Publications of J. H. Miller

STUDIES IN

EUROPEAN HISTORY

CIVILIZATION IN THE MIDDLE AGES

WITH AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SOURCE STUDY METHOD

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.

The University of Nebraska

AINSWORTH & COMPANY

378–388 Wabash Ave.

CHICAGO

1900

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

The pedagogy of the last half of the nineteenth century differs both in matter and in method from that of the first half. Our age is scientific above all things, and this spirit has permeated, one by one, all branches of instruction. The change in matter has consisted in a revolt against the claims of the classics to a monopoly of all knowledge and all discipline. The revolt was successful and the classics were relegated to their proper place in the new curriculum. Henceforth they are to form a part and not the whole of education. Through the breach thus made new studies entered demanding their share of attention. In truth, some of them demanded more than their share, and for a time, under the influence of the reactionary spirit, the movement threatened to go too far in the opposite direction and to abandon the classics entirely.

But the new matter was not more important than the new method. With the sciences came the scientific spirit and the laboratory method. The old method, or lack of method, presided at the birth of the new studies, but the text-book recitation was at first supplemented by experiments performed before the class, and at last by experiments performed by the class, and the change was complete. That the laboratory method was the only method to be employed in teaching the sciences was quite clear; that it had a universal application and might be as readily employed in teaching other

subjects, not generally recognized as sciences, was not so clear. The result of this apparent inability to understand the great possibilities in the new method has been a marked absence of progress in the teaching of certain subjects. History, unfortunately, is one of these. I say "unfortunately," for I know of no subject whose right teaching is of more importance, especially for the people of a democracy. And yet it was but natural that history should be one of the last subjects to feel the touch of the scientific influence. Its subject was commonplace—humanity; its material—the every day objects found under the hands and eyes of every human being. Neither subject nor material lent itself readily to scientific treatment. The impulse to change generally comes from the top and it was only in the last generation that the historical method was sufficiently developed to make it possible for the great teachers of history to give that impulse. But at last the impulse has been given and is making its way through our whole system. Up to the present time, however, it has made the greatest progress in the universities and better colleges and has not produced a very deep impression upon the secondary schools. Yet the signs are not lacking to prove that the time has come for energetic and systematic work in the grades below the college. As an aid to this work, the following "source" extracts have been prepared, with an introduction upon method and its application in the secondary schools.

A good definition of history is not easy to find, but perhaps one of the best is that given by Bernheim: "History is the science of the evolution of man in his activities as a social being." Let us examine the definition care-

fully and endeavor to get at its meaning. In the first place, it is claimed that history is a science, that is, a body of systematized knowledge. If, as has been recently affirmed, there is no science but exact science and natural science, and man is excluded from the realm of nature, our claim cannot be allowed. But I am inclined to think that all sciences are not equally exact, and that if the term "natural" be used to exclude man, then there are sciences that are not natural sciences. I am also inclined to think that man is as natural as any other animal. The refusal to concede to history a place among the sciences may have had some weight a hundred years ago, but it has none to-day. "Knowledge is science in the degree in which it can be subjected to method and law and so rendered comprehensible and certain. Under this test history must surely be assigned the rank of a science, though confessedly inexact and as yet but partially wrought out." But what science is absolutely exact or completely wrought out? All are in a state of flux, and are more or less inexact and incomplete. History is one of the late comers. Its greater incompleteness and inexactness as a science are due to its complexity and to the fact that its development depends so largely upon the development of a considerable number of auxiliary sciences.

We note in the second place that history is the "science of the evolution of man." History is no longer a simple teller of stories; the muse has set herself a sterner task. We are conscious that the society of to-day differs from the society of one thousand years ago. An evolution has taken place and it is the work of the historian to trace this evolution through all its phases. It should be noted, further, that it is not simply the evolution of

the American, nor of the Englishman, but the evolution of all men. This idea is too new to be fully realized, but in the period of African, Chinese, and Japanese wars, it should be evident to the most superficial observer that history, universal history, has for its theater the whole globe and for its actors all mankind.

The last point in the definition to be considered is the fact that history has to do with *all* the activities of man as a social being. History is not simply "past politics." It is that and something more, for in order to understand the meaning of the social evolution of man, all the expressions of man's life in society must be considered, whether these expressions be political, economic, literary, artistic, or religious. It is with man's social life in its completeness that the historian has to do.

