors and learned men were to transmit its treasures to Italy. But the schism, revived after 1261 in spite of Michael VIII., was fatal to her. The western people attacked the Greeks, desperately and mercilessly, and Mussulman Turks were allowed to subdue them, and Latin Christianity took no effective measures for their safety.

**15. Cyprus and Armenia.**—There were but two independent Latin states remaining in the Latin Orient after the loss of Acre in 1291: Cyprus, occupied by princes of the house of Lusignan, and the small kingdom of Armenia in Cilicia, which kept its native princes until the middle of the fourteenth century. Small result after so many crusades.

**16. Spread of Mohammedanism.**—At the end of the thirteenth century the Mohammedans were undisputed masters of the entire Mediterranean coast. They spread out in a large half circle which stretched from Smyrna to the Straits of Gibraltar. But, while one horn of their crescent in the Orient was pushed ever forward into the Greek Empire, the other in Spain was growing duller and duller in centuries of struggles with the Christians.

**17. Formation of the Spanish Kingdoms.**—The Iberian peninsula had never been entirely conquered by the Arabs. The region in the northwest escaped their grasp and from it arose two small independent states: Asturia and Cantabria, which, united, formed the kingdom of Oviedo and, later, of Leon. The Spanish march in the north, organised by the Franks under Charlemagne, was between the Ebro and the Pyrenees; from this came, during the Carolingian decadence, the kingdoms of Navarre and Aragon. Then Castile, torn from Navarre, was formed in the upper basin of the Douro, and, united to the kingdom of Leon (1037), it soon constituted the largest Christian kingdom in Spain. Finally the county of Portugal, given to a prince of the house of France as fief of the crown of Castile (1094), was, in its turn, organised into a kingdom (1139).

Thus there were in Spain four Christian kingdoms. On the other hand the caliphate of Cordova disappeared, to give place to seven Moslem kingdoms.



Between the Christians and Mussulmans, both equally fanatic, war was incessant. The Castilians occupied Toledo (1085); the Portuguese, Lisbon (1147); the Aragonese, Saragossa (1118). The Cid Campeador made his name illustrious by exploits which legend and poetry have embellished. In the thirteenth century, after a defeat inflicted on the Almohades at Las Navas de Tolosa (1212), the Mussulmans fell back on all sides. Aragon conquered the Balearic Islands and Valencia; Castile took Cordova, Jaen, Seville, Cadiz, and reached out to the Mediterranean by occupying Murcia and Tarifa; Portugal finally annexed Algarve. At the end of the century there remained to the Mussulmans but a part of the kingdom of Grenada.

**18. Military and Religious Organisations of Spain.**—During this constant crusade Spain was powerfully assisted; while Africa was sending the Almoravides and Almohades to the help of their coreligionists, the crusaders, Frenchmen especially, were swarming into the Peninsula. On the other hand, the wars among the Spanish kingdoms and their civil strife did not prevent organised resistance. Religious and military orders founded in the twelfth century kept them united in the national struggle. These were the order of Calatrava, founded in 1158; that of Alcantara, in 1176; that of Compostelle, in 1175, entrusted with the protection of the tomb of Saint James, and of the pilgrims who went there in masses, to pray; and last of that of Evora, in Portugal, in 1162. They formed a standing army, ever ready to march to battle and follow up a victory. The holy war moulded the Spanish character and institutions. It installed within them a horror of the infidel and heretic, and the pride of blood free from any taint from the enemy of the faith.

19. **Political Organisation of the Spanish Kingdoms.**— In no other Christian country was the clergy so powerful; it was exempt from all obligations; its members were solely responsible to their own judicial courts. Its nobility was composed of a few old families already settled in the mountains of the south at the time of the Arabian invasion, some powerful vassals of the king, and some gentlemen of slender fortunes who were mostly vassals of the great lords. These members of the petty nobility were called *hidalgos*. In Aragon, the chiefs of the nobility were the *ricos hombres*. The people had organised and learned how to defend themselves before the kings had grown powerful, so they had been forced to grant to rich individuals, to religious or city communities, many privileges or *fueros* which the Spaniards guarded with jealous care. In Aragon, the defence of public and private right was entrusted to a supreme magistrate, the *justicia*. His tribunal judged and settled all differences between the king and the orders of the nation, all quarrels among their respective orders; he could compel all royal officers to be responsible to him for their acts. He was himself subject to the restraint of a commission appointed by the king and the assembly of the kingdom. After 1265 he was chosen from the ranks of the petty nobility, because the high seigniors could not be condemned to corporal punishment. Affairs of general importance were discussed in the Cortes, where sat, on one hand, the prelates and heads of religious orders considered as feudal lords; on the other, the chiefs of the nobility. In Aragon the king opposed, to the *ricos hombres*, the petty nobility and deputies of the cities; from the middle of the twelfth century the Cortes included four orders, the *ricos hombres*, clergy, simple knights (*infanzones*), and city deputies. Castile had no *justicia*, or supreme judge, and

was therefore much more torn by civil strife than Aragon.

**20. Spanish Civilisation Impeded by the Holy War.**—The struggle for the *fueros* and against the infidel absorbed Spanish activity entirely during several centuries; it did not leave the nation enough leisure to contribute in any degree to the artistic, literary, and scientific movement of Europe. Without doubt it had a brilliant epic poetry centring around the Cid; Catalonia, which was closely related to Languedoc by language and politics, produced famous troubadours; the king of Castile, Alfonso X., the Wise (d. 1284), was poet, historian, and jurist. He traced the plan for a vast general chronicle, and ordered the editing of a code of laws in seven parts, which was carried out under his supervision by a group of scholars. But Spain's greatest glory in the thirteenth century is perhaps having produced the man who best represents her genius, that of a conqueror and a believer, the founder of the Order of Preachers, Saint Dominic.

#### *IV. Central Europe: Germany.*

**21. The Political Decay of Germany.**—From the tenth to the thirteenth century Germany changed very much. Its frontiers were extended on the west by the addition of Lorraine (924) and on the east by the conquest and Germanisation of the Slavic peoples between the Elbe and the Oder. The divisions within her own territory were also modified. In Charlemagne's time the country was divided into counties (*pagi*, *Gaue*). After him five large national duchies were formed: Franconia, Saxony, Swabia, Bavaria, and Lorraine. Lorraine was then separated into two duchies, Upper and Lower Lorraine; Austria and Carinthia were detached from Bavaria, and Bohemia was included among the German duchies; finally,

Thuringia and Friesland had their own existence. With these duchies, which correspond to well-outlined geographical divisions, other states were formed, quite artificially by war and colonisation, such as the marches, margravates, or marquisates of the northeast: Misnia, Lusatia, and Brandenburg, and those of the north: Holstein, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania. The triumph of feudalism brought about new transformations. The old counties disappeared; certain lords succeeded in grouping under their authority several of those territories, but they were more often, on the contrary, parcelled out into numerous fiefs. This nobility of the second order acquired hereditary titles from the end of the eleventh century; its ranks were enlarged later by agents of the principal seigniors and prelates (*ministeriales*) who at first exercised almost servile functions, and who later succeeded in carving for themselves domains out of the fiefs they were administering. Finally, the national duchies weakened themselves in their struggle for power, as that of Saxony after the disgrace of Henry the Lion, or they disappeared, like those of Franconia and Swabia. On the death of Frederick II. Germany was divided up into a host of states, small and large, secular and ecclesiastical, German and not German, which made the political map of the country strangely complicated.

**22. Definite Triumph of the Feudal Régime in Germany.**—The states enjoyed sovereign power, actual for a long time, and legal after Frederick II. formally accorded it to the ecclesiastical (1220) and secular seigniors (1232). The princes exercised the functions of the former dukes and counts, that is to say, they had the right to dispense justice and the duty of maintaining the public peace, commanding the armed force, and holding local assemblies; they drew, moreover, all royal revenues, and were

henceforth considered as masters of the territory. The inhabitants, free or not, became their subjects. They had vassals who in their turn succeeded in certain countries (Swabia, Franconia, and the Rhenish countries), in acquiring independence, but who elsewhere, in the north, for example, remained subject to the suzerain of the country. Some few countries kept their old liberty, like Zealand and the Swiss cantons.

**23. The Election to the Crown.**—The crown was elective. In the thirteenth century the high feudal lords disposed of it. The three archbishoprics of Mainz, Trèves, and Cologne, the count palatine of the Rhine, the duke of Saxony, and the margrave of Brandenburg had each a vote; Bavaria and Bohemia contested the seventh, which definitely fell to Bohemia in 1275. Any free man might be elected, providing he was eligible, spiritually and physically, to govern a kingdom. Foreigners even were named, as Richard of Cornwall and Alfonso of Castile. On the coronation day the king swore to respect the rights of each individual and to maintain the public peace; if he failed in this, the palatine count could judge the case with the other princes. Dating from Otto I. the king of Germany became, usually, head of the Holy Roman Empire; he then bore the title of *Imperator Romanorum semper augustus*; if the son were elected during his father's lifetime, he was titled *Rex Romanorum*. He wore also the two crowns of Italy and Arles.

**24. The High Officers of the Crown.**—Close to the king were the high officers of the crown. These were at first the three chancellors for Germany, Italy, and Burgundy, who were the archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trèves; the count palatine performed the functions of grand seneschal, and was as well judge of princes; the duke of Saxony was grand marshal; the margrave of Brandenburg,

grand chamberlain; and the king of Bohemia, grand cup-bearer. At various times the king would convoke a diet (*Reichstag*) made up of the nobles of the kingdom, that is to say, all those who depended immediately on the king and who were named princes, whatever might be their material power. The diet concerned itself with the making of laws, with public peace, lawsuits concerning princes, and with war, etc. In addition to the imperial diets, the king held also, in the various provinces of the Empire separate diets (*Hoftage*) at which the provincial nobles had to be present; the special interests of the region were treated in these assemblies and regulations made for the entire Empire were locally enforced there.

**25. Restricted Powers of the Crown.**—The king could convoke the feudal army, but since Henry VI. he was obliged to give the reasons for the intended expedition. All vassals summoned had to appear or forfeit their fief. The duration of military service was undetermined; if it had not been so, the numerous Italian expeditions would have been impossible. On the other hand, the vassal was given an indemnity for equipment, and in certain cases, pay. The royal revenues were small, unless the crown fell to a rich noble such as Frederick of Hohenstaufen. Outside of his own domains, there were but few contributions, due from castles, cities, non-feudal monasteries, the right of asylum, payments in kind during war-time, and certain earnings of justice and the chancellor's office. Yet these resources were so meagre that the Hohenstaufen tried to enrich themselves outside of Germany. The royal domain, reorganised in northern Italy, brought in much money, but when the Hohenstaufen dynasty had disappeared this property was depreciated, and the royal finances were ruined in the great crisis of the thirteenth century.

**26. The City Leagues.**—A penniless monarchy, almost without troops, without a capital and a central administration, was powerless to maintain order. The king declared himself protector of the public peace, but he had no means to maintain it. The policing of the country had to be done by individuals, the cities formed leagues for mutual protection; in 1254, Mainz, Cologne, Worms, and Speyer, Strasburg, and Basel united for ten years, and admitted many nobles into their alliance. Thirteen years earlier Lübeck and Hamburg had joined together, and they grouped around them other cities and organised the famous league known since 1255 as the Hanseatic League. Emperors were soon compelled to recognise these leagues, which they had originally forbidden. Finally the citizen class was admitted to the diet, although in an inferior position, and constituted one of the political orders of the state.

**27. German Civilisation. Letters. Academic Literature.**—Germany, whose destiny it seems to be to overstep her own boundaries, and who, when the invasion ceased, began again to reach out to the south of the Alps and east of the Elbe, also felt outside influences, especially in matters concerning art and literature. The literary renaissance arose, in a way, with Bruno, brother of Otto I., and priests of the royal chapel. It was inspired by Italy and the East, and expressed itself either in episcopal schools, as at Cologne, Magdeburg, Speyer, or in monasteries like that at Reichenau, which produced Herman the lame, a prodigy in science; or Saint Gall, where Ekkerhart wrote, the first, in date, of German epic poets; or Gandersheim, whose abbess was the learned Gerberge, sister of Otto the Great, and was noted because of Hrotsuitha, celebrated for her epic poems and her prose dramas imitated from Terence. This literature was pre-

eminently learned and pedantic; Latin was the only language used, as suited a country and a period when priests alone were interested in study.

**28. The National Epic Poem of Germany.**—But Germany had also a powerful native poetry whose most remarkable productions were the song of the Nibelungen, which relates the struggle of the Burgundians, and especially of the family of Nibelung, against Etzel or Attila; and the poem of Gudrun, telling of the marvellous adventures of Hagen, prince of Ireland, and his wife Hilda, an Indian princess, and their grand-daughter Gudrun. Whilst in Siegfried, the hero of the Nibelungen, who is invulnerable except on his shoulder and who dies in the prime of life, we recognise some features of Achilles; in Gudrun, spirited away by a disappointed rival, yet ever faithful to the beloved whom she has chosen, we recall Ulysses's wife. Therefore the Germans look upon these two poems as their Iliad and Odyssey.

**29. Chivalrous Epic Poetry in Germany. The Minnesinger.**—There grew up beside these works, in which were revived, in their wild simplicity, memories of the great German and Norman invasions, another literary branch, but not growing from the old Teutonic trunk. The poems of chivalry of France and the lyric poetry of the south in Languedoc were grafted on to it and bloomed with fresh charm. This borrowed literature pleased the taste of the period. The poet Conrad, who wrote at the request of Henry the Lion (or his father Henry the Proud), imitated the Chanson of Roland, while the Carolingian legends passed into the rhymed chronicles of the emperors (*Kaiserchronik*). Others imitated or translated poems from the Round Table: Parsifal and his son Lohengrin, who was the knight of the swan, Titurel, Tristan and Isolde, Eric and Gauvain, the knight of the lion.



Henry of Veldeke borrowed the story of Aeneas from the Norman trouvère, Benedict de Saint More, as the priest Lamprecht borrowed that of Alexander the Great from Aubrey of Besançon (or Briançon), a compatriot of the Empress Matilda, wife of Frederick I. Our troubadours inspired the Minnesinger—"singers of the spring-time of love"—the most celebrated, Henry of Valdeke, Wolfram of Eschenbach, Hartmann von der Aue, Godfrey of Strasburg, and especially Walther von der Vogelweide, living in the time of Frederick Barbarossa, and writing at the time and even at the court of Frederick II., their admirer.

**30. Church Architecture.**—Originally art was also borrowed. It blossomed early in ecclesiastical architecture copied from that of Italy and Byzantine Greece. The foundations of the choir of Strasburg were laid in 1015; the Roman cathedral of Speyer was mostly built under Henry III. The vast cathedrals in the valley of the Rhine, called the "Priests' Street" (*Pfaffenstrasse*), were built, enlarged, and decorated by French and Italian workmen. Germany gave to her churches majestic or huge proportions, which changed their character, but which reflected so much the better the idea of grandeur which the Hohenstaufen stamped on all about them.

**31. Confused Situation of Europe.**—The first impression that is left, after going over this general review of states in Europe, is a sense of extreme and painful confusion. Doubtless political and social institutions offer, in most of the countries, striking analogies, but the great evil of feudalism had been the repeated subdivision of sovereign power and the creation of a thousand local tyrannies, no government being really strong and well armed. If we compare this amazing diversity with the dignified simplicity of the Roman world, the contrast is remarkable.