The historian then attempts to describe the evolution of the society of which he himself forms a part. But how can this evolution be traced? The old Greeks, Romans, and Germans, are long since dead and cannot be called back to life that we may study their civilization. That civilization must be reconstructed, but how and from what material? Shall we allow full play to our imaginations and call the result an historical reconstruction? Such a history would have as much value as the work of a botanist who had never studied plant life. There is but one way to reconstruct the life of the past and that is from the remains of the past. Everything that has come down from the past must be used in reconstructing the past. These remains are called historical sources. As the word "history" is applied indiscriminately to both the fact and the record of the fact, it is of the

utmost importance that, at the very outset, we draw the line sharply between the two. The historical fact is what actually did happen in all its fullness and truthfulness; the record of the fact is the belief of certain persons as to what happened. It is self-evident that the fact and the record of the fact may be quite different things. In truth, they generally are quite different and never can be exactly the same. If this last assertion be correct, then we can never know exactly what happened at a certain time and in a certain place and it is evident that absolute historical truth is beyond our reach.

An examination of the way in which the record is made will make more clear the truth of the above statement. An event takes place and is gone. One or more persons make a record of it. Our knowledge of the event is obtained from the record. If it be inexact or incomplete we are helpless, for the event will not take place again. It cannot be conjured up a second time and induced to move slowly that we may catch its slightest peculiarity. The botanist, the chemist, and the physicist may repeat their experiments until the record is satisfactory, while the historian is often dependent upon the record of an event made by a careless or ignorant observer. What we have before us then is not a photograph of the fact, for the fact passed through a human brain before reaching paper and was more or less distorted in the passage. A hundred and one things may conspire to make this record defective. Physical defects, combined with ignorance, passion, and prejudice may so transform the fact as to render it hardly recognizable and to make the record a veritable caricature. And when, in addition to all this, the

record is not made upon the spot, time plays strange tricks with the memory and renders the transformation even greater. Such are the difficulties of making the fact, or that which actually happened, agree with the record of the fact, or the belief as to what happened. What actually happened is called objective history; what is believed to have happened is called subjective history. The aim of the scientific historian is to make the last approximate as closely as possible to the first. This can be done only by a most exhaustive collection of all the records and remains relating to the event and a most careful and critical examination and interpretation of them. But what specifically are these sources? They are the records of eye and ear witnesses; of the persons taking part in the event or present when the event took place; all direct remains from the event that have come down to us and enables us to form a setting for the event. In the case of a battle, we search for the diaries and letters of the combatants; we interrogate survivors; we read the dispatches of generals and the reports of observers; we study the battle-field, the arms and equipments, and the resources of either side. In short, all material is collected that can throw any light upon the event itself and help us to restore it. The sources may be classified as follows:

I. Historical remains.
  A. In narrow sense.
    a. Remains of men.
    b. Languages.
    c. Social conditions: manners and customs, festivals, forms of worship, institutions, laws, constitutions.
    d. Products of human skill: utensils, arms, buildings, coins.

e. Records: courts, assemblies, speeches, newspapers, letters, tax-rolls, etc.

B. In broader sense.

a. Monuments.

b. Inscriptions.

II. Traditions.

A. Pictoral: statuary, pictures.

B. Oral: stories, anecdotes, songs.

C. Written: annals, chronicles, biographies.

While the reconstruction of a period in history must rest upon the historical sources coming down to us, much help in interpretation of the sources is obtained from analogy. There exists to-day upon the globe societies representing many of the stages through which our civilization has passed. Through the study of existing societies much light is cast upon the obscure places in past development.

These sources then, the remains of the event itself, and the descriptions of it, are the material with which the historian must work. The difference between the sources and a narrative text must be fully grasped before the new method can be understood. Grote's History of Greece is not a source, but the result of Grote's study of the sources, his attempt to reconstruct the past from the sources. The value of this reconstruction is determined by comparing it with the sources, and the sources of Greek history are all the things enumerated above under the heads of Historical Remains and Traditions. Where are these sources enumerated? First of all in bibliographies devoted to the histories of particular countries. In some of the older bibliographies no distinction is made between sources and modern writers, but in the latest scientific works the two classes are kept separate. When a work on bibliography is not accessible, the informa-

tion may be obtained from the foot-notes of a modern historical narrative. Turn to a volume of Gibbon or Macaulay and at the bottom of each page will be found an enumeration of the sources of information. From these foot-notes a complete list of Gibbon's or Macaulay's sources may be obtained.

But when the historian has collected his material, he has only taken the first step. The material must be tested and its value determined. Upon the success of this criticism of the sources depends the value of the reconstruction. What will be its value if it rests upon worthless material? We must know first of all if the material is genuine, that is, if it is what it pretends to be. Much material that the last century accepted as genuine has been rejected as false by this, and often as intentionally false, or forged. The "Forged Decretals" and "The Gift of Constantine" are but two of many examples that might be cited. I have not space to enumerate the tests by which evidence is tried to determine its genuineness. In spite of the high degree of development attained in this branch of historical method, the results reached are not always satisfactory. The different opinions among specialists touching the lately discovered "Athenian Constitution," of Aristotle, is a not uncommon illustration of inability to reach satisfactory results.