**32. Tendency to Unity: the Roman Empire in the Germanic Nation.**—However, the memory of ancient unity never disappeared entirely. Charlemagne and Otto the Great resuscitated it with splendour, and dating from the last half of the tenth century, German sovereigns aspired to universal sway. The Hohenstaufen especially were deeply imbued with a sense of the rights which the imperial dignity conferred on them. They were not satisfied with reigning in Germany and the annexed kingdoms of Italy and Burgundy; they claimed suzerainty over Hungary, Poland, and Denmark. France acknowledged it for a space of time during the reign of Otto the Great; but under the Capetians she never let slip an opportunity to proclaim her entire independence. In England Richard the Lion-Hearted submitted to it through political necessity, and in order to secure his release from prison; but after the death of the Emperor Henry VI. it was no longer tolerated. Spain always rejected it; she pretended that, having been formerly abandoned by the Romans, the emperor of the Romans had no right over her. Even in Italy there were always two rebellious regions: in the north, the republic of Venice; in the south, the kingdom of Sicily. The kings of Cyprus and Armenia, in the Orient, acknowledged themselves vassals of Henry VI. In a letter purporting to be from Frederick Barbarossa to Saladin, but which was certainly written by a contemporary, the emperor is made to invoke the classic memories of Crassus killed by the Parthians, and of Mark Antony losing himself at Cleopatra's feet, all this going to prove that the rights of the Empire over Oriental countries were still valid.

**33. Wherein the Empire was Harmful to Italy and Germany.**—These claims seem childlike to us; they were taken seriously in the Middle Ages, and the result was

that the king of Germany was not a national sovereign. The more he believed in his imperial supremacy, the farther he led his country into adventures. He sacrificed his own interests to an illusion. He wished to reign in Rome, his legal capital, but shattered his forces against a power that was at first less than his own, then equal to, and finally greater than it. The popes, too, dreamed also of controlling the Christian world. The struggle between these rival powers was inevitable, and it ended in the triumph of the Church. The popes, in their turn, set up a claim to the disposal of the imperial crown. Innocent III. evolved a famous theory. He said that it was by the Pope's favour that formerly the empire had been taken from the Greeks and entrusted to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne; the authority which Leo III. on this occasion had exerted, as the representative of God, should henceforth and forever remain with his successors; hence the popes could, no matter when, withdraw their gift, to bestow it on another person or nation which might be truly worthy of it. Doubtless the emperor was as necessary to the world as the Pope, but pontifical power, coming from God, should supersede imperial power, coming from man.

Germany and Italy were victims of the wars undertaken to satisfy this twofold ambition, a legacy to the Middle Ages from antiquity. In Germany royalty was paralysed because it remained elective, and it was elective because of its union with the Empire, since the Papacy, assuming the right to crown the emperor, could not tolerate a hereditary empire.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

### THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.\*

**1. European Unity a Gift of the Church.**—In default of political unity the Middle Ages at least possessed religious unity, which was bestowed by the Roman Church. The Church, in the thirteenth century, was a strange and mighty state. It had no frontiers; in the midst of an armed society, it had no armies; but it possessed a learned hierarchy, a clearly defined dogma, a horror of all opposition, and the art of governing men and making them love its domination.

**2. Papal Elections and the Pope's Authority in the Church.**—The Pope was the head of ecclesiastical society

\* **SOURCES.**—The main source for papal history is the vast collection of papal bulls, whether calendared in works like those of Jaffé and Potthast, or published *in extenso* or in extracts in the "Annales Ecclesiastici" of Baronius and Raynaldus (Lucca edition, 1735-1787, forty-two volumes in folio), and in the volumes of "Pontifical Registers," edited by students of the French school in Rome. There exists a "Bullarium magnum Romanum," (Luxembourg, 1747-1758, eleven volumes in folio) which covers the period between 450 and 1550. For the clergy of France, the "Gallia Christiana," published by the Benedictines, is an important collection, as well as the "Monasticon Anglicanum" of Dugdale, for England, the "Italia sacra" of Ughelli for Italy, and for Spain, the "España Sagrada," of Florez.

**LITERATURE.**—Tardif, "Histoire des Sources du Droit Canonique"; Fournier, "Les officialités au Moyen Âge"; Montalembert, "The Monks of the West"; Sabatier, "The Life of St. Francis of Assisi"; Moeller, "History of the Christian Church," with full bibliographies; Allen, "Christian Institutions"; Reichel, "Complete Manual of Canon Law."

just as the emperor was the chief of the secular order. Since the decree of 1059 the cardinals alone had the right to choose the Pope; it was merely for form's sake that the consent of the people and the clergy of Rome was asked after that. Alexander III. did away with even this figment of popular intervention, and decreed that, in the future, the election should be decided by a vote of two-thirds of the electors (1179). Street riots were thus avoided, but not rivalries in the College of Cardinals. After the death of Clement IV. (1268), they were seventeen months without coming to a decision. Then they were imprisoned in the palace at Viterbo, where they lived; at the expiration of a year they were still undecided. One day, at last, the roof of the building was removed and the torrents of rain forced them to make up their minds. They elected Gregory X., who, to avoid a recurrence of such a scandal, commanded that hereafter cardinals should be immured in separate cells, and should not leave them until a Pope had been chosen (1274). This is known as the Conclave. The Pope was then consecrated and crowned with the tiara, with great pomp, usually in the cathedral of Saint Peter. His reign began from that day. In the acts issuing from his chancery he assumed the humble title of "servant of the servants of God"; but when speaking of himself he was less modest. Gregory VII. called himself the "vicar of Saint Peter"; Innocent III., the "vicar of Jesus Christ." This was in no wise vanity on his part, but an assertion that his power proceeded from God, and that all his acts were the work of God. Therefore, in the Church, almost unbounded power was acknowledged to be vested in the Pope. With the condition that he respect the word of the Scriptures, the sentences of the Fathers, and the canons of the councils, he might decide supremely in all matters of doctrine

and discipline. Belief in his infallibility was not yet required, but it was scarcely to be thought that he could make a mistake when speaking in the name of God and for His Church.

**3. The Decretals and the Corpus Juris Canonici.**—The decisions, decrees, or decretals of popes had therefore the force of law. Innocent III. took great pains in compiling them. Down to that time the collections of decretals, even the celebrated “Decretum” compiled about 1140 by a monk of Bologna, Gratian, had been individual works, of no authentic value. Innocent III. officially ordered one of his notaries to make a like work, which, when finished, he sent to the university at Bologna, that had, so to say, the monopoly in Europe of teaching the canon law, declaring that it might be freely used in courts and schools. About 1230 Gregory IX. commanded the Dominican, Raymond of Pennafort, his chaplain, to draw up a systematic code of canonical law. This is known as the “Five Books of Decretals of Gregory IX.” Later the work was continued, and when completed, was termed the “Body of Canon Law” (*corpus juris canonici*), the basis of the absolute power of the popes, as the body of civil law (*corpus juris civilis*) was for that of the emperors.

**4. The Papal Authority over Bishops.**—The Pope was the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Archbishops took an oath of subjection to him. Bishops were generally, after 1215, elected by the chapters, but the Pope reserved the right to confirm the election. After the eleventh century mention of episcopal elections is often couched in the formula, “by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See.” If two or several candidates were elected at the same time, the case was laid before the Pope, who might then name a prelate of his own choice.

English history affords a famous illustration of this, when Innocent III., rejecting for the see of Canterbury both the candidate elected by the monks and the prelate nominated by King John, chose Stephen Langton. In Castile Alfonso X. (1252-1284) acknowledged the Pope's right to depose and reinstate bishops, and to annul elections, "even if the candidate chosen were worthy." In no other country was such a high privilege granted him; but it was almost universal that he could dispose as he wished of ecclesiastical benefices. Down to Innocent III. popes were content to beg the bishops to grant certain benefices to their favourites; after that Pope, a formal order was sent them. The privilege was grossly abused. In the council at Lyons (1246) England protested against the numerous Italians enriched by these excessive grants, these strangers "who had no concern for souls, and who levied yearly sixty thousand marks more than the net receipts of the king from the entire kingdom." Yet the evil was unabated. As to the right of appeal, claimed with especial obstinacy by Nicolas I., it assumed unusual importance at the end of the eleventh century; there were almost no cases, in ecclesiastical or civil matters, which might not be appealed to the court of Rome. Finally, the Pope had the right to bind and loose on earth as had Jesus Christ in heaven, and to grant remission of sins; he shortened the pains of purgatory by distributing indulgences and established rank in heaven by canonising saints.

Associated with the Pope was the College of Cardinals and the group of offices or tribunals which comprised his court.

**5. The College of Cardinals.**—The cardinals formed a college empowered to elect, as has been seen, the Pope in conclave. The Pope chose from among them his extraor-

dinary ambassadors, or legates *a latere*. The cardinals were divided into three classes: the cardinal bishops, priests, and deacons. Innocent IV. bestowed the red hat on cardinal legates; later the others were given it also.

**6. The Court at Rome and the Pontifical Chancery.**—Among the departments which made up the Roman *curia*, or better, the Court of Rome, the most important were those of the chancery, through which passed all affairs of the Papacy, one might almost say of Christianity. In the eleventh century it was presided over by a chancellor and vice chancellor, assisted by notaries for the drawing up of acts and the supervision of inferior agents. Four departments were subject to their orders: the bureau of minutes, where were drawn up, most concisely, the minutes (a kind of abstract) of acts written in the Pope's name; the engrossing bureau, where the original acts were written out, or copies to be sent to certain individuals; the registry bureau, where acts which were to be kept were copied into parchment registers; and finally the bureau of seals, where the "bull," or seal of the Pope, was affixed to acts. The bull was a ball of lead flattened on two sides, bearing on one side the Pope's name inscribed between the arms of a cross, and on the other the effigies of Saint Peter and Saint Paul. The most minute care was taken to guard the authenticity of pontifical acts. For example, different formulas were used for each kind of acts; the language could be scanned in peculiar rhythm; the way of dating and affixing the bull, etc., was determined by precise rules which counterfeiters—and they were many—taxed their ingenuity to evade. The customs of the chancellor's office, or to express it differently, the rules of pontifical diplomatics, were a model for most of the European chanceries, but no state, except England, has possessed archives so well kept as has the Holy Sec;



certainly none in the Middle Ages were of such a universal character.

**7. Finances of the Holy See.**—To support the clerks of the chancery and church dignitaries, to maintain the pomp which even the most economical popes were obliged to affect, to provide for the expenses of warlike enterprises and others, of a different nature, undertaken throughout Christendom by the papal policy, large sums were required. At first popes drew the revenues from Saint Peter's patrimony, and all the domains in Italy in the possession of the Holy See. About the end of the twelfth century a priest of the Roman Church, Cencio Savelli, who became Pope Honorius III., made out a book of the papal revenues of this sort (*Liber censuum*) a valuable document for the comprehension of the financial administration of the pontifical state. Added to this was Peter's Pence, paid in some countries, especially England, since the eighth century; Gregory VII. demanded it of William the Conqueror, who consented to pay, since his predecessors had done so. John Lackland, on acknowledging himself a vassal of the Holy See (1213), fixed the amount of tribute at one thousand marks—seven hundred for England and three hundred for Ireland. Other vassal states also paid tribute; Frederick II. promised one thousand gold pieces for Sicily. In addition, many churches and convents paid for rights of protection; bishops and abbots paid for the ratification of their elections, and archbishops to obtain the pallium; the forwarding of bulls and other pontifical letters was taxed, as well as dispensations and indulgences. Yet this was not enough, and in order to meet the urgent demands of the moment, the popes had recourse to special taxes imposed on the clergy. The financial system of the court of Rome has been mainly developed since Innocent IV.

**8. The Councils and Christian Dogma.**—The popes convoked councils when it was necessary to determine points of dogma or make weighty decisions concerning general interests of state. Those which were supposed to concern Christendom at large were called Ecumenical. Including the last, which was held at the Vatican in 1870, there have been twenty of these. The council convoked by Innocent III., in 1215, at the Lateran, is reckoned as the twelfth, and the one held at Lyons (1245-1247) as the thirteenth. The first eight were common to the Greek and Latin churches; but dating from the ninth (1123), they are, in reality, concerned only with the interests of the Roman Church. The number of members in the councils naturally varied. In that of 1215 there were present four hundred and twelve bishops, seventy-one primates and metropolitans, more than two thousand clerics from all countries and of every order. The Latin patriarchs from Constantinople and Jerusalem were there; those of Antioch and Alexander were represented; the rulers of Byzantium, Germany, France, England, Spain, Hungary, Cyprus, and Jerusalem sent ambassadors. This concourse proved, in the most formal way, the immense prestige which Innocent III. exerted over the Christian world; the speedy conclusion of the deliberations testified to his power. Three days, in fact, were all that were needed to approve (one cannot say discuss) seventy canons relating to the most varied and knotty questions. The attendance at the council of Lyons was much less numerous, for there were only three patriarchs and one hundred and forty bishops, almost all English and French.

**9. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Bishops.**—All Christian countries were divided into bishoprics and archbishoprics. As has been indicated, bishops and arch-

bishops were more often, after 1215, elected by chapters. And also, from that time on, their dependence on the Holy See was unquestioned. As in the Pope lay the "plenitude" of ecclesiastical power, he was supposed to delegate a part of his "solicitude" to bishops, who thus became his lieutenants. He could, moreover, interfere in the governments of individual churches, and even withdraw from the jurisdiction of the "ordinary" any chapters and monasteries whatsoever which were then said to be "exempt"; absolve penitents from certain grievous faults, and bestow benefices directly which would have been, in common law, within the gift of the diocesan bishop. However, the power which the latter wielded was still considerable. He had, in fact, the power to confer orders, and he held jurisdiction over his diocese. 1. He conferred the major orders and the sacrament of confirmation, consecrated other bishops, blessed new abbots and abbesses, consecrated the oil and chrism on Holy Thursday, blessed the holy ornaments, bells, churches, and cemeteries, and degraded priests for serious offences. 2. He had, within his diocese and over priests, judicial and administrative power; he apportioned and supervised public instruction, conducted inquiries regarding habits and faith (*inquisition*), founded and protected charitable and hospital establishments.

**10. The Chapter.**—This extended and multiform authority was shared and limited by the chapter and archdeacons. The chapter was the college of canons. Communal life was discontinued for them, in France, in the twelfth century; then property belonging to the chapters was divided into "prebends," each one being devoted to the needs of a canon. Each one lived in his own establishment, therefore, but they all met at service and in the capitulary assemblies. They then had their place or

stall in the choir. The dean sat in the first stall—he directed the services and presided over the chapter meetings; the second was occupied by the chorister, who led the liturgical singing; then came the archdeacons, the chancellor, the theologian—who interpreted the Scriptures, the scholasticus—who presided over the cathedral school, the penitentiary, the custodian or treasurer—who was entrusted with the Church treasures, and the chamberlain—who administered the temporal affairs of the chapter. The chapter which named a bishop was often withdrawn from his jurisdiction and placed directly under a metropolitan or the Pope. They were two similar forces, rivals and often hostile. Collegiate churches were those possessing a chapter, but not having a bishop.

**11. The Archdeacons and the Officials.**—The archdeacons were the bishop's lieutenants. For him, and in his name, they visited the diocese and presided over diocesan synods and the episcopal tribunal. As a rule, there were several in one diocese, which was thus subdivided into archdeaconries. They often infringed on the powers of the bishop. In order to check them, bishops established, dating from 1170, the so-called "officialty," an ecclesiastical court into which came all clerical and matrimonial suits. The president of the tribunal, or the "official," was a creature of the bishop. His growing authority was not long in ruining that of the archdeacon.