If our material has stood the tests of genuineness, we then proceed to consider its relation to the event. Suppose, for example, we have a description of the battle of Salamis; what do we want to know about that account in order to determine its value? First of all, who wrote it? Herodotus. Who was Herodotus? A Greek. Was he living at the time?

Probably. Was he present at the battle? Probably not. Why not? The battle took place in 480 B. C. and Herodotus was born about 485 B. C. That would make him about five years old at the time. It is evident, then, that Herodotus, although he lived at the time, could not have been present at the battle and must have obtained his information from others and many years later. He is not, then, a source, but was obliged to write his account from the sources, as a man born in 1860 might write the history of our Civil War. This conclusion is both true and false. There are cases in which a work that was not originally a source might become a source, namely, when all the material upon which that work is based has been lost. The sources with which Herodotus worked have disappeared and we cannot go back of him. He is practically our court of final appeal. Having now decided that the account of the battle of Salamis in Herodotus is the principal source of information, shall we proceed at once to use it? That is, is the criticism at an end, and is it time to reconstruct the event from the record? Not yet. We want to know more about this man and the conditions under which he wrote. What had been his education, what was his position in society, what his special preparation for writing? In a word, was he able to tell the truth? But a man may be able to tell the truth and not be willing to do so. Herodotus lived in Asia Minor. Was he friendly to the Persians and hostile to the Greeks? Was he an aristocrat? He might be unfair to the Athenians. Was he a democrat? He might be unjust toward the Spartans. How can these questions be answered? By a careful study of the work of Herodotus, page by page, and line

by line, aided in the study by opinions of men like Grote, Curtis, and other historians of Greece who have covered the same ground. The tests thus applied might be summed up under the following heads:

LOCALIZATION.

I. Who was the writer?
II. When was the work written?
III. Where was it written?

VALUE OF EVIDENCE.

IV. Was he able to tell the truth?
V. Was he willing to tell the truth?

It is easily seen that question V. is the least easily and satisfactorily answered. A negative answer to this question would have the most disastrous effect. The absolute conviction on the part of the historian that his witness was not truthful would lead him to reject the evidence. The reconstruction of the event might have produced far different results had the evidence been accepted. It often happens that the different versions of an event found in different historians is due to the fact that one historian believes a certain witness honest and the other believes him dishonest.

The work of criticism being ended, the work of reconstruction begins.

The first step in reconstruction is the establishment of the facts. The event may be described by a single witness, by several witnesses that agree in substance, or by several witnesses that disagree. In the first case the value of the evidence will depend upon the general character of the witness and the way in which his evidence harmonizes with our general knowledge of the period; the second case represents the most satisfactory kind of

evidence, when the witnesses are independent of one another. In the last case, the evidence of the most reliable witnesses must be set over against the least reliable, and when they disagree the evidence of the unreliable witnesses is rejected. These are the general principles. I have not space to point out in what manner they are modified in the application.

Having established the individual facts, the next step is to arrange them. This may be done under the heads of time and place, that is, we may arrange in their order all the events that have taken place in the United States (place) during the nineteenth century (time), or it may be done in accordance with the relation of the facts to some feature of the history of the period studied, as the constitution, the religion, the art, etc. The two methods may, of course, be combined, that is, we may arrange the facts with regard to religion in the United States, in the nineteenth century. The arrangement of the facts is determined by the object that the historian has in mind and is nothing more than putting his notes in order that he may see what they mean as a whole, and what the development has been. At first sight it might appear that the work of reconstruction was now at an end. But this is far from the truth.

The facts having been established it is necessary to determine what each fact means (interpretation) and what they all mean when taken together (combination). The interpretation of the sources is divided into interpretation of the remains, of the traditions, and interpretation of the sources by one another. Suppose that we have established the fact that in one of the European countries milestones of a certain kind and the remains of walls of a peculiar

construction are encountered along the roads. Interpretation justifies us in saying that this was once the course of a Roman highway. This is the simplest form of interpretation of remains. More difficult problems in interpretation would be to restore the coinage system of a country from the coins that remained, or to describe the condition of the early European tribes from the root words common to all the Aryan people on the continent. An interpretation of the facts of tradition demands a knowledge of the writing of the period we are studying, of the style of the writer, of the time and place where the record originated, and the character of the writer. All of these things have been mentioned under the head of general criticism; they must be applied in the interpretation of each fact, for if we do not understand all these things, we shall fail to interpret the facts correctly. Last of all, we are much aided in the work of reconstruction, through the interpretation of the sources by one another. The documents are often unintelligible, and the contemporary narrative written by those who have helped to make the documents tell us what they mean. The Iliad and the Odyssey are used to interpret the remains found in Greece and in Asia Minor. Having now fixed the facts and interpreted them it is necessary to combine these interpretations that we may get a view of the whole subject. The combined result must be lighted up by phantasy that working upon the results given it by criticism, interpretation, and combination endeavors to see the events in the form in which they happened. It is not with the imagination playing freely that we have to do here, but with the phantasy dealing with definite data. Where the phantasy is defective