**12. The Diocesan Synods and the National Councils.**—At stated times the bishop gathered about him sometimes the priests from the episcopal city, sometimes those from the entire diocese who had the charge of souls. In the latter instance they formed the diocesan synod, in which the bishop discussed the general affairs of the diocese. In the same way metropolitans convoked provincial synods, and there were synods or national coun-

cils, including the entire clerical body of a country, just as the ecumenical councils united the clergy of Christianity.

**13. The Dioceses and the Bishops without a Diocese.**—The number of bishops has varied. In some countries there were as many bishops as there were former Roman cities. This holds good in France especially, where the ecclesiastical departments, until the end of the old régime, represented the administrative divisions of Roman Gaul. Hence the reason for naming a bishop's residence a city. In England, for instance, there was always a sharp distinction in administrative terms between the cities, or episcopal towns, and other towns or fortified boroughs. The conquests of the Latins in the Orient and Palestine led to the creation of numerous dioceses; they disappeared naturally when Latin domination was overthrown, but the titles survived. The bishops without a diocese, whom the Pope named to these sees, were called bishops *in partibus infidelium*.

**14. Parish Priests.**—Parishes were directed by priests called, according to the locality, deans, rectors, priors or chaplains, and *curés*, after the middle of the thirteenth century. Sometimes they were named by bishops, more often by the nobles who supported the officiating priest; the nobles were then said to be the patrons of the parish. The right of patronage and presentation of livings was most jealously guarded by nobles, especially in England, and involved most discriminating legislation after the twelfth century. Archpriests were also instituted by the common council of the bishop and the archdeacon. They were entrusted with the execution of diocesan statutes and the supervision of the habits of the priests. In the thirteenth century they even had a jurisdiction and seal.

**15. The Regular Clergy. The Principal Religious Orders.**—The “regular clergy” made up the host of monks, living under a *regula*, or rule, and united under the guidance of abbots in large monasteries or abbeys; and under the direction of priors or provosts in the priories, which were less important communities depending on an abbey. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries were the golden age of monasticism, which had an amazing development and diversity of form. The diffusion of monastic life was certainly one of the characteristic features of the Middle Ages, and the most striking effort that was made, in this period, to soften and improve social conditions. The monasteries can be divided into six principal categories:

1. *Order of Hermits.*—The most celebrated to-day is the Grande Chartreuse, founded in 1084 in Dauphiné, by Saint Bruno of Cologne. Fasting and almost continual silence were observed, complete abstinence from meat, and perpetual seclusion. There was also the order of Grammont in Limousin; Mount Carmel, which, founded in 1156, was transported to Europe in the thirteenth century; and the Hermits of Saint Augustine, definitely constituted in 1256.

2. *Charitable Orders.*—In 1099 Robert of Arbrissel founded a Benedictine abbey for women at Fontevrault, with separate buildings for magdalens, lepers, disabled persons, and even an abbey for men. A woman was placed at the head of all these houses consecrated to prayer and deeds of mercy. The order was celebrated throughout western France. Eleanor of Aquitaine gave it especial devotion and wished to be buried there. The order of the hospital of brothers of Saint Anthony was founded at Vienne in Dauphiné, at the time of the first crusade, and that of the Holy Ghost in 1178 at Montpellier. The

order of Trinitarians or Mathurins was created in 1198 for the ransoming of Christians taken by Mussulman pirates.

3. *Orders for the Reform of Monastic Life.*—The canons of Saint Augustine were cloistered monks, subject to a rule taken from the writings of the illustrious bishop of Hippo. An abbey of this order was established at Saint Victor, at the gates of Paris, by Louis VI. (1113); it became, under the guidance of William of Champeaux, a flourishing seminary for philosophical and theological studies. However, the Augustinian canons never held a sway equal to that of the Premonstrantes. This was founded by a German, Norbert, who was of the family of the lords of Gennep at Xanten on the property of Prémontré, in Coucy forest, which the count of Champagne, Thibaut IV., gave him (1120). He gathered about him, not monks, but regular canons; for these religious priests the cloister was merely a place of retirement where they prepared themselves for teaching, preaching, and pastoral services. They went out thence as priests pledged to poverty; chaste, disciplined, and zealous missionaries. Saint Norbert's idea suited so well the needs of the time that many monasteries were formed on this model in France and northern Germany. Norbert himself died (1134) archbishop of Magdeburg, after having helped to spread the Christian faith in Slavic and pagan countries which had scarcely begun to be Germanised.

4. *Orders of Chivalry.*—We have already mentioned the Templars and the Hospitallers, which were spread throughout Europe, as well as the Teutonic Order and that of the Brothers of the Sword, bent on the conquest of the Slavic provinces along the Baltic, and the four orders created in Spain for the war against the Mussulmans. They were solely occupied in this warfare; but they were recruited almost entirely from the ranks of

the nobility. Members of the clergy were forbidden to carry arms; these monk-knights were sworn, on the contrary, to perform military service. Their rank in society, which they assumed by right of birth, and the services rendered to the Christians, caused great riches to flow into their hands. Their pride was so much the more increased, and soon their power became inimical to kings and even to the Pope.

**16. Cluny, Citeaux, and Clairvaux.**—5. *Cluny and the Sister Houses.*—Cluny, having led during the entire eleventh century the ecclesiastical reform movement, had grown somewhat lukewarm in enjoyment of the victory gained by Gregory VII. The order was reformed at Citeaux, a monastery founded in 1098, near Dijon, by Robert, abbot of Molesme, who subjected the monks to the severest Benedictine rule. The numbers increased so rapidly that the third abbot sent colonies to La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond. These are the “four daughters” of Citeaux. The most celebrated was Clairvaux, which was founded by Saint Bernard. The monks, both Cistercians and Bernardines, wore white gowns and cloaks. They were called White Monks, to distinguish them from those of Cluny or Black Monks. Their abbeys were held together by means of the general chapters which gathered all the abbots at plenary assemblies. This was a powerful organisation which other orders, such as the Premonstrants, adopted, and which helped much to discipline the regular clergy, as the secular clergy had been for some time under episcopal authority.

**17. The Benedictine Rule.**—Almost all the orders that have been reviewed were founded before the end of the twelfth century, a new proof of the fruitfulness of this really decisive period in the history of the Middle Ages.



It should be noted, moreover, that most of them originated in France; a fresh proof of French expansion at a time when feudal society, by yielding to discipline, began to grow beneficent. With the exception of those monasteries, which were quite numerous, in which the rule of Saint Augustine was still in force, almost all observed that of Saint Benedict, revised with increased vigour by Saint Bernard. From the eighth to the eleventh century the Benedictines were untiring workers in agriculture and the improvement of land; later they were especially zealous in intellectual work. Many were set to translate old manuscripts; others wrote all kinds of books on history, theology, literature, or science. It is in great part due to them that ancient literature was not entirely lost to us.

**18. Looseness in the Habits of the Clergy, Especially of the Cloistered Orders.**—But the astonishing prosperity of religious houses tended to a relaxation of discipline. Master Fulk, several times employed by Richard the Lion-Hearted, in negotiations with Philip Augustus, said to the king of England one day when he was annoyed with him: “You have with you three daughters who will keep you out of the kingdom of heaven: Pride, Luxury, and Avarice.” The king answered him: “I have already married these three daughters: the first and oldest, Pride, to the Templars; the second, Luxury, to the Black Monks; the third and last, Avarice, to the White Monks.” This was more than a mere witticism. Startling and sad revelations are met with on each page of a highly valuable register, recording the visits made to the churches and religious houses of his diocese by Eudes Rigaud, archbishop of Rouen, certainly one of the most honest men of Saint Louis’s time. Here again, as in the twelfth century, the Church tried to stamp out the evil herself, and, as

then, the initiative came from the regular clergy. It was the new orders which undertook to recall the Church to her real character of humility and charity. The originators were a Spaniard, Dominic, and an Italian, Francis of Assisi.

**19. The Mendicant Orders: Saint Francis and the Friars Minor.**—6. *Mendicant Orders.*—Francis was born in 1182, at Assisi, an Umbrian town that had been enriched by commerce. His father, Bernadone, was a man of means and he, himself, in his youth loved to spend money recklessly. Suddenly, at the expiration of some festival in which his comrades had proclaimed him king of youth, he renounced the possessions of this world and the material joys which they procure. He resolved to live from that time on charity, and began to preach love of mankind and the virtue of poverty. Disciples soon joined him and he established them in a ruined chapel, called the Portiuncula, near Assisi; he exacted from them, in all its austerity, the triple monastic vow of poverty, obedience, and chastity (1209). He named them Friars Minor (*Minoritæ*) because he looked upon them as the least in the kingdom of God. However, they were not cloistered; quite the contrary; he ordered them to live in the world so as to convert it the better. He advised them to be gentle and cheerful, to look closely into and relieve poverty, yet never be discouraged. In all these precepts he set the example: enduring joyfully disdain and insult; caring personally for lepers for whom originally he felt intense aversion; spreading out his love over all creation, upon beasts and men, whom he called indifferently his brothers and sisters. The new order and rule which the founder imposed were approved by Honorius III. (1223). Saint Francis also established a minor order for women, the order of St. Clara, but they were sworn to perpetual

silence and seclusion (1224). Finally a third order was instituted, comprising laymen only, living in the world, owning property and marrying, rich or poor, noble or workman, simply required to observe the great precepts of faith and Christian charity. The Father Seraphic, as he was called, died October 4, 1226, after having sought martyrdom in vain in Egypt during the fifth crusade. His reputation for holiness was already so great that he was canonised two years later.

**20. Saint Dominic and the Preaching Friars.**—Dominic was born in old Castile, near Osma, in 1170. He was, in contrast to Saint Francis, a learned theologian. Saint Francis did not trouble himself about heresies; Dominic, on the contrary, was their untiring adversary, especially during the wars against the Albigenses. He organised the first brotherhood of his disciples in Toulouse itself, the seat of heretics, and succeeded in having it accepted by Honorius III. He travelled through Italy, Spain, and France, stirring up partisans, chiefly among learned men, zealously orthodox; founding numerous monasteries, and training his monks for preaching. He named them the Preaching Friars. In 1220 he convoked, at Bologna, the first general chapter of the order, and imposed upon them, as Saint Francis did on his flock, the obligation to beg. The two great reformers attained the same result, though in different ways. Saint Francis humbled himself so as to be on a plane with the poor and lowly. Saint Dominic commanded his followers to renounce temporal possessions, so as to prove to heretics that it was possible to live according to the teachings of the Gospels and yet remain faithful to the Roman Church. He died the following year (1221). As among the Franciscans, so among the Dominicans, there was an order of women and a third order for repentant laymen. The two orders had

about the same organisation: they were divided into provinces, administered, among the Minors, by a minister, and among the Preachers, by a prior; and as a body they were subject to a general, who was answerable solely to the Pope.

**21. Marvellous Success of the Mendicant Orders.**—Their success was marvellous. Soon there were convents everywhere; even the Franciscans established them, relaxing the strict observance of their primitive rule. The popes lavished privileges upon them; they could receive confessions, and bury in their own cemeteries without episcopal authorisation, and hence excited the jealousy of the parish priests, whose revenues were thereby diminished. They had their own schools, and were given chairs in universities; and in this way the animosity of the teaching fraternity was aroused. But contests only stimulated their zeal and brought them in fresh privileges. The Dominicans were particularly entrusted with inquests concerning heresies and grew to be formidable by organising the Roman Inquisition.

**22. Religious Excitement. The Spiritual and the Eternal Gospel.**—The Franciscans were compromised, at one time, by giving themselves up to mysticism. Many among them, those who accepted in its entire severity the Master's doctrines, adopted ideas taken from the books of Abbot Joachim, founder of the order of Fiore in Calabria (1202). The latter divided human life into three successive stages, corresponding to the three persons of the Trinity. "The first, that of the Father and the Law, was the secular age and of married men; the second, that of the Son or the Gospels interpreted literally, was the age of the secular clergy; the third, that of the Holy Spirit, should be the age of monks." For rigid Franciscans the Master was the initiator into this third period,

which was to be the reign of the Holy Spirit; this is why they were called "Spirituals." One of their number, Brother Gherardino of San Donnino, wrote in 1254, at Paris, a treatise on the "eternal Gospels," in which the Gospels, stripped of all enigmas and figures of speech, would be readily understood and would complete the work of the Church. The treatise was condemned by Pope Alexander IV., who proscribed at the same time the writings of Joachim and his disciples. The Spiritual sect continued, however, until the end of the thirteenth century, placing the Franciscan order, as a whole, in disfavour, which contributed to the immense success of the Dominicans.

**23. The Enemies of the Church among Laymen.**—However, the Church, so strongly organised, a true copy of feudal and general society, did not fail to have enemies. These were not merely among statesmen, sceptics, like Frederick II., who would have supported the Church on condition that she lent herself to his service, but those who opposed readily to the injunctions of faith philosophic doubt or even incredulity. The Church had still greater difficulties to withstand in the form of heresies.

## CHAPTER XXX.

### THE CHURCH AND HERESIES.\*

1. **Albigenses (Cathari) and Vaudois.**—Dating from the eleventh century, antichristian beliefs, drawn from the East, had spread throughout northern Italy and the southern provinces of France. In the former place the sectarians were known as Patarini, because they took part in the social movement which stirred Lombardy so deeply in the time of Gregory VII.; in France they were called *Bonshommes*, *Publicans*. The leaders of the sect, those who had renounced marriage to lead the life of the pure, were *Cathari*, or “Perfect Ones.” Later, they were classed under the more general name of Albigenses, because Albi was so filled with them. In the twelfth century they organised a rival church, which had its priests, bishops, and councils. Some there were who had not thrown off orthodoxy, yet were tolerant towards heresy. Raymond VI., count of Toulouse, kept with him a Catholic bishop and an Albigensian priest, to make sure of being in favour with God, however the case might be. Another sect was organised about 1160 by a rich citizen

\* **SOURCES.**—“*La Chanson de la Croisade contre Les Albegois*,” edition of P. Meyer, 2 vols. (1875-1879). P. Frédéricq: “*Corpus documentorum inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis neerlandicæ*.” First part, 1025-1520 (1889).

**LITERATURE.**—Vaissete, “*Histoire de Languedoc*,” new edition, 14 vols., 4to; Müller, “*Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen*”; Molinier, “*L’Inquisition dans de Midi de la France au XIII<sup>e</sup> et au XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*”; Lea, “*A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*.”

of Lyons, Valdès or Valdis. The Vaudois were Christians whom study of the New Testament had diverted from the official Church. They wished to live like the apostles, charitable and poor, entirely devoted to preaching and good works; but they rejected purgatory, masses for the dead, and confession made to priests of evil lives. They spread rapidly through Piedmont and Lombardy, Lorraine and Alsace, Switzerland, Bavaria, and Austria. Condemned in the council at Verona (1184), they were included in the general persecution of the Albigenses. They continued to live on, nevertheless; rejecting the authority of the Church because of the corrupt lives of the clergy. The Albigenses enjoyed relative peace during the twelfth century, but this ended as soon as Innocent III. ascended the throne.

**2. Futile Efforts to Convert the Albigenses.**—First the Pope tried persuasion. He sent into the south monks from Cîteaux with full authority to act, not only against heretics, but also negligent prelates. They lost their time in idle discussions. In an interview which Saint Dominic held with them, the priests, at Montpellier (1206), he reproached them for their display, which contrasted with the simplicity of the Albigenses, and which scandalised true believers. They acknowledged what he said as true, but were not courageous enough to follow his example. Dominic was soon left alone with the legate, Peter de Castelnau.

**3. Murder of the Legate. The Count of Toulouse Excommunicated, 1209.**—The most powerful among the princes who protected, rather through indifference than conviction, the heresy of the Cathari was Raymond VI., count of Toulouse; the legate first appealed to him. He predicted “that the wrath of God would fall upon him and crush him”; then, as Raymond did not yield, he excom-

municated him (May, 1207). The Pope confirmed the sentence in violent terms, which scarcely seemed to disturb the count of Toulouse. After some useless discussion, Raymond dismissed the legate with threatening words, and he was followed by one of the count's servants and killed. The murder was expiated with more blood than was that of Thomas à Becket. The Pope had the monks of Citeaux preach a crusade. Since he granted the same privileges as for an expedition to Palestine and forty days' military service was all that was required of the crusaders, they came in swarms. The north literally rushed upon the south.

**4. Conquest of the South. Simon de Montfort.**—Two hundred thousand men, led by Arnaud, abbot of Citeaux, had already reached Valencia, when Raymond VI. yielded; but he only succeeded in diverting the storm which threatened him to his nephew, Raymond Roger, viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne. Béziers was taken by assault and the inhabitants massacred. "Strike them all," said the Pope's legate, to the cut-throats. "God will know his own!" It is doubtful whether this hideous speech was uttered, but it is certain that more than twenty thousand persons perished in the massacre. The crusaders then went on to lay siege to Carcassonne; the place was very strong, as its walls, still standing, bear witness. Finally the viscount was taken in ambush, and while they were pretending to negotiate with him, the place was taken by surprise. The booty was immense, but they took few prisoners. In order to hold the conquered territory, the victors chose, as their leader, Simon de Montfort, an ambitious and bigoted man, a soldier full of resources, and an able administrator. He had already taken part in the fourth crusade; but he had been of the small number who refused to go to Zara or Constantinople



and who had honestly performed their duty in the Holy Land. The authority given him was at first temporary, but he acquitted himself of his task with so much zeal and persistence that he at last became the recognised leader of the crusade. He was only too well fitted for the task!

**5. Ruin of Raymond VI.**—Meanwhile Raymond VI. had gone to Rome to complain to the Pope of the frightful havoc committed in the South. The Pope received him well, but sent him to the legates to vindicate himself for the murder of Peter of Castelnau. In fact he did appear at the councils of Saint Gilles (September, 1210) and Arles (January, 1211). The conditions imposed on him were so shameful that he took up arms; all, however, lords and citizens, Catholics, Albigenses, or Vaudois, answered his call to war to fight “the strange folk of the north.” Simon, leading an army that was constantly reinforced, took Lavaur (1211), gained a victory over Raymond VI. at Castelnaudery (1212) which assured him possession of most of the counties of Toulouse, Foix, and Comminges, and finally he repulsed, under the walls of Muret, a great army which Peter of Aragon had just brought to the aid of his brother-in-law, Raymond VI. (1213).

**6. The Council of the Lateran (1215) Authorises the Spoliation of the South.**—Up to that time the king of France had not moved. In 1215 his son Louis appeared in the south with an army; he entered Toulouse with the legate, Bishop Folquet, and Simon de Montfort. Then Raymond’s ruin was completed. In vain he plead and promised, so as to move Innocent III. The council of the Lateran renewed, confirmed, and extended all decrees issued already against heresy. As for Raymond VI., “considering that, according to certain indications, his

country could not be held in the Catholic faith," the Pope decreed that he should be "stripped forever of his power and banished from his country to do penance for his sins." The conquered territory was given to Simon, who qualified himself "by the grace of God, count of Toulouse, viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne, duke of Narbonne." The remainder, that is to say the marquisates of Beaucaire and Provence, were to be entrusted to the guardianship of trusty men, to be returned to Raymond's son on his majority, "if he were worthy of them." The booty was so vast that Simon was able to organise more than four hundred fiefs, which were given to French seigniors; French bishops were also invested with the vacant dioceses and conducted searching inquests into the faith of the people. The Inquisition was beginning!

**7. Uprising of Raymond VI., and Death of Simon de Montfort, 1218.**—Innocent III. did not live to see the end of a war which he had zealously promoted, although he seems to have regretted its excesses. It is credible that his hand was forced at the Lateran Council and that indirectly he wished to encourage Raymond VI. to resist when he told him, on dismissing him: "Whatever you may do, may God help you to begin well and end better!" Raymond soon took up arms and reëntered Toulouse to the intense joy of the inhabitants, who massacred all Frenchmen found in the streets (September, 1217). Simon laid siege to his capital and was killed there, and the crusaders' army beat a retreat.

**8. The King of France Sole Gainer by the War against the Albigenses.**—A new crusade was then preached in France; the son of Philip Augustus took the cross for the second time, but he was defeated before Toulouse (1219). Simon's oldest son, Amaury, continued the struggle; he

was beaten at every point, and concluded a treaty with young Raymond VII., who had just succeeded his father (1222). He finally left the south and ceded all his claims to the new king of France, Louis VIII., who took his way south for the third time. The king seized Avignon after a siege of three months, while other crusaders entered Nîmes, Carcassonne, Béziers, Castres, Albi; death overtook him at Montpensier in Auvergne (May 8, 1226). But Raymond VII. was so exhausted that he gave up the fight. By a treaty negotiated at Meaux, concluded and sworn to at Paris before the doors of Notre Dame (April 12, 1229), he was deprived of the dioceses of Narbonne, Maguelonne, Nîmes, Uzès, and Vivers, Velay, Gévaudan, Albigeois, and a part of Toulousain; the viscount of Béziers was despoiled of the greater part of his states. Raymond VII. kept what remained on condition of marrying his daughter Jane to a brother of Louis IX.; in case no child should be born of this marriage, the county of Toulouse should revert to the crown.

**9. Destruction of Civilisation in the South.**—There was a worse result. The south was ruined by a merciless war lasting twenty years. The persecutions directed against the real or supposed heretics suppressed the development of a civilisation that had been original and brilliant; Languedoc, forcibly annexed to northern France, was nothing more than a dependence of the royal domain. Doubtless the growth of French unity had made a great advance, but was it necessary to buy so desirable a result at the price of so many tears and so much blood? There, as in the Orient, the crusades had piled up nothing but ruins, and the south of France never recovered entirely from this crushing blow.

Another result of the crusade against the Albigenses was the establishment of the Inquisition.

**10. The Inquisition.**—It has been already seen that bishops were empowered and enjoined to watch over the lives of their flock; but in the beginning there were no peculiar penalties against heresy. The situation altered in the eleventh century. In the time of Robert II. it is recorded that thirteen heretics were burned at Orléans (1022). Louis VIII. ordered the same punishment to be inflicted on the Albigenses (1226). By the council of Toulouse (1229) the parish priest and three trustworthy laymen in each parish were ordered to seek out heretics. Finally, in 1233, Gregory IX. entrusted this mission to the Dominicans. At the same time special laws were enacted to cover this new species of crime. Torture might be used to draw out an avowal of heresies from suspected persons; they were denied the aid of lawyers and doctors; anyone who persisted, in spite of everything, in his error (as if error in a matter of opinion could be a crime amenable to civil law) should be put to death; those who retracted might still be “immured”; and lastly, the least implicated were marked by a red cross on their clothing and forever stamped with infamy. The punishment was perpetual, on earth as in heaven! These cruelties brought on fresh revolts: the inquisitor, Conrad of Marburg, was killed in Germany (1236); the inquisitors in Languedoc were massacred at Avignonet (1243), and this attempt almost revived the smouldering fires of the wars against the Albigenses. But, in spite of all, the persecutors accomplished their object, and heresy was finally stamped out at the end of the thirteenth century.

**11. The Enemies of the Church in the Ecclesiastical World.**—The fierceness of the war against the Albigenses was a serious warning to the Church. Her moral sway, so great in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, began to

weaken in the thirteenth. The rapid spread of the Mendicant orders aroused new difficulties within her own ranks. She was forced to suppress the excesses of the "Flagellants" who walked in procession through the towns, scourging themselves in the streets, naked to the waist; there were the "apostles," vagabonds whose leader, a Franciscan driven from his convent, claimed to be the son of God; also the "men of the woods" who, in the garb of Saint Francis, begged in bands in the forests and along the highways, leaving nothing to be gleaned after they had passed; and "the men with bags," who carried on less boldly their scandalous trade of begging.

**12. The Jews.**—Outside the ranks of the Church, the refractory elements, hostile or persecuted, had to be met and counted with, such as the schismatic Greeks and the Jews. The first had nothing to fear, but the Jews were hated by the Christians, who related, concerning them, fables as dangerous as they were absurd. Were they not accused of sacrificing Christian infants at the feast of the passover? An archbishop of Armenia seriously told the monks of Saint Alban that, in his land, a Jew was still living who had been present at our Lord's passion, and that he had even struck him with his fist to hasten his steps to the place of sacrifice. "Go, Jesus, go more quickly!" he said to him jeeringly; and Jesus, looking at him severely, had answered: "I am going, and thou, thou shalt wait until I return!" Since that time the Jew had been waiting, and is still doing so. Later he was called the Wandering Jew, and in the seventeenth century he was named Ahasuerus.

**13. The Predominance of the Church Endangered by Lay Authority.**—It was a far call from the time when Christian society had been silently enlisted under the standard of Saint Peter and the ecclesiastical yoke had

been everywhere accepted. The period during which the Roman Church was at the summit of her temporal power was also the time when the royal power, object of a lay religion, was organised and fortified in all parts; the century of Innocent III. was also that of Saint Louis, the grandfather of Philip the Fair.

## CHAPTER XXXI.

### CHRISTIAN AND FEUDAL CIVILISATION—INSTRUCTION AND SCIENCES—LITERATURE AND ARTS—WORSHIP.\*

**1. Instruction. The Seven Liberal Arts.**—Teaching was at first confined to monasteries and chapters of cathedral churches. Charlemagne had made it respected, and since his time its development had continued. The Church, which had the monopoly of it, used all her power in its favour. The method followed in schools was that which the dying classic world had bequeathed to the Middle Ages. The three arts of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics (the *trivium*) were taught first, then the four sciences of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music (the *quadrivium*). Then it was that the young man approached the higher studies of theology, law, philosophy, or medicine. Dating from the eleventh century, medicine was taught, especially at Salerno in Italy and at Montpellier in France. Law, and primarily Roman law, such as it had just been revealed in the manuscripts of the legal works of Justinian, was eagerly pursued in the schools of Bologna. France was the true mother country of the philosophy known as “scholastic.”

\* LITERATURE.—Rashdall, “The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages”; Denifle, “Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters”; Denifle et Chatelain, “Cartulaire de l’Université de Paris”; Fournier, “Statuts et Privilèges des Universités Françaises”; G. Paris, “La Littérature Française au Moyen Âge”; Moore, “The Development and Character of Gothic Architecture.”

**2. Scholastic Philosophy.**—This philosophy was not original. It proceeded direct from Plato and Aristotle, but it scarcely knew their books and only imperfectly their theories. In fact, few, even among the most learned in the Middle Ages, were competent, not only to understand, but even read Greek; besides, there were but a few writings of Aristotle and Plato translated or analysed in the sixth century of our era by Boëthius. But this little evoked, about the origin of ideas and beings, serious problems which the two Greek philosophers had solved differently. Therefore the scholastics were soon grouped into two hostile camps: the partisans of Plato, or “Realists,” and those of Aristotle, or “Nominalists.” Both parties, however, elucidated their doctrines in the same way. They would take a sentence from their favourite master, and attempt, by discussing with their auditors, to deduce from it its logical conclusions. In this way dialectics, or the art of reasoning, whose laws had been outlined by Aristotle, was peculiarly esteemed in the schools.

**3. Beginnings of Scholastic Philosophy.**—The first schoolmen were the Anglo-Saxon, Alcuin, and the Irishman, John Scotus Erigena, who taught in the palace schools under Charles the Bald, and whose science was held, in the ninth century, to be marvellous. After him the most illustrious were Frenchmen. We will only mention Gerbert, who became Pope Sylvester II. The scholastics were the lights of the Church, but soon the Church was startled by the boldness of their thoughts and the freedom of their writing, and persecuted them. Berengar, a pupil, and then a brilliant professor at the school of Tours, was condemned for offensive propositions about the Eucharist (1050). Roscelin, canon of Besançon, dared to explain by philosophical reasoning the



mysteries of the Trinity; he was condemned by a council and abjured, after having escaped being massacred by the populace (1094). Men were by that time warned that in matters of faith they must believe, not reason. But has not reason rights in the eyes of authority? Thus questioned Abelard.

**4. Abelard, 1079-1142.**—Peter Abelard was born in 1079, at Pallet, near Saint Nazaire, in the county of Nantes. His parents were noble. He was the oldest of the family and consequently destined to be a warrior; however, his father wished him to be taught. The young man profited so readily by his studies that he sacrificed, as he said, Mars to Minerva, and he devoted his life to science. In Paris he followed the teaching of William of Champeaux, the canon of the cathedral. He bore an active part in the discussions directed by the professor, but met his doctrines with such exact and eloquent logic that he forced him to acknowledge himself beaten. He became a master in his turn, without a diploma (in those days one was not required), and opened a school a rival to that of the cloister of Notre Dame, on the property of the exempted Abbey of Saint Genevieve. Later, after the tragic ending of his love with the learned and noble Heloïse, he became a monk and took up teaching with brilliant success. Soon he gathered about him thousands of disciples; his books passed “from nation to nation, from kingdom to kingdom.” But his success brought him many enemies, and his ideas ruined him. Abelard had the boldness to claim that in truths which are within the domain of reason, it was useless to have recourse to faith; even in theology he would have faith elucidated and strengthened by reason. This was the very spirit of freedom of thought, which had many centuries to wait before its rights should be conceded.

**5. Saint Bernard. Abelard Condemned.**—Thereupon he was attacked. No one showed in this struggle firmer and more far-sighted determination than Saint Bernard. He also was of noble race. The third son of a Burgundian knight, weak in body, and sickly, he withdrew from the world when he was twenty-two (1113). As a monk at Citeaux, it was not long before he was noted for his ardent piety, science, and energy. He was ordered to take a colony of Cistercian monks to the upper valley of the Aube (1114) and there founded the celebrated Abbey of Clairvaux, of which he was the first abbot. The rule was austere and penetrated into Sweden and Denmark. However, he never confined himself to monastic life, and was constantly busied with worldly interests; it was he who promoted the second crusade. His opinions were the same as those of Gregory VII. concerning the Papacy and the relationship between the temporal and spiritual powers. As a determined advocate of orthodoxy, in his opinion there was no answer to be made to arguers, other than to show them the word of the Fathers condemning their doctrines. He therefore stood for the principle of authority; to the doubts of reason, which seeks truth, he opposed faith, which solves all difficulties in the name of authority. The head of the philosophical school had already been questioned about a treatise published on the Trinity in 1122. Another called, "Yes and No" (*Sic et Non*), in which he showed that even in dogma the opinion of the Fathers had varied, was laid before the council of Sens (1141). Abelard undertook to prove to the assembled bishops that his ideas were not inimical to Church doctrines. Saint Bernard anticipated him. First he held a special meeting in which his eloquence prejudiced minds against Abelard; then, the day of the solemn sitting, instead of allowing his

adversary to speak, he crushed him under the weight of quotations drawn from the books of the Fathers, which contradicted Abelard's doctrines.