the highest results are not obtained; where the imagination is uncontrolled, the results are unscientific and often worthless. Phantasy, as here used, means the ability to restore the historical past from definite data without doing violence to the data. But all the difficulties of reproduction have not yet been enumerated.

The final conception of the subject calls for an understanding of the physical, psychical, and social conditions under which the events took place and their relation to other events. For the factors to be considered in dealing with human development are the influences of nature, the psychology of the individual and of the masses, and the institutions under which the individual lives. Geography, psychology, and sociology are for the student of history, auxiliary sciences. Last of all, in considering the subject, treated in its deepest and broadest meaning, the historian rises into the realm of the philosophy of history.

Having thus, step by step, proceeding from the most particular to the most general, formed a conception of the past period in accord with the evidence, the historian commits it to paper, supporting his narative throughout by proof. His work is done. He has worked carefully, faithfully, and honestly, but it must not be forgotten that the value of the result depends upon the ability of the historian and the material at his disposal. If he had at his disposal all the sources in existence, if criticisms, interpretations, combinations, and reproductions were infallible, it would never be necessary to rewrite the history of that period. But that is inconceivable and as a consequence *history is constantly being rewritten from the sources.*

Such is the way in which history is written.

"But why," you ask, "has so much space been devoted to the way in which history is written? I want to know how to study history and how to teach it." The student of history and the teacher of history must learn of the writer of history. His method must be our method. This position is sound and is in harmony with the scientific spirit that characterizes all our school work to-day. You may *read* history, if you will, but do not imagine that you are *studying* history, if you are not employing the method of the historian working directly with the sources and forming your own judgment.

The objection will be raised that this might do for the specialist in history, but is out of place when applied to all students of history. But this argument is not logical. It is just as necessary that all students of history should do laboratory work in history by going to the sources, as that all students of botany, chemistry, and physics should do laboratory work in those lines. As I have already said, the laboratory idea is more novel when applied to history than when applied to some other subjects, but it is not less true because it is novel. It is not the intention to make historians of all our boys and girls, but rather to teach them to study what history they do study scientifically. And it is high time that this work were being done. For if there is any one thing that we need more than another in our political life, it is men who are capable of determining what are facts and of telling what those facts mean. In the past, history has been read and recited in our schools that our boys and girls might obtain a certain amount of information concerning their nation or their race. May it be studied in the future for the further purpose of disciplining their minds and rendering them

capable of forming sound, independent judgments upon the sources or the raw materials of history! To such a mind the opinion of another is of value only as far as it rests upon evidence that stands unscathed the test of the severest criticism.

Having considered the way in which history is written, it is now in order to point out its application in teaching. The success of the application in the schoolroom will depend upon the extent to which the teacher is filled with the spirit of historical research. To acquire a fair share of this spirit, genius is not necessary, but simply a desire to know the truth and a willingness to search patiently for it. I shall assume, then, that the teacher possesses some of the spirit that she wishes to impart to her pupils, and that she is endeavoring to develop more of that spirit in herself.

It might be possible to deal with the application of the method to all the grades, from the primary to the graduate course in the university, but that would be too comprehensive and would pass beyond the scope of this chapter. It is not the intention to describe an ideal state of things, but to take the teaching of history as it exists and to show how it may be improved. We shall consider, then, how the study of the sources may be made practical for the high schools, and how by devoting no more time to the teaching of the subject than is now given, better results may be obtained.

The source work cannot be done without a collection of sources any more than botany can be studied without plants. But by a collection of sources I do not mean a library; I mean a book made up of extracts from the sources and photographs of the historical remains. This book must be placed in the hands

of the pupil. I have talked with teachers who told me that they were "using the new method," and I have discovered that there was but one copy of a book of sources in the schoolroom, and that was on the teacher's desk. They believed that they were using the new method, but I fear that they did not know what the new method is.

The book of sources is not a narrative like the ordinary school history. It does not read smoothly. "It seems to be disconnected," as one puzzled teacher put it. She was right. It is disconnected, and it is the duty of the pupil under the guidance of the teacher to connect it. Out of the photographs of ruins, of temples, of statuary, of remains of every kind, out of the extracts from documents, diaries, contemporary narratives, newspapers, etc., this brick and lumber and mortar of history—teacher and pupil are to do on a small scale what the historian does upon a large scale—reconstruct the past.