**6. Abelard's Death, 1142.**—Condemned before being heard, Abelard appealed from the council to the Pope, and started towards Rome to plead for himself his cause before the Holy See; but the emotions of the struggle had shattered his health. He stopped on the way at the Monastery of Cluny, whose abbot, Peter de Montboissier, called the Venerable, received him with the consideration due to his genius and misfortune. There he soon passed away (April 21, 1142), a touching example to the monks in the simplicity of his life. "So was this man in our midst," wrote the Abbot of Cluny to Heloise, "simple and upright, fearing the Lord, and turning from evil. . . . As is related of Saint Gregory the Great, he let no moment slip by without praying, reading, writing, or dictating. It was while performing these pious acts that the heavenly messenger found him."

**7. Orthodox Philosophy. Peter Lombard.**—In the meantime the conflicts between theologians and philosophers compromised philosophy. William of Champeaux, resigning his chair in the cloister of Notre Dame, went forth to teach, in the school of Saint Victor, a disregard for this science which had brought him only mortification. Hugh of Ypres, his disciple (1133-1143), attempted to prove that the reason of man, thrown back upon itself, is powerless to attain truth; grace, and grace alone, that is, the arbitrary will of God, will lead one to it. Thus it was that dialectics which, under the inspiration of free reason, had stirred up such deep problems in the first half of the century, fell into disrepute in the second half. Peter the Lombard (1158-1160) made a collection of the most irrefutable statements pronounced by the Fathers

concerning the nature and attributes of God, the creation, the incarnation, and the sacraments. The "Master of the Sentences," as he was called, believed he could in this way rid theology of all useless and dangerous questions. His book had great success during the entire Middle Ages, and beyond, but it failed to allay religious disputes. Yet for a time the Church seemed pacified.

Two momentous events occurred in the thirteenth century: the foundation of the University of Paris and the introduction of the books of Aristotle into the schools.

**8. The University of Paris, 1200.**—This originated in the cathedral school. From the earliest times students had flocked to Paris; they had come in greater numbers since Abelard's time, but they had never enjoyed especial privileges. In 1200 in a quarrel between some German students and townspeople, encouraged by the presence of the provost of Paris, five students were killed. The king had the provost and his officers arrested, and granted the scholars, henceforth forming a corporation (*universitas*), the privilege of exemption from municipal justice in criminal cases. Pope Innocent III. immediately confirmed this privilege; he even partly released students from superior supervision exercised by the chancellor of the chapter of Notre Dame (1213), who gradually lost his power over the corporation. In 1246 the University adopted a seal. In the meantime it had formed an organisation: the masters of arts had long been teaching on the Mount Saint Genevieve; they were divided into four corporations or nations, into which students were grouped according to their origin, France (Ile de France), Normandy, Picardy, and England. Each nation had its own seal; every month it selected its general head or rector. In turn, the students in canon law or "Decre-

tists," doctors and theologians, acquired the right to teach outside of the city, and formed three other corporations, each having its dean and seal. In all, this made four faculties.

**9. The Faculty of Arts.**—The faculty of arts prepared for the three others. Studies were begun there before the age of fifteen, and logic was taught. Those who wished to fit themselves for teaching were required to undergo an examination called "determination" and much later the baccalaureate, which the student took in public, once a year, in the Lenten season. If he passed, he went, when he was twenty-one, to claim from the chancellor of Notre Dame or of Sainte Genevieve his license or authorisation to teach; after 1213 the chancellor could not withhold it if six masters swore, with their hands on the Gospels, that the claimant was worthy to be given a license. Then the licentiate might become a master on condition of being received by his new colleagues; then he must swear to observe all the regulations of the Faculty. All masters did not teach, nor during the entire time, for more than one followed the courses of the upper faculties, especially theology, while carrying on his teaching in the faculty of arts. When he conducted a course he was given the title of regent. Usually he taught in a black gown with a furred hood of the same hue. Most of the schools were situated in the *rue du Fouarre* (Straw Street). School furniture was very simple, for it was composed of a chair on a platform and a desk for the professor; the scholars were seated on the ground. Although they had few worldly goods, their gaiety was unfailing; the *rue du Fouarre* was the noisiest in Paris, and nightly broils were frequent.

**10. The Faculty of Theology.**—Theological studies covered eight years; the baccalaureat was first taken after

five years' study. Lessons might then be given on Holy Writ and the Book of Sentences of Peter Lombard. After three years of this apprenticeship, and providing he were thirty-five years old, a student might present himself to the chancellor of Notre Dame, to receive his license; and finally the licentiate had to be received by the corporation of masters, after having led a solemn discussion in the presence of the company. The long period of study, and the advanced age that a man must reach before being fitted to teach explains the small number of students who completed their studies and took their degrees, but this explains also the depth of the studies and the reputation which the faculty of theology at Paris enjoyed during the Middle Ages. Added to this, students were better guarded and more favoured. Most of them, in fact, lived in convents or colleges.

#### **11. Students in Theology. Convents and Colleges.—**

The two large mendicant orders of Franciscans and Dominicans intended, as has been seen, to teach religion by preaching, and direct souls by means of the confession. For this they needed trained theologians; teaching, for them, being a means to an end. In 1229 the Preaching Friars were authorised to establish, in their convent at Paris, a chair of theology; the Minors imitated them in 1230, then the Premonstrants (1252), the Bernardines (1256), the Carmelites (1259), etc. The secular clergy, less closely organised, offered fewer resources and guarantees to theological students. However, from the twelfth century, hotels or colleges, similar to the charitable houses founded by pilgrims, received the poorest among them.

**12. The Sorbonne.**—In 1257 a canon of Cambria, Robert de Sorbon, friend of Joinville, and fellow soldier with Saint Louis, gave a house “situated in Paris, rue Coupe-

Guele, before the palace of the Thermes," to lodge "poor masters studying theology." This was the college of Sorbonne. Eleven other similar colleges were founded in the course of the thirteenth century. Students lived there in common. As a rule there were in these colleges both students in arts and theological students. They were given weekly a sum of money for food, which was known as a purse, amounting to two sous parisais at the least and eight sous at the most; they had no claim on such a purse unless their fortune was less than a stated sum. They were required to be licensed in arts in order to receive a theologian's purse. If at the end of ten years they were not capable of directing a course, they must leave the house.

**13. The Faculties of Law and Medicine.**—These two faculties never played anything but an unimportant part in the University of Paris. In law, Roman law was first taught with canon law; then the former was proscribed and nothing was studied except the Decretum of Gratian. Thus law was no longer anything but a branch of the faculty of theology. Three years sufficed for the baccalaurate, five years for the license. Those who wished to teach, after undergoing a possible examination, must be accepted by the corporation of doctors; for here they were doctors and no longer masters, as in the three other faculties. In order to be admitted to the doctor's degree, it was necessary that the aspirant give proof that he had an income of eight francs parisais.

**14. University of Paris and Royal Power.**—Such was the inner organisation of the University of Paris, so celebrated during three centuries. It was a powerful body, because of the number of its students and its extended privileges. It abused them; the elective system tended easily to anarchy, and more than once the

government was forced to interfere. In 1229 the students rose up in arms against the provost of Paris, who, in spite of the royal charter of 1200, was bold enough to attack, with his archers, the riotous fellows; several were killed or wounded. The University then suspended its teachings, and, unable to obtain justice from Blanche of Castile, disbanded. It was not reëstablished until two years later, through the Pope's intervention, who obtained judicial satisfaction from the regent.

However, the University of Paris did not have the monopoly of public instruction in France. Under Saint Louis there were flourishing schools at Bourges and Angers, a university at Toulouse, a law school at Orléans, and schools of law and medicine at Montpellier. The Church encouraged them, because they were of benefit to her.

In other lands, the University of Bologna was of much earlier date than that of Paris; in England, Oxford was organised at the same time as Paris; Cambridge came soon after. At Naples, Frederick II. founded in 1234 a university for the Two Sicilies. But Paris was to hold in Europe, during a long period of time, the first rank, because of the number of its students and its brilliant teaching.

**15. Aristotle Revived. New Impetus to Scholastic Philosophy.**—The preponderance given to the faculty of theology at Paris is due to the favour enjoyed again by scholastic philosophy, which during half a century had fallen into disrepute. The impetus came from Spain, where a celebrated school of philosophy was formed in the twelfth century, in which the works of Aristotle, entirely recovered, were especially studied. It was the school of Cordova, the country of the Mussulman Ibn Roschd, otherwise Averroes, the learned commentator of



the writings of the citizen of Stagira, and of the Jew, Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), his disciple, who attempted to reconcile Aristotle and the Bible. One of their contemporaries, Raymond, archbishop of Toledo from 1130 to 1150, had a Latin translation made of not only the works of these two philosophers, which had a marvellous success throughout the theological world of Europe, but also, and most important, of the original books of Aristotle. When all the great Greek philosopher's thought was given out, instead of the abstracts by Boëthius or the endless commentaries by schoolmen, it was like a new light pouring in upon man's intelligence. Alain of Lille; Simon, canon of Tournai; Alexander Neckam, abbot of Cirencester (d. 1217), raised philosophy again to an honourable position. Another Englishman, Alexander of Hales, a Franciscan monk called the Irrefutable Doctor, and the Swabian Albert, of the counts of Bollstaedt (1193-1280), who entered the Dominican order and was known as the Universal Doctor, or the Great, were the founders of orthodox Aristotelianism. They were surpassed by their disciples: Thomas of Aquinas (1227-1274), surnamed the Angelic Doctor, and John Fidenza, better known as Bonaventura (1221-1274). The first was a preaching friar, the second a friar Minor; they were both canonised by the Church. The two important works of Saint Thomas, the "Summa Theologiæ," and the "Summa against the Gentiles," include in their able synthesis the entire Church doctrine in philosophical and theological questions. They have not been surpassed: after five centuries they are regarded with deserved favour by Catholic theologians.

**16. The Learned Men of the Thirteenth Century.**—In a period so deeply imbued with orthodoxy and logic, literature and the sciences could not fail to be saturated with

the religious spirit. Naturally it inspired the preachers whose sermons have preserved for us, in the midst of pedantic quibbles, so many precious bits of information as to customs. It is found also in the writing of scientific men, for if the Middle Ages did not produce any science, they did develop real scientists. The names of Albert the Great, of the canon Vincent of Beauvais, who was preceptor to Saint Louis and who was able to condense into three treatises or "Mirrors" all the knowledge of his times, of Honorius of Autun, of the Englishmen Gervais of Tilbury, Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, and above all Roger Bacon, all prove sufficiently that the thirteenth century was not an age of ignorance, and that the Church did honour to science. These scientists admitted the spheroid form of the earth; they calculated with figures which are called incorrectly Arabic—they were invented by Gerbert (except the zero, which was thought of in the twelfth century); they knew the properties of the magnetic needle, which always turns to the pole star, and the use of the mariner's compass. The learned Roger Bacon, a Franciscan monk, knew the magnifying properties of convex lenses, the composition of powder, etc. Hoping to convert the Tartars, Saint Louis sent William of Ruysbroeck or Rubruquis on a mission. He penetrated as far as Caracorum, the capital of the Great Khan (1253). The Italian Franciscan Planocarpini was sent by Innocent IV. to the Golden Horde (1245). These travels served geography more than religion; they opened the way to the celebrated Venetian Marco Polo. But however ingenious or profound they might be, the ideas acquired by students in the Middle Ages never formed a system based on calculation, experience, or experiment; an exact method was lacking to make these speculations fruitful. There was

a variety of scientific literature, in verse and in prose, on the aspect of the world, the properties of bodies, on precious stones and their curative and marvellous powers, on medicine, hunting, and war. Writers went so far as to versify the Institutes of Justinian, the customary law of Normandy, the movable feasts of the Church, and the calendar. This was pure empiricism, a piece of wit, or nonsense. The teaching of the time taught men to reason, but originality was too often left undeveloped.

Something of this intellectual dryness may be found in the literature, so varied and in part so original, of the Middle Ages. And again, as in theology and philosophy, France was the great initiator.

**17. The Literature of the North. The Epics of Chivalry.**—In northern France, where feudalism was more deeply rooted, the chivalrous epic was cultivated most brilliantly.

**18. Chansons de Geste. The Subjects.**—The epic poem came from the very heart of the people. The Germans had brought the taste for it with them; and on Roman soil, as they had sung of their barbarian heroes, so they sang the exploits of their victorious kings. Clovis and Dagobert were heroes of poems that have now disappeared. The illustrious Carolingian family provided still greater subjects for the epic. Pippin the Short, Charlemagne, Charles the Bald (with whom the legend confuses Charles Martel), Louis, son and the grandson of the great emperor, were the centre of long epic tales in which appear also their principal councillors and captains: Roland, who died at Roncesvalles; Ogier the Dane, his inseparable companion; William, count of Toulouse, who fought brilliantly against the Saracens, who became a monk, after being one of the first in the court of Louis the Pious, and who died in the odour of sanctity. With

these persons, who really lived, are introduced characters that are doubtless imaginary, as Garin de Monglane and Doon of Mainz, heroes of feudal warfare. But, even though the personages are fictitious, the primitive epic reveals the ideas, sentiments, and passions of the time in which it was composed. "It is usually warlike; for war against the foreign foe is what fires men with a common enthusiasm and evokes a consciousness of their solidarity; in that lies its national type. It is so much the more typical, since neither its subject nor form is borrowed from abroad; it is the most direct and spontaneous creation of the national genius."\* Those who found, (*trouv *), created the epic themes, were the *trouv res*. For a long time their tales were unwritten and remained anonymous, which accounts for so many of them being lost. They passed from mouth to mouth, recited and sung by the *jongleurs*, who did not hesitate to elaborate, as suited their fancy, on the primitive canvas.

**19. The Works.**—Not until the second half of the eleventh century was there any attempt at writing them down. The oldest and one of the finest is the poem or "Chanson de Geste de Roland," which takes as its subject the disaster at Roncevalles. They sing of the wars undertaken by our kings against the enemies of the East, the Saxons of the North, the Normans of the South, the Saracens. These are the ones of most ancient origin, that were already constituted before the formation of feudalism. Next in order are those that relate either the struggle between the growing feudalism and the Carolingian monarchy: "Renaud de Montauban," the "Four Sons of Amion," "Girard de Roussillon," "Huon de Bordeaux;" or the wars of the barons among themselves: "Raoul de Cambrai," "Garin de Lorraine," etc. To the

\* Gaston Paris.

twelfth century, properly speaking, belong those which refer to the crusades. This inexhaustible epic was marvellously successful. As the *chansons de geste* depicted the sentiments of feudal aristocracy, they were carried to all countries where feudalism was powerful: in England, where they were introduced by the Normans, and thence passed on into Norway and Iceland; in Germany, in Spain, and even in Italy, where they found a second home.

**20. The Classic Epic.**—In this vein other rhyimers, with a smattering of learning and eager to be known, related the more or less fabled tales of antiquity. The marvellous history of Alexander the Great was done into verse by Albéric de Besançon, the History of Troy, of Æneas, and doubtless of Thebes, by a native of Touraine, Benoit de Sainte-More, etc. In these poems one must not look for a faithful portrayal of antiquity. Alexander with his captains was artlessly represented as a king of France or England in the midst of his barons. Thus the painters and sculptors who depicted the Roman soldiers placed as sentinels at the door of the Holy Sepulchre dressed them in the armour or coat of mail. The simplicity of these poems is the more interesting to us, since it is the picture of the feudal world that we find in them; the plot being taken from classic sources, but coloured with the life of the Middle Ages.