The narrative school history — Meyers, Barnes, or Swinton—can never take the place of the book of sources, nor can the book of sources take the place of the narrative. *The pupils should use both. If they can have but one, it should be the book of sources, supplemented by a condensed statement of connecting facts.* The narrative text and the book of sources supplement one another. The book of sources contains the material *to be worked up into a narrative;* the other book *contains the material that has been worked up into a narrative.* This comparison of the book of sources with a good narrative text should be continued until their relation is understood. The books are not opposed to one another, but *they are not the same thing and one cannot do the work of the other.*

The source extracts that follow may be used in various ways. They may be employed simply as supplementary reading in connection with a narrative history; they may be used to supplement a book made up partly of sources—like the Sheldon-Barnes histories,—not all of the questions being answered, or each study may be worked over thoroughly in accordance with the directions that follow. In that case, one or two hours a week would be devoted to the topic until the study upon it was complete. This is one of the most conservative ways of introducing source study. The remaining hours of the week could be devoted to the continuous study of some portion of European History. This book of source extracts should not be confounded with the books, sometimes called source books, that contain source extracts plus a condensed statement of connecting facts. Such a book may furnish material enough for a connected study of European History; the extracts in this book do not.

The work begins by an examination of the book of extracts that the pupil may understand what they are and what he is to do with them. The method of work should then be explained and for the morrow's lesson a number of questions upon the first extract assigned for preparation. The mistake of requiring too much work at the outset should not be made. Many of the questions look simple to the teacher; they may not appear so simple to the pupil. Moreover, if the teacher be a bright woman, she will not limit herself, in the class discussion, to these questions, but will add others suggested by her own study.

Before the pupils come into the class, they must prepare their lesson. This lesson con-

sists in answering a number of questions, or, in other words, solving a number of problems. This is the rock upon which a large majority of the teachers have been wrecked. They did not insist upon the preparation and the work was not done. Each question must be answered fully, the answers written neatly in a note-book and brought into the class in that form. This should represent the independent thought of the pupil and should enable one to gauge his ability. An answer that does not carry its proof with it should not be accepted. "Yes" and "No" are not complete answers; they are simply theorems to be demonstrated. "Why did you answer 'yes'?" is the question to be put at once, and the pupil must understand that his work is not finished until he has *proved his point by evidence taken from his source-book.* This reasoning must all appear in the answer contained in the note-book.

When the class meets each pupil has before him, *open on the desk,* his note-book with answers and his source-book. This exercise is not to be a test of memory. The teacher should not waste the recitation hour in trying to discover how many facts have lodged in the brain of this boy or of that girl. Let the teacher read the first question and call for an answer. She should be sure the answer is *read.* Boys and girls have an innate objection to doing things in the right way. She told them to write the answers out, but some of them did not think she meant it. She must convince them that they are unprepared if they come to class without the written answers. The answer read, she proceeds to criticise it. First of all, has any evidence been omitted? Let other members of the class supply it. Is the reasoning incorrect? She forces the pupil to

defend his answer with the evidence before him and follows him from point to point until he sees that it cannot be defended. When his conclusions are wrong, she does not tell him so at once and give him the right answer, but lets him see that he has not proved his point. It may be through lack of evidence; it may be from a false interpretation or combination. The whole discussion plays around this pupil's answer, and the rest of the class is drawn into it. The pupils having more evidence and other conclusions contribute them. While this discussion is going on, every member of the class follows closely and takes down in his note-book every bit of evidence that he had overlooked and every interpretation or combination that he had not noticed in writing his answers. At the close of the hour each pupil goes away knowing more about the subject than when he came. He carried in his own work; in the class room he added the ideas of the teacher and of fellow pupils. The class notes, as proof of attention, must be insisted upon and kept distinct from the original answers.

The work goes on in this manner until all the questions on the topic have been answered and discussed. Many teachers have thought that the work stopped here, but if the method of the historian is to be our model, that cannot be true. We must arrange and classify our results and see how they look as a whole. The results to be arranged are the answers and class notes. Let this be explained to the pupils and let it be pointed out that their work on the topic will be finished only when the judgments they have formed are arranged in the shape of a narrative. They should be told that they are writing history. It may not be very valuable history for the world at large,

but it may be very valuable for them. Their conclusions may be very weak, but it is only through the exercise of the judgment that they learn to draw sound conclusions. They are to analyze their results and this analysis is to be given the form of an outline. If they do not know how to make an outline, time should be taken to teach them. The material should not be arranged for them, but an outline of some subject should be upon the board showing them how to make heads and sub-heads. Then they should be allowed to try their hands on their own material.

These outlines—or some of them—should be placed on the board before the recitation and criticised during the recitation. The attempt should not be made to run them all in one mould, but the pupils should know what they are about and be able to give reasons for their divisions and subdivisions. Above all, no points should appear in the outline that cannot be supported by evidence. It is true that—as a student once remarked—"a man has a right to his opinion," but it is equally true that in history that opinion is of no value unless it rests on evidence.

The last step consists in composing a short narrative, based upon and following the outline closely. Portions of these narratives should be read and criticised, and some especially good narrative read in its entiretly in the class. Here, as elsewhere, the teacher should watch closely for unsound general statements, for inexact and incomplete statements. Any and all of these things indicate that the pupil is not working with his eye on the evidence. The reading of the narrative completes the study on that topic, and the same operation is repeated with the next topic.

As the pupil goes from topic to topic and handles one bit of evidence after another, the teacher should let slip no opportunity of acquainting him with the principles of the historic method in their simplest forms. By the use of many simple illustrations, and by frequent reiteration, the boy or girl is led to see something of the value of the study of the life of humanity and to understand something about his relation to it. He may learn, little by little, that the restoration of the past must rest upon evidence, and after he has made an intelligent study of a period, he should be able to enumerate the evidence used. In connection with his American history he might even be allowed to collect evidence and to learn something of its value. Pupils may be sent to old residents to gather information touching the history of the town, state, or nation. They may be asked to make a list of the sources that would be used in writing a history of the town. This list should be based upon their personal research. Of course, with young pupils the matter of criticism cannot be carried far, but they can learn that an eye and ear witness is the best kind of a witness. The boy who *went* to the circus is listened to in preference to the boy who did not go, but has *heard* about it. They can understand why we should go to the diary of Columbus if we want to know what happened on his voyage to America. They can even understand why the evidence of one witness is better than that of another. They know that if their father belongs to one political party he does not believe what the papers of the other party say. It would also be an easy matter to show how difficult it is to learn the whole truth about an event. They may write independent accounts of something that

has recently taken place in the city or town, and of which they have personal knowledge. The accounts should be as careful and detailed as possible. Let them compare the accounts, noting the different points of view and attempting to reconcile them, thus establishing the matter of fact. In this way in the work in United States or general history a thousand opportunities will occur to familiarize the pupils with the principles of the historical method. There should be but little generalization at the outset; the generalizations should develop naturally from the specific cases.

It should be said by way of anticipation, that the teacher should not feel discouraged if she does not get on rapidly at first. Let her have patience and persevere; let her remember that the principles of historical criticism are but the rules of common sense employed in every day life, and she will soon see light.

The success of the work will depend, to a large extent, upon the control of the note-book. I have found that the most satisfactory book is one with a separable cover. The leaves are tied in as fast as needed. Covers and paper may be obtained at a very small cost. The material should be arranged in the book in an orderly manner. My system has been to follow this order: Answers, Class Notes, Outlines, Narratives. A heading on each sheet indicated the topic to which the answers belonged and all the answers were numbered. Sheets of brown cardboard separated the Answers from the Class notes, the Class notes from the Outlines, etc. The object of all this system was to render the examination of the books easy. For they must be examined at fixed intervals and a record kept of their condition. The work will not succeed unless the

pupil does his duty and the condition of his book is an excellent test of how he is doing it. The record for each pupil may be kept upon a separate sheet, with the following columns, running from left to right: Due (when the book was due and when handed in), Answers (how many, quantity, and quality), Class notes (quantity and quality), Outline, Narrative, Oral Discussion (part taken by the pupil in class discussion). At the end of the term the card will give a good idea of what the pupil has done. There was one other column headed "Time" and in it was noted the number of hours given to the preparation of lessons. It was taken from the student's "time card," kept in the back of his note-book. This "time card" was of the size of the note-book and was ruled with columns at the left for the date, in the center for a statement of the work done (writing answers, making outlines, etc.), and at the right for the hours or minutes given to the work. The keeping of this card is a valuable piece of work in itself. Such are the general suggestions touching the work. Others will be made from time to time throughout the year.