**21. Decadence of Chivalrous Epics.**—The decadence of epic poetry is contemporary with that of lay feudalism, in the thirteenth century. Since their charm continued, the old *chansons de geste* were repeatedly done over, but the tale was lengthened without being improved. Under the facile pen of Adam, “the king of minstrels,” the “Chanson de Roland,” which at first contained four thousand lines, was lengthened to twenty thousand, but they were only just so many words more.

**22. Prose Tales. Arthur and the Round Table.**—There was also the prose epic. Originally this had for its foundation old British tales which had survived the Anglo-Saxon conquest and still lived on the lips of Welsh bards. A Welsh priest, Geoffrey of Monmouth, who died bishop of Saint Asaph in 1154, introduced several of them into his fabulous history of the British kings. This was soon translated into French by the Jerseyman Wace, who added much to his model (1155). He conceived the famous Round Table, at which sat, in perfect equality, the chosen knights of king Arthur. With Arthur appears Tristan, prince of Leon in southern Wales, famous as the first among warriors, hunters, and harpers—Tristan, who through magic potion is bound in an enduring and unhappy passion to Iseult, niece of the queen of Ireland. Launcelot also, the type of a perfect knight, and Perceval, who passed his adventurous life in search of the Holy Grail, in which, it is said, Joseph of Arimathea received the blood which flowed from the wounds of our crucified Lord. The stories of Arthur, Launcelot, Tristan, and Perceval were originally detached. A poet of Champagne, Christian of Troyes, the best writer in verse of the twelfth century, collected them into one tale in verse. In this new form they were highly successful. Christian devotes much space to a brilliant description of the palaces, festivities, ornaments, and arms; he surrounds the women with a halo of respect which the Middle Ages until then had rarely shown; he describes chivalrous love, incompatible with marriage indeed, but ennobling those who experienced it.

**23. The Literature of the South. Lyric Poetry.**—In this conception of life and love, so different from that revealed in the *chansons de geste*, the influence of the south is felt. There, at least as early as the eleventh century,

an original form of literature blossomed. In the valleys of the Garonne and the Rhone feudalism was less strongly developed than in the North. Classes of society were less fixed and the barbarian element less powerful. Two vast states had been early formed, that of the dukes of Aquitaine and counts of Poitiers, and that of the counts of Toulouse of the house of Saint Giles. The country had not been wasted by anarchy as in the north. Under these favourable circumstances, riches and comfort were found in cities and castles. Women held an honoured position; under their influence manners were softened and passions refined. The condition of society was naturally reflected in poetry; it is mostly addressed to women and discourses of love. It was not an echo of popular tales, it was not anonymous. Affected by men who were proud of their wit, it was clever, studied, often intentionally obscure, and always mindful of literary form.

**24. The Troubadours.**—Professional poets were not alone inspired, for in the foremost rank of the troubadours appear knights, noble seigniors, and priests. Side by side with men of the lower class, such as Marcabrun, a foundling; Bernard, son of a serf, a baker in the castle of Ventadour; Giraut de Borneil, born of poor parents, whom he devoutly succoured; Peter of Auvergne, a plain citizen's son, there are others who belong to political history. These are William IX., duke of Aquitaine; Eble III., viscount of Ventadour; Jaufre Rudel, lord of Blaye, who was enamoured of a countess of Tripoli, without having seen her, and set out on a crusade so as to reach her, dying in her arms; and Rhaimbaut, lord of Orange and Courtheson, who was beloved of the countess of Die, also known for her love poems, and Bertrand de Born, lord of Hautefort, who fought against Henry II. of England under the command of his son, the young Henry, and,

fallen into the father's hands, owed his life to the fair verses in which he deplored the premature death of the son. There was also a gentleman of Auvergne who, although a monk in the Abbey of Aurillac and prior of Montaudon, lived in the world for all that, petted by kings and nobles. Folquet of Marseilles, son of a Genoese merchant, was not so lax in his mode of life. Having been loaded with honours by Richard the Lion-Hearted and the count of Toulouse, having loved a daughter of Manuel Comnenus, wife of William VII. of Montpellier, he took holy orders at Citeaux and was later elected bishop of Toulouse (1205). His regret for his early life was unceasing, and when he heard some song of his which he had once composed, he would mortify himself that day by living on bread and water. Folquet was an exception, for among the troubadours faith was lukewarm, and this is one other distinguishing feature between them and the *trouvères* of the north, their colleagues and contemporaries.

**25. Gallantry (Courtoisie).—**This spirit of indifference, which has already been noted among those who tolerated the heresy of the Albigenses, this refinement of manners, appreciation of wit, and stilted verse had developed in the south a peculiar form of politeness called *courtoisie*. It reached the feudal courts of the north through the influence of several noble ladies, at a time when women were just beginning to play an important political rôle. In the twelfth century, indeed, some possessed kingdoms or vast fiefs, a fact which seems incompatible with the military character of feudalism. Was it not the time when the Empress Matilda, daughter of Henry I., wore the royal crown of England, and Eleanor, granddaughter of the troubadour William IX., the ducal crown of Aquitaine? Eleanor, in turn wife of the kings of France and



England, contributed more than any other to the cultivation in the north of a taste for southern civilisation. A daughter of her first husband, Marie, who married Henry I., the Liberal, count of Champagne, was, like her, passionately fond of gallantry; she patronised Christian of Troyes, and even provided him with the theme for one of his poems, "Launcelot, or the Tale of the Cart." Another daughter, born of the second marriage, Matilda, married Henry the Lion, and imported into Germany the taste for poetry and courtly ways. Her son, Richard the Lion-Hearted, composed the verses and music of love songs. And lastly, were not these noble dames, learned in points of gallantry, known to hold consultations in the casuistry of love? Several of their judgments were kept, and a worthy chaplain about 1220 compiled from them "The Art of Loving according to the Laws of Honour."

**26. Middle-Class Poetry. The Fabliaux, Renard the Fox.**—As has been seen, the thirteenth century was marked by the definite emancipation of the citizen class. The middle class of that time had a corresponding literary form in which to express itself, and if it were not new it was at least animated with a new spirit. This was shown in the fables, and especially in the *fabliaux*. They were satires, sometimes moral, more often irreverent or licentious, directed against nobles, priests of immoral lives, evil women, and deceived husbands. Æsop employs animals, in his fables, to which he attributes the passions of men; this plan was imitated in the twelfth century. It suggested the idea of inventing tales in which animals still figure, but where little attention is paid to the moral. Their adventures conform to the characters attributed to them; for instance, the wolf struggles with the fox, a strife in which brute force is mastered by cunning. Laughter, not moralising, was what was wanted. As time

goes on the character becomes more defined: the wolf was Isengrin, and the fox Renard; each had his wife, Richeut and Hersent. With these important parts were personages of less distinction: Noble, the lion; Grimbert, the badger, Renard's cousin; Chanteclair, the cock; Couard, the hare; Tibert, the cat; Bernard, the donkey, maliciously presented in the garb of an archpriest. Towards the end of the twelfth century the episodes concerning these characters were woven into one connected story of Isengrin and Renard. Thus the "Romance of Renard" was evolved. This plebeian epic marks the bourgeois's entrance into literature.

**27. The Romance of the Rose.**—"The Romance of the Rose," composed about 1237 by a young poet of twenty-five, William of Lorris, was written for society of the time of the regent Blanche of Castile. It is an ingenious and delicate piece of wit, in which the author relates, in allegorical form, the aspirations of a young lover and the obstacles which prevent him from plucking the rose, or reaching the young girl who has caught his fancy. He becomes the vassal of Love; he is well received by Welcome, but his enemies are Danger, Backbiting, Shame, and Fear, etc. William left the poem uncompleted, and it was taken up and continued, forty years later, by John Clopinel, of Meung-sur-Loire. But the characters of the primitive work were entirely transformed; the sentiments were coarse, and the speech was cynical. He was speaking to a different audience, to the corrupt contemporaries of Philip the Fair.

**28. History. Villehardouin, Joinville.**—With history we come back to real life. Down to the thirteenth century it had been almost exclusively written by priests, especially by monks, and in the Latin tongue. After the crusades it grew worldly, so to speak. The Latin chron-

icles were kept up in the monasteries until the end of the Middle Ages, but there appeared works in French, either prose or verse, in great part related by witnesses of the events. We have no work of this kind describing the first two crusades except the fragment of a versified account of the siege of Antioch (1098), written in Provençal. There is about the third crusade a poem of twelve thousand lines of eight syllables, composed by one Ambroise, *jongleur* in the army of Richard the Lion-Hearted. The fourth crusade was recorded by Geoffrey de Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne (1160-1213), in an accurate, straightforward, and virile style which was a model for French prose, as the "Chanson de Roland" was for epic poetry. And likewise the most graphic accounts of the seventh crusade have been given us by an actor in this disastrous expedition. Joinville, seneschal of Champagne (1224-1317), accompanied thither Saint Louis, of whom he became the inseparable companion. He had already written the principal events, when at the urgent request of Jeanne of Champagne, the wife of Philip the Fair, he undertook a history of the sainted king. He was then eighty, but he had kept a vivid memory of the events which stamps his work with the freshness of youth. He dictated at random, however, taking up his account at different times, so that there is no order, and the end bears the marks of age. This brave and worthy knight was as simple-hearted as a child.

**29. The Great Chronicles of France.**—Lastly the kings, dating from Louis VI., had their regular historians. These were the monks of Saint Denis. The abbey which kept the oriflamme wrote the official history of our sovereigns. Suger for Louis VI. and Louis VII., Rigord and William the Breton for Philip Augustus and Louis VII., William de Nangis for Louis IX. and his son, com-

piled some important works in Latin. Then the translation into French of the original chronicles was begun, and there was formed a kind of collection of the Great Chronicles of France, which for two centuries were always well received, and hence, are another instance of the progress of ideas in the French monarchy.

**30. Arts.**—This progress stands out more prominently, if from literary works we pass to works of art. The highest art of the Middle Ages was expressed in the building and ornamenting of churches. This was natural and a necessary consequence of a period of such ardent faith, with a clergy so rich and powerful. But in this building there were three periods, characterised by the expressions Roman, Romanesque, and Gothic.

**31. The Roman Basilica.**—First adopted was the plan of the Roman churches built on the model of the municipal basilicas in which the supreme magistrate dispensed justice. The most usual form was a rectangle, one of the shorter sides being modified to a half circle. In this half circle or apse, which projected, were placed the bishop's throne and the altar. The remainder of the church was divided into three sections, parallel with the apse: the middle section or nave, and the two aisles. The nave was separated from the aisles by a series of columns which supported a wall in which were windows or bays, admitting light to a gallery in the second story. The nave, often very wide, was covered by a roof of open rafters. This framework had an advantage as to weight, and, because of the width of the nave, allowed space and light, but its construction demanded skilful workmen, who were becoming more and more rare; moreover, it caught fire easily, which was a serious objection in a period of constant invasions. During the Norman invasions most of the churches were consumed by fire.

**32. The Romanesque Churches.**—When this danger was passed, there was an attempt made to build more substantially. Bricks were discarded, so much used by the Romans, and stone was used, which was very plentiful in central and northern France, so that Raoul Glaber said, about the year 1000, that the earth wore a “white garment of churches.” Another innovation was the stone vaulting which replaced the wooden roof. Architects then used in succession, or at the same period, the cylindrical vault springing from the two opposite walls, also called the barrel vault; the groined vault resting on four piers or pillars, and the domical or hemispherical vaulting over a circular area, like those of the Pantheon at Rome, Saint Sophia in Constantinople, or Saint Mark’s in Venice. In this style, called Romanesque, architects had to take into account two factors: the weight of this stone covering, which was sometimes carried to a great height, and the thrust of the arches, which bore obliquely on the walls and pillars and tended to throw them out of the perpendicular. For a long time they knew no other way to meet the difficulty than by increasing the thickness of the walls and piers, or later, strengthening the groinings by stone ribs springing diagonally from one pillar to another and intersecting at the apex of the vault; this was the pointed arch, ogive. The style was first used in Benedictine churches. The Abbaye aux Hommes and the Abbaye aux Dames at Caen, built by William the Conqueror and his wife Mathilda to expiate the sin they had committed in marrying, although cousins, may be considered as perfect examples of this architecture. Saint Sernin of Toulouse, constructed entirely of brick, is also a good example of Romanesque in the south. When well built these churches have a powerful, massive effect, a distinctive mark of Romanesque archi-

ecture, which is noticeable also in private buildings. However, their characteristics varied according to the regions; the differences of Romanesque styles corresponding to the divisions of feudal France.

**33. The Gothic Church.**—About the reign of Louis VII. some architects were inspired with the idea of supporting the outer pillars, where the thrust of the pointed arch came, by means of stone arches, which in their turn rested on solid piers projecting beyond the walls of the aisles. These abutting pillars and arched buttresses allowed for a diminution in the thickness of the walls and the interior columns, which were then relieved of all weight except the vertical pressure from the roof. At the same time, the use of the pointed arch became general and the place of the rounded openings or round arch of the Romans was taken by openings bearing the pointed arch, now incorrectly named ogival. This style, wrongly called Gothic, brought about a revolution in ecclesiastical architecture. It became possible to raise the arches to an unheard-of height, increase the width of the naves, introduce large windows, and, though but for a short time, roomy galleries in the second floor, well lighted, as in Notre Dame at Paris. If one's reason is startled by the exterior, with its series of arched buttresses supporting walls too light to stand alone, the interior commands one's admiration because of the elegance of the clustered pillars supporting and lending height to the arches, the windows and the vaulting, the pleasing variety of reliefs, and the sublime vastness of the nave. The Gothic church is the expression of the religious ideal of the Middle Ages; it is, as it were, a prayer, a *sursum corda*, materialised and apparently imperishable.

**34. Variety in Unity of Gothic Architecture.**—This style arose in central or Capetian France; it lent itself

to the construction of the most beautiful cathedrals in honour of the Virgin—Notre Dame of Paris, Rheims, Chartres, and Amiens, etc. It offered but one type, so to speak, varying according to periods, not localities. The primitive or early Gothic corresponds to the reign of Philip Augustus; in Saint Louis's time the flamboyant Gothic was brilliantly exemplified in the Sainte Chapelle. The celebrated architect, Villard de Honnecourt, a pupil of the Cistercian monks, whose works he went as far as Hungary to study (1235-1250), developed the theory of this art which reached its zenith. However, architects' names are rarely known in the Middle Ages. As the *chansons de geste* were gradually formed by a succession of unknown *trouvères*, so were our superb cathedrals built by bodies of workmen who are still unrecognised. It seemed to be a spontaneous and impersonal expression of the French genius. And finally, let us note, the uniform triumph of Gothic architecture was contemporaneous with two kings, founders of French unity. It completed harmoniously the period in which the Middle Ages reached their highest point. The rapid spread of the Gothic architecture abroad, considered with the fact of the dissemination of French literature, indicates the intellectual hegemony of France in the Middle Ages.

**35. The Decoration of Churches.**—The artists were admirably seconded by other artists even less known than they, if possible. These were sculptors, who cut figures of men, animals, and plants in the greatest profusion. As time advanced it is strange to see how much more elaborately they represented vegetation. The rudimentary boss of the time of Philip Augustus was elaborated with flowers and profuse foliage in the fourteenth century. The vault of the apse, which is semicircular in form, the plain surfaces of the triumphal arch which di-

vides the nave from the transept where the high altar is placed, sometimes even the high walls of the nave, at first were decorated with mosaics, of which there are many remains, or of paintings in distemper, of which there are rare specimens still remaining. But when the walls of the nave were broken by large windows, the master workmen in stained glass closed the openings with vast stained-glass windows, whose rich and varied colours shed a joyful glow throughout the edifice, in perfect harmony with the triumphant spirit of Catholicism in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There were morose spirits or rigorous theologians who thought that the Church went too far. Saint Bernard, of one mind with the austere monks of Cluny, condemned the immense height of the churches, "their extreme length, the richness of the polished materials, and paintings which attract the eye." He deplored the expense of these magnificent buildings, while so many human beings were destitute. The moderate spirits, like Suger, found in the beauty of the churches an additional reason to praise God. Suger was right, and the voice of reason was heeded. On the other hand, the goldsmiths and workers in enamel vied with one another in decorating the objects used in church ceremonies: pyxes, altar tables, crosiers, monstrances, shrines, and reliquaries, etc. So did the illuminators of liturgical books keep pace with the weavers, working at the most beautiful woollen stuffs or brocaded silks which were used in Church worship.

**36. Art as Applied to Worship.**—Art as applied to worship was both a picture of life and a lesson. On the façades of the great churches, sculptors had carved the history of humanity and Christianity, from the fall of man to the last judgment. The allegorical figures of vices and virtues were infinitely varied; they revelled in



strange, fantastic, grinning beasts, the terrifying and necessary retinue of the devil, the horned king, black and hairy, from hell, the enemy of the human race. Master workmen in mosaic dwelt rather on the creation and redemption; painters of stained glass reproduced the most celebrated scenes of the Bible. The works of these artists, taken as a whole, made up a kind of "layman's Bible" that appealed to the eye and was understood by all.

**37. Church Festivals.**—In addition to this were the Church festivals, in all their splendour and variety. The life of Christ appealed to the imagination of the faithful during the entire year. In December, when nature sleeps the sleep of winter, man awaits the arrival of our Lord; the four Sundays of Advent prepare him for the joys of His birth. That day (*natalis dies*, Noël), Christmas, is closely followed by the celebration of the Circumcision (January 1) and the Epiphany, which recall the day when the shepherds and the magi, Gaspard, Melchior, and Balthazar, led by the star over their heads, come to the Child's manger (January 6). Then the time when the Lord was crucified draws near; as penance, one must refrain from meats, beginning the fortieth day (*quadragesima dies*, Carême), Lent, before Easter. Palm Sunday celebrates Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem; Good Friday, the day when He was crucified. Easter, when He arose from the dead, was the greatest festival of the year. By some intricate calculations the date fell irregularly from the 22d of March to the 25th of April. The Annunciation (March 25) and the Ascension were celebrated with unusual splendour. Christians were even undecided as to the beginning of the year, some preferring Christmas, others, as in Capetian France, Easter. These were not all festivals. The Virgin, the mother

of Christ, had her worship, which recalled the principal events of her earthly life; her birth, Nativity, September 8; the Annunciation, the Purification, or Candlemas, February 2; the Assumption, August 15, and finally saints had their worship and their shrines.

**38. The Worship of Saints.**—At first no peculiar homage was paid except to martyrs. Then pious individuals who died in the odour of sanctity were accorded a like respect. They were known by the miracles they had performed while living, or which took place on their relics. Relics were considered so precious that they were desired everywhere; every altar at which Mass was celebrated enclosed some kind of a relic; knights sometimes had bits of relics enclosed in their sword-hilts. The places containing those most revered were the object of eager pilgrimages. During the Norman invasions the objects which the fugitive monks carried with them most carefully were the bodies of their saints. Since the desire to possess them was so great, they were frequently stolen, and the theft was considered a pious fraud. Saints, looked upon as mediators between God and man, seemed to partake of the divine nature. Moreover, the good deeds performed by the saints were considered more than sufficient to earn them heaven. This excess of good deeds, still further increased by the infinite merit of Jesus, who had suffered, although without sin, made up a kind of reserve fund of which the Church believed itself empowered to dispose. The Pope drew upon this treasure to buy release for souls who were expiating the pains of purgatory. This was the practice of indulgence.

**39. Sacred Music.\***—Church services were celebrated with as much display as was compatible with the revenues

\*The music of the Middle Ages was a continuation of that of antiquity, which theoretically had been preserved by Martianus

of each church; they were regulated entirely by the clergy. The people were present merely as spectators and listeners. The singing was performed by a choir of priests. Several of the learned theologians composed Latin hymns which are still sung; the "Lauda Sion," and "Pange lingua," is due to Saint Thomas Aquinas, and to the oldest biographer of Saint Francis, to Thomas of Celano, the "Dies iræ."

**40. Origin of the Theatre.**—Out of the necessity of appealing to the imagination of men there developed from religious festivals the preëminently profane art, the dramatic art. The two great mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption were presented to the people's eyes at Christmas and Easter. The "mysteries," at first written by priests in Latin and presented in the churches, were afterwards played outside the churches, on rough theatres and in the vulgar tongue. At the same time with the mysteries grew the "miracle plays," from songs, in honour of saints, or from readings of the lives of the

Capella (fourth century), Saint Augustine (fifth century), and Boetius (sixth century). The instruments remained of about the same character as during the Greek and Roman periods. Long strides were made in musical art during the Middle Ages in two important points: (1) Notation. The musical signs, first placed at unequal distances above the text, were finally placed on parallel lines, their numbers varying arbitrarily from three to eleven; and on each stave the tone was indicated by Roman letters, invented by Boetius, which, distorted later more and more, became the modern clefs. The names designating the notes of the scales were given by Guy d'Arezzo (eleventh century), who took the first syllable of the first six verses of a hymn to Saint John ("si" was named much later). (2) While neither Romans nor Greeks seem to have known what we call harmony, that is to say, the chord of several different and simultaneous sounds, its existence is ascertainable as early as the sixth century. Doubtless it came from a Germanic influence. This double advance opened the way to modern music.

saints. Both were enacted by young men, and the patron saints of youth were the favourite subjects—Saint Nicholas or Saint Catherine. Later the brotherhoods, or assemblies, of the Virgin assumed the different rôles in acting the miracles of Our Lady. The dramatic element was not lacking in these subjects, but it rarely found adequate expression; yet there was enough talent to suit the coarse taste of the men of those times.

**41. Popular Parodies of Religious Feasts.**—Piety was not universal in the Middle Ages, far from it, and just as sculptors did not hesitate to introduce into their compositions creatures and scenes that were ridiculous, grotesque, or obscene, players sometimes turned religious festivals even into scenes of license. At Christmas young clerks were freely allowed to parody the rites of worship and sing disrespectful hymns. It grew into the *Fête des Fous*, which the Church was soon obliged to forbid. In England children, chosen by other comrades, were decked out in episcopal robes and went about caricaturing the bishop. There were opportunities for amusement in this period which is painted in such sombre colours, and often they were abused. However, these were the exceptions. For everyone, priests and laymen, the engrossing matter was to reach heaven, and the surest means was still to follow the Church's precepts, which assumed to control every moment of earthly life. Regenerated by baptism, kept in the path of duty by confession of sins, fortified in faith by communion, man was unwilling to quit this life unless the Church brought him the help necessary for the supreme journey, the viaticum. From the cradle to the grave, both blessed by her, she took entire possession of man.

## GENERAL SUMMARY.

Let us cast a glance backward over the nine centuries which have elapsed since the beginning of the great invasions. Four main facts stand out: (1) The slow, but inevitable, destruction of the Roman Empire; (2) the establishment of the feudal system; (3) the efforts made by Empire and Papacy to revive, for the individual benefit of each, classic unity; (4) the erection of separate governments, and the formation of a Christian Europe which is developed under the moral hegemony of the Church.

1. At the close of the fourth century the Roman Empire was still standing. It had embodied the legal conception that all inhabitants of the world subject to Rome form a body politic in which the political status and rights of the individual are fixed by law, in which security to individuals and property is guaranteed by a hierarchy of officials who are directed by a magistrate with a life appointment and absolute power. This was the conception of the state, the imperishable creation of ancient Rome. The Mediterranean was the centre of the Roman world. Then came the barbarians, urged on by a kind of irresistible attraction towards so rich an empire, which offered so many delights to them, so poor. Gradually they flowed in, by slow infiltration or sudden inundation, selling or imposing their services upon her. When there ceased to be an emperor in the West and the sole head of the Empire lived at the other end of the world, at Constantinople, the barbarian kings settled throughout the Empire were

in fact independent. The administrative machinery of the Romans was, on the whole, maintained, but they distorted its organic form through a misapprehension of its nature. They considered the soil which they occupied as their personal property, and the functionaries as tools for their rapaciousness. The idea of statehood disappeared. At the same time the equilibrium of the Mediterranean world was destroyed by the overwhelming advance of Islamism, which was taking possession of northern Africa entire and threatening the classic Græco-Latin civilisation on the Bosphorus and in the Pyrenees. Charlemagne attempted to restore some order in the political chaos of the West and stop the Arabian invasion; he was successful in so far that he left an imperishable memory in history, but the causes of disintegration were too deeply rooted to be swept away by a hand even as powerful as his.

2. Feudalism then took shape. Individuals were no longer safe unless they placed themselves in the dependence of seignior, nor were lords, unless they assumed the obligations of vassalage. Royalty was powerless; political unity had disappeared; nothing remained but individual powers, often brutal and unbridled. It was the triumph of anarchy. These powers flung themselves upon one another in private wars, until they were finally drawn into the wild stream of the crusades, where they were speedily exhausted, or until, elsewhere, they were controlled and disciplined by the moral power of the Church and the material strength of royalty, that was slowly being reconstructed. The feudal system, moreover, while giving vast scope to individual energies and heroic virtues, afforded men, in many petty states which were the outcome of this system, a security which no central power assured them longer; it also helped to reëstablish order

and prosperity and stimulate the revival of letters and arts.

3. There was, however, in the midst of this coarse aristocracy one vital factor which stood for order and social improvement—the Christian Church. In the tenth century her power was dominant throughout Europe, except perhaps in the Scandinavian countries. She bore within her antagonistic elements, which were fruitful before they became dangerous to the Church herself. She preached a religion of universal charity and love towards all men; she was therefore the enemy of hereditary differences of rank, which were based on violence. On the other hand, she had retained the hierarchical organisation, naturally assumed when she entered, secretly or legally, the Roman administrative body; in this respect, she was the direct heir of the former Empire, and could conceive of no other remedy for the evils of society than in the erection of a centralised power. This is why she received Clovis (496), consecrated Pippin (754), restored the imperial dignity in the West in favour of Charlemagne (800), and then of Otto the Great (961). The Roman emperors of Germanic race wished then to rule with the powers defined in the rediscovered Justinian law. At first the Ottos succeeded. Afterwards, under the sway of certain theological ideas, much in favour, especially at Cluny and in the monasteries which had boldly undertaken the reform of ecclesiastical morals, the Papacy assumed the leading rôle in the government of the Christian world. As a result the imperial and papal powers, until then harmonious because one was subordinate to the other, quarrelled because each one aspired to universal monarchy. Begun under Gregory VII., the war between the Empire and the Papacy ended in the thirteenth century by the triumph of Innocent III. and Innocent IV. over the Hohenstaufen. Germany and

Italy were the principal scenes of action during this war; the two countries paid dearly in men and money, and still more so in losing the opportunity of becoming powerful and well-administered states. The Church's advantage was transient, for in Europe, in the meanwhile, great kingdoms had grown up which would not endure the yoke of imperial monarchy nor pontifical theocracy, and which were then strong enough to command respect for their independence.

4. In the thirteenth century, in truth, Europe was not merely a geographical expression; it offered already the appearance of an organised body. In the north there were the three Scandinavian kingdoms, constantly in touch with England and Germany, even sending crusaders to the Holy Land; to the east lay the still chaotic mass of peoples, Slavic, Roumanian, and Hungarian, who were connected by their beliefs and form of worship with Roman or Byzantine Christianity; on the south were the Greek Empire and the Spanish kingdoms, which were the vanguard of Europe, threatened by Islamism; in the centre there were four important peoples. On the one hand were Germany and Italy, where the ruin of the Empire had left a free field to feudalism; on the other hand, England and France, whose royalty, on the contrary, was powerfully armed and which maintained the closest relations with each other. Religion was the one bond which united all these states. There was one Christian Europe with one single tongue, the Latin, and one single head, the Pope. Therein lay their point of union, which was entirely moral, and all the more powerful since it was recognised by general consent. Finally, social conditions were improved everywhere; the enfranchisement of individuals went on, of peasants in the country and of citizens in the towns. Humanity was moving forward,



and far from the Middle Ages appearing to us as a period of decadence, ignorance, and barbarism, we admire in them, after the disorders caused by the invasions of the fifth and sixth centuries, and the disturbances of the ninth and tenth, a long and brilliant period of progress, revival, and bloom from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. Modern civilisation was being announced and prepared.



## INDEX.

### A

Abbassides, the, 159, 163  
 Abelard, 306, 517-519  
 Abu-Bekr, Caliph, 148  
 Acre, capture of, 364  
 Administrative system of Capetian France, 426-428; of Saxon England, 447; of Henry II., 457; of England in XIII. century, 464; of Germany in XIII. century, 481  
 Æthelstan, 446  
 Aëtius, 45-49  
 Africa, Vandal conquest, 44; Arab conquest, 154  
 Agriculture in XIII. century, 386  
 Alaric, 39-44  
 Albigenses, the, 413, 506  
 Alcuin, 203, 516  
 Alexander III., 311-314, 489  
 Alexis I., 346, 353  
 Alfonso X., the Wise, 479, 491  
 Alfred the Great, 446  
 Ali, Caliph, 152  
 Andelot, treaty of, 81  
 Angevin dynasty, 403-406, 454-464  
 Anglo-Saxons, 125-127, 189  
 Antioch in first crusade, 354  
 Appanages, the, in France, 415, 422  
 Arabia, condition of in VII. century, 135-138; subdued by Mohammed, 143  
 Arabian Empire and civilisation, 148-165; science, 162; commerce, 349  
 Arabs, Charlemagne attacks, 185; attack Greek Empire, 339  
 Aragon, treaty of France with, 418

Architecture, 485, 536-540  
 Arianism, 108  
 Aristotle, study of, 524  
 Army, Roman, 12; early German, 28; Frankish, 90, 200; French, 437; Anglo-Saxon, 449  
 Arnold of Brescia, 306-308  
 Arnulf, Emperor, 224, 226, 230, 235  
 Arnulf of Metz, 169  
 Arthur, King, and the Round Table, 530  
 Arts, the seven liberal, 515  
 Assassins, the, 164  
 Assemblies, Roman provincial, 7; early German, 24; Frankish, 87, 192-194  
 Attila, 46-51  
 Augustine, St., 44, 45, 123, 204  
 Augustine, St., of Canterbury, 129  
 Avars, the, 181

### B

Bacon, Roger, 526  
 Bagdad, Caliphate of, 160, 189  
 Becket, Thomas, 404, 455  
 Bede, the Venerable, 131  
 Belisarius, 103  
 Benedict, St., of Nursia, 131  
 Benedict, St., of Aniane, 199  
 Benedictine Order, the, 500  
 Bernard, St., 306, 307, 518  
 Blanche of Castile, 413-415, 417  
 Boëthius, 59, 61  
 Bohemia, 471  
 Boniface, St., 175-179  
 Bouvines, battle of, 325, 411  
 "Brothers of the Sword," 473  
 Brunhilda, 77-83, 123  
 Bulgarians, 337  
 Burgundians, 64, 68