The following works contain about everything that exists on method in the English language. They have to do more with the question of how to study history than how to teach it, but I have tried to show that the teacher must know how to study history before she can teach it. These are books that every teacher of history, who is not a teacher simply for a year and a day, should possess. They should form the beginning of a professional library. Study them, meditate upon them, and apply their teachings. Go to them again and again, until you have mastered them and are ready for something better:

Freeman, E. A., Methods of Historical Study, London, 1886; Droysen, J. G., Principles of History, Boston, 1893; Hall, G. S., Methods of Teaching History, Boston, 1889; Andrews, E. B., Brief Institutes of General History, Boston, 1890; Arnold, T., Modern History, New York, 1895; Acton, Lord, The Study of History, London, 1896; Stubbs, W., Medieval and Modern History, Oxford, 1887; Barnes, M. S., Studies in Historical Method, Boston, 1896; Hinsdale, B. A., How to Study and Teach History, N. Y., 1895; Langlois, Ch. V., and Seignobos, Ch.: Introduction to the Study of History, N. Y., 1898; Fling, F. M., Outline of Historical Method, Lincoln, 1899.

F. M. FLING.

European History Studies

Vol. II., No. 1. SEPTEMBER, 1898

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

EUROPEAN HISTORY STUDIES.

CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN.

The Works of Tacitus. The Oxford translation, revised, with notes. Vol. I., the Annals. Vol. II., the History, Germany, Agricola, and Dialogue on Orators. London, 1890 and 1889. Juvenal, translated by Charles Badham, M.D., F.R.S., and Persius, translated by the Rt. Hon. Sir W. Drummond. New York, 1837. The Letters of Caius Plinius Caecilius Secundus. The translation of Melmoth, revised and corrected by Rev. F. C. Bosanquet, B.A. London, 1890. The Lives of the Twelve Caesars, by C. Suetonius Tranquillus, translated by Alexander Thompson, M.D. Edited by J. Eugene Reed, M.A. Two volumes bound in one. Philadelphia, 1889. The Writings of Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus. In three volumes, Vol. I. In Ante-Nicene Christian Library: translations of the writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325. Edited by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., and James Donaldson, LL.D. Edinburgh, 1869.

BEARING in mind the purpose of these extracts, I quote the cheapest and most accessible editions rather than the most scholarly.

The student should make himself familiar with the most important facts concerning each author, when and where he lived, what sort of a man he was, what position in society he occupied, what he wrote, etc. For the purpose of

this number, the chief stress in preparing the biographies should be laid on the question, In how far may the opinions expressed here be regarded as current at the time? In how far are these authors "representative men?" If Tacitus and Pliny thought ill of the Christians, what other classes in Roman society in all probability thought the same? The Pagan writers quoted are so familiar to the student that no information concerning them is necessary here. Tertullian, however, is less generally known, and I may be permitted to remark that of the two tendencies in the early Church, the one looking to an assimilation of the old Græco-Roman civilization and seeking an accommodation rather than a conflict with the Pagan world, the other rejecting any mingling of Christian and Pagan whatsoever, and regarding all conciliatory efforts as acts of idolatry, as a betrayal of our Lord, of these two tendencies, Tertullian was the uncompromising champion of the latter, and it was in no small degree due to his numerous writings that the early Church gradually assumed this attitude. He is the best representative of the aggressive side of early Christianity; the side which soon controlled the Church and triumphed over the Empire. He is representative of the Church militant.

Those who intend to follow this course can not do better than to provide themselves with Prof. G. B. Adam's Civilization during the Middle Ages, New York, 1894. Lecky's History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne, Vol. I., Ch. III., should be consulted in the preparation of this number. Prof. Dana C. Munro and Edith Bramhall,

A.M., have published an excellent pamphlet on The Early Christian Persecution, in Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, published by the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1897. Price twenty cents. It has a select bibliography at the end.

I. WHAT THE ROMANS THOUGHT OF THE JEWS.

Juvenal, Satire XIV., lines 127–152.

There be, who, bred in sabbath-fearing lore,
The vague divinity of clouds adore;
Who, like their sires, their skin to priests resign,
And hate like human flesh the flesh of swine.
The laws of Rome those blinded bigots slight,
In superstitious dread of Jewish rite:
To Moses and his mystic volume true,
They set no traveller right, except a Jew!
By them no cooling spring was ever shown,
Save to the thirsty circumcised alone!
Why? but that each seventh day their bigot sires
Rescind from all that social life requires!
Our other faults will youth spontaneous learn;
But one there is, it takes some pains to earn.
A specious baseness, that in virtue's name
And solemn garb too oft appears the same!
"A careful man! frugal and self-denied!"
Such titles oft the sordid miser hide,
Whose sharp-eyed vigils in no slumber cease:
(Like Pontic dragons o'er the golden fleece.)
Some, too, the great artificer admire!
'Tis no mean thing this talent to acquire!
As if the petty gains that avarice sweeps
From every side would not at last be heap
As if the workmen whose eternal din
Rings on the anvil should no wages win!

Tacitus, Hist. V., Ch. IV., V., and XIII.