Burgundy, formation of kingdom of, 225  
 Byzantine art and literature, 343-344; civilisation, 475

## C

Canossa, 295  
 Capetian (Robertian) dynasty, 235; history in XI. and XII. centuries, 391-402; in XIII. century, 403-420  
 Cardinals, college of, 289, 491  
 Carolingian dynasty, 169-191; decadence of, 211-227, 240  
 Cassiodorus, 59  
 Castile, formation of kingdom of, 476  
 Cathari, the; *see* Albigenses.  
 Celts, in Britain and Ireland, 124  
 Chansons de geste, the, 527-529  
 Charities, French mediæval, 439  
 Charlemagne, 179-191, 311  
 Charles the Bold, 214, 216, 221, 224, 226, 234  
 Charles the Fat, 223, 233  
 Charles Martel, 159, 170-172  
 Charles the Simple, 236  
 Chivalry, 257-262; the Orders of, 499  
 Chosroes the Great, 105  
 Christianity, 15-18  
 Church, early organization of, 15-17; Merovingian, 96; power of, in IX. century, 220; feudalism in, 262; schism of Greek and Latin, 345; serves the Capetian house, 399; in the XIII. century, 488-505  
 Cid Campeador, the, 477, 479  
 Cities; *see* Communes; government of Roman, 5; in Frankish state, 90; in XIII. century, 331, 377-384, 429; in England, 465; in Germany, 483  
 Cistercian monks, 500  
 Clairvaux, 500  
 Clement IV., 489  
 Clergy, secular and regular, 15-16; reform of Frankish, 177; Carolingian, 198; Anglo-Norman, 452; secular, 494-497; regular, 498-504

Clermont, council of, 351  
 Clovis, 64-72  
 Cluny, reform of, 287, 505  
 Cnut, 446  
*Coloni*, the, 18-20  
 Columba, St., 128  
 Columban, St., 129  
*Comitatus*, the, 27  
 Commerce, in XIII. century, 389  
 Communes, the, 380-384, 465  
 Comnenus, dynasty of, 346  
 Conrad II., Emperor, 283  
 Conrad III., Emperor, 302, 357  
 Conrad IV., Emperor, 334  
 Conradin, 334  
 Constance, peace of, 315  
 Constantine, donation of, 280  
 Constantinople, Arabs attack, 158; taken by the fourth crusade, 367  
*Corpus juris canonici*, 490  
*Corpus juris civilis*, 110  
 Cortenuova, battle of, 329  
 Councils, ecclesiastical, 494  
 Count, the Frankish, 196  
 Crescentius, 274, 279  
 Crusades, the, 348-370, 417, 419  
 Curia, Papal, 492  
*Curiales*, 18-20  
 Czechs, the, 471

## D

Dagobert I., 84  
 Damiani, Peter, 287  
 Danes, war with Franks, 185; invasion of England, 446  
 Decretals, False, 221; papal, 490  
 Diocese, organization of the, 495-497  
 Domesday Book, the, 451  
 Dominic, St., 479, 503  
 Dukes, Frankish, 197  
 Dunstan, St., 446

## E

Ebroin, 160  
 Edessa, taken by Turks, 357  
 Edward the Confessor, 447, 449  
 England, Anglo-Saxon, 125-127, 445-449; and Charlemagne, 189; Norman and Angevin, 449-466

Egypt, conquered by the Arabs, 151

Eleanor of Aquitaine, 398, 401, 402, 404, 456, 532

Emperor, Roman, worship of, 2

Empire, Eastern, in VI. century, 99-114; from VII. to XI. century, 336-347; in XIII. century, 474-476

Empire, Latin, of the East, 368-370

Empire, Roman, extent and organisation, 1-13; Holy Roman, 486

Empire, Western, fall of, 52; revived by Charlemagne, 187; revived by Otto I., 275

Eudes, King of France, 224, 235

## F

Fabliaux, 533

Faalty and homage, 251

Feudalism, 208, 246-267, 377, 423, 450, 480

Fief, the, 247; organisation and revenues, 254-257

Fontenoy, battle of, 216

France, modern, in IX. century, 226; feudal divisions of, 250; Capetian, 391-444

Francis, St., 502

Franks, 64-85; institutions of, 86-97; in VII. and VIII. centuries, 167-191; Carolingian institutions, 192-210

Fredegonda, 78-83

Frederick I., Emperor, 303-317, 363

Frederick II., Emperor, 321, 325-335, 370, 417, 505

Friars, the; *see* Mendicant Orders.

## G

Gaul, administrative divisions of, 3; condition of, 8

Gerbert; *see* Sylvester II.

Germans, early, customs and government, 21-32

Germany, early tribal divisions of, 35; modern, in X. and XI. centuries, 268-300; in XII. and XIII. centuries, 479-485

Ghibellines, the; *see* Hohenstaufen.

Godfrey of Bouillon, 353, 355

Gothic architecture, 538

Greek Church, 345

Greek Empire; *see* Eastern Empire.

Gregory I., the Great, 121-124, 129

Gregory VII., 288-297, 399, 452

Gregory IX., 329-331, 370, 490

Gregory X., 489

Gregory of Tours, 97

Guelfs, the, 301-317, 321-335

Guilds, 379

## H

Hadrian IV., 307-311

Hanseatic League, the, 483

Harold, King of England, 447, 449

Haroun-al-Raschid, 163, 189

Hastings, battle of; *see* Senlac.

Henry I., Emperor, 270

Henry II., Emperor, 244, 281-283

Henry III., Emperor, 284

Henry IV., Emperor, 294-298

Henry V., Emperor, 298, 398

Henry VI., Emperor, 319-321, 323, 365, 405

Henry I., England, 397-399, 453,

Henry II., England, 379, 402-405, 454

Henry III., England, 412, 416, 418, 461-464

Henry I., France, 394, 396

Henry the Lion, 303, 314, 319, 321

Herman de Salza, 328, 331, 371

Hildebrand; *see* Gregory VII.

Hincmar, 219-222, 267

Hohenstaufen, the, 301-335

Honorius, Emperor, 38, 40-42

Honorius III., 326, 328, 502, 503

Hospitallers, Knights, 339

Hugh Capet, 245, 391-394

Hugh the Great, 241-243

Hungarians, invasions in X. century, 230, 271, 272, 338

Huns, the, 37, 46-51

## I

Iconoclastic controversy, 341  
 Immunity, the, 96, 249  
 Ingeborg, Queen of France, 406  
 Innocent III., 321-326, 329, 366,  
 370, 406, 410, 487, 490, 491,  
 494, 507, 509  
 Innocent IV., 332, 417  
 Inquisition, the, 512  
 Investiture, feudal, 352  
 Ireland, early inhabitants, 124;  
 christianised, 128  
 Irene, Empress, 181, 189  
 Italy, in X. century, 273-275

## J

Jerusalem in first crusade, 354;  
 kingdom of, 355, 358-362;  
 taken by Saladin, 362  
 Jews, the, in Middle Ages, 513  
 Joachim, Abbot, 504  
 John VIII., 220, 224  
 John, King of England, 323,  
 404, 408-412, 456-458, 460,  
 491, 493  
 Joinville, 535  
 Judicial system, Frankish, 91,  
 199; in kingdom of Jerusalem,  
 361; of Capetian France, 424-  
 426, 430-434; of Angevin  
 England, 464  
 Justin I., 100  
 Justinian, 101-114

## K

Knighthood, system of, 257-262  
 Koran, the, 145

## L

Lanfranc, 452  
 Langton, Stephen, 459, 491  
 Legates, Papal, 292  
 Legislation, Frankish, 192-104  
 Legnano, battle of, 313  
 Leo I., 50, 52, 119  
 Leo IV., 230  
 Leo IX., 288, 289  
 Leon, formation of kingdom of,  
 476

Literature, Roman, 14; Arabian,  
 162; Charlemagne's revival of,  
 203-205; Byzantine, 343; Ger-  
 man, 483-485; of Northern  
 France, 527-530; of Southern  
 France, 530-534  
 Lombard League, 312, 329  
 Lombard, Peter, 519  
 Lombards, 116-118, 122, 173, 179  
 Lorraine, formation of kingdom  
 of, 225  
 Lothaire, Emperor, 213-219  
 Lothaire II., Emperor, 302  
 Lothaire, King of France, 243  
 Louis II., 219  
 Louis IV., 241-243  
 Louis V., 244  
 Louis VI., 376, 383, 396-401  
 Louis VII., 357, 376, 383, 398  
 401-404, 457  
 Louis VIII., 412, 413, 415, 511  
 Louis IX., 376, 383, 392, 404,  
 413-420, 422, 425, 428, 431-  
 436, 462  
 Louis the German, 213, 216-219  
 226  
 Louis the Pious, 211-215, 232  
 Lyons, Council of, 332

## M

Magna Carta, 412, 460  
 Manfred, 335, 418  
 Matilda, Countess, 295  
 Matilda, Empress, 453  
 Mayor of the Palace, Frankish,  
 88, 169  
 Mendicant Orders, the, 502-504  
 Merovingian dynasty, 65-85,  
 167-169  
 Mersen, treaty of, 236; edict of,  
 234  
 Milan resists Frederick I., 308-  
 315  
*Missi dominici*, 197, 212, 428  
 Mohammed, 138-145, 148  
 Mohammedanism, 140, 145-147;  
 spread of, 148-165, 476  
 Monasticism, 498-505  
 Mongol invasion, the, 474  
 Montfort, Simon de, Earl of  
 Leicester, 461-463

Montfort, Simon de, senior, 508  
 Municipalities; *see* Cities, Communes.  
 Music, sacred, 542

## N

Navarre, formation of kingdom of, 227, 476  
 Nicholas I., 222, 230, 345, 491  
 Nicholas II., 289, 291  
 Normandy, formation of duchy of, 239; in XI. century, 394; conquered by France, 409  
 Normans, in southern Italy, 290-292, 297, 304, 339  
 Norsemen, the, 231-233, 235-237, 446

## O

Odoacer, 53-55  
 Osmiades, the, 152-454, 159  
 Ostrogoths, 36, 55-62, 103  
 Otto I., Emperor, 242, 271-277  
 Otto II., Emperor, 244, 277  
 Otto III., Emperor, 244, 278-281  
 Otto IV., Emperor, 321, 323, 328, 406, 410  
 Ottocar I. of Bohemia, 471  
 Oxford, Provisions of, 461

## P

Papacy, development of, 115, 119-122, 173-176, 222; condition in X. century, 278; authority in the church, 488-490  
 Papacy and Empire, 276, 284, 286-300  
 Paris, besieged by Norsemen, 232; in XIII. century, 387, 429  
 Paris, University of, 520-525  
 Parliament, English, 461-464  
 Pascal II., 299, 306  
 Pataria, the, 290, 306  
 Peace of God, 265  
 Persia, in VI. century, 105; conquered by the Arabs, 150; influence on Arabs, 160  
 Peter the Hermit, 350, 352

Peter de Vinea, 331  
 Philip I., 395  
 Philip II., Augustus, 325, 363, 365, 379, 383, 384, 404-413, 422, 424, 426, 458  
 Philip of Suabia, 321, 324, 406  
 Photius, 345  
 Pippin the Elder, 169  
 Pippin of Heristal, 169  
 Pippin the Short, 172-177  
 Poitiers, battle of, 157  
 Poland, 471  
 Portugal, formation of, 476  
 Prætorian prefect, the, 4  
 Priests, parish, 497  
 Provence, formation of kingdom of, 224  
 Provinces, Roman, government of, 4

## Q

*Quadrivium*, the, 515  
 Quierzy-sur-Oise, edict of, 234

## R

Radagaisus, 40  
 Ravenna, Exarchate of, 118  
 Raymond VI., of Toulouse, 506-510  
 Raymond VII., of Toulouse, 511  
 Religion, early German, 30-32  
 Renard the Fox, 533  
 Revenue of Capetian France, 434; of the Papacy, 493  
 Richard I., of England, 319, 320, 323, 363, 365, 394, 404-406, 408, 456-459  
 Richard II., of England, 394  
 Robert II., of France, 393  
 Robert Guiscard, 291, 297, 340  
 Robert of Normandy, 453  
 Robert the Strong, 232, 235  
 Roland, Chanson de, 528, 529  
 Rollo of Normandy, 237-239  
 Roman law, Justinian's codification of, 110  
 Romanesque architecture, 537  
 Rome, taken by Visigoths, 42; by Vandals, 51, in VI. century, 119; the Leonine city, 230; in X. century, 274; in XII. century, 305

Romulus Augustulus, 52  
 Roncaglia, assembly of, 309  
 Roncesvalles, 185  
 Rose, Romance of the, 534  
 Rudolf, King of France, 240  
 Russians, in IX. and X. centuries, 338, 472; in XI. and XII centuries, 473

## S

Saints, the worship of, 542  
 Saladin, 362-365  
 Saracen Empire and civilisation, 148-165; invasions in X. century, 230; in Spain, 351  
 Sassanides, kingdom of, 105, 150  
 Saxons, conquest by Franks, 183  
 Scandanavian States, the, 467  
 Scholasticism, 516, 524  
 Schools, Roman, 13; Charlemagne's, 203-205; mediæval, 515  
 Science, Arabian, 162  
 Seljuks; *see* Turks.  
 Senlac, battle of, 449  
 Serfdom, 376  
 Sicily, kingdom of, 304, 320, 325, 328  
 Simony, 286  
 Slavs, war with Franks, 185; invasions in IX. century, 229; in Greece, 337; formation of states, 470-474  
 Sorbonne, the, 522  
 Spain, Visigoths in, 44, 104, 114; Arabs in, 155, 351; Christian kingdoms of, 476-479; organisation of, 478  
 "Spirituals," the, 505  
 Stephen, King of England, 454  
 Stilicho, 40-42, 125  
 Strasburg, Oath of, 216  
 Suger, 400, 402  
 Sylvester II. (Gerbert), 244, 280, 516  
 Syria, conquered by the Arabs, 149

## T

Taxation, Roman, 9-11; Frankish, 201

Templars, Knights, 359  
 Teutonic Order, the, 328, 331, 359, 474  
 Theatre, origin of the, 543  
 Theodora, Empress, 101  
 Theodore, St., of Canterbury, 130  
 Theodoric, 55-62  
 Theodosius the Great, 38  
 Theodosius II., 47, 100  
 Third estate, the, 375, 386  
*Trivium*, the, 515  
 Troubadours, the, 531  
*Trouvères*, the, 528  
 Truce of God, 265  
 Tunis, crusade against, 419  
 Turks, the, 165, 347, 350

## U

Ulphilas, 36  
 Universities, mediæval, 524  
 Urban II., 298, 366

## V

Valentinian III., 44, 51  
 Vandals, 44-47, 102  
 Vassalage, 208, 246, 253  
 Vaudois, the, 506  
 Venice, 349  
 Verdun, treaty of, 217  
 Villehardouin, 534  
*Villes de bourgeoisie*, 384  
 Visigoths, 36-44, 48, 69

## W

Waldenses, the; *see* Vaudois.  
 Wessex, 445  
 William I., England, 378, 449  
 William II., England, 453  
 Witenagemot, the, 449


## Y


Yaroslaff the Great, 473


## Z


Zeno, Emperor, 55











BINDING SECT. JUN 11 1970

D  
118  
B453

Bémont, Charles  
Medieval Europe

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