In order to bind the people to him for the time to come, Moses prescribed to them a new form of worship, and opposed to those of all the world beside. Whatever is held sacred by the Romans, with the Jews

is profane: and what in other nations is unlawful and impure, with them is permitted. * * * They abstain from the flesh of swine, from the recollection of the loathsome affliction which they had formerly suffered from leprosy, to which that animal is subject. The famine, with which they were for a long time distressed, is still commemorated by frequent fastings; and the Jewish bread, made without leaven, is a standing evidence of their seizure of corn. They say that they instituted a rest on the seventh day because that day brought them rest from their toils; but afterwards, charmed with the pleasures of idleness, the seventh year also was devoted to sloth. * * * (Ch. IV.)

These rites and ceremonies, howsoever introduced, have the support of antiquity. Their other institutions, which have been extensively adopted, are tainted with execrable knavery; for the scum and refuse of other nations, renouncing the religion of their country, were in the habit of bringing gifts and offerings to Jerusalem,—hence the wealth and grandeur of the state; and also because faith is inviolably observed, and compassion is cheerfully shown towards each other, while the bitterest animosity is harboured against all others. * * * The first thing instilled into their proselytes is to despise the gods, to abjure their country, to set at nought parents, children, brothers. * * * The Egyptians worship various animals and images, the work of men's hands; the Jews acknowledge one God only, and conceive of him by the mind alone, condemning, as impious, all who, with perishable materials, wrought into the human shape, form representations of the Deity. That Being, they say, is above all, and everlasting, neither susceptible of likeness nor subject to decay. In consequence they allow no resemblance of him in their city, much less in their temples. In this way they do not flatter their kings, nor show their respect for their Caesars. But because their priests performed in concert with the pipe and timbrels, were crowned with ivy, and a golden vine was found in the temple, some have supposed that Bacchus, the conqueror of the East, was the object of their adoration; but the Jewish institutions have no conformity whatever to the rites of Bacchus. For Bacchus has ordained festive and jocund rites, while the usages of the Jews are dull and repulsive. (Ch. V.)

Prodigies had occurred which that [the Jewish] race, enslaved to superstition, but opposed to religion, held it unlawful, either by vows or victims, to expiate. * * * (Ch. XIII.)

QUESTIONS.

1. What three charges does Juvenal bring against the Jews? 2. Does Tacitus give essentially the same reasons for his intense dislike of them, or does he advance others? 3. Which of these various charges would a Roman consider to be the most serious? 4. Does Juvenal seem to suspect the religious significance of the Jewish rites? 5. Does Tacitus explain them correctly? 6. Does Juvenal betray the least sign that he appreciates the moral greatness of this people, or their importance in the history of the world? 7. Does Tacitus? 8. Is Juvenal impressed by the purity of the Jewish conception of their Jehovah? 9. Is Tacitus? 10. Why did the Romans fail to appreciate the peculiar greatness of the Jews? 11. Is ignorance alone a satisfactory explanation?

II. WHAT THE ROMANS THOUGHT OF THE CHRISTIANS.

Tacitus, The Annals, XV., Ch. XLIV.

* * * But not all the relief that could come from man, not all the bounties that the prince could bestow, nor all the atonements which could be presented to the gods, availed to relieve Nero from the infamy of being believed to have ordered the conflagration. Hence, to suppress the rumour, he falsely charged with the guilt, and punished with the most exquisite tortures, the persons commonly called Christians, who were hated for their enormities. Christus, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, in the reign of Tiberius; but the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also, whither all things horrible and disgraceful flow, from all quarters, as to a common receptacle, and where they are encouraged. Accordingly, first those were seized who confessed they were Christians: next, on their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of burning the city, as of hating the human race. And in their

deaths they were also made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the hides of the wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined, burnt to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for that spectacle, and exhibited a Circensian game, indiscriminately mingling with the common people in the habit of a charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. Whence a feeling of compassion arose towards the sufferers, though guilty and deserving to be made examples of by capital punishment, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but victims to the ferocity of one man.

QUESTIONS.

1. How was it possible for a man of Tacitus's exalted moral character, who saw and lamented the corruption of Rome, to use such harsh expressions against the greatest moral force the western world has ever known? Could he have been well informed concerning it? 2. Did he realize its importance and foresee its future? (This is his only reference to it.) 3. Did any of the educated Romans of his time realize its importance? 4. Can you suggest an explanation of this remarkable fact? (Lecky, European Morals, I., Ch. III.) 5. Did Tacitus know of the Jewish origin of Christianity? 6. Did this create a presumption in its favor to his mind? 7. What practices and beliefs of the early Christians could, if not perfectly understood, give rise to the harsh language he uses? (infra) 8. In what year did these events occur? 9. What information does this passage offer as to the number of Christians in Rome at this time?

Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, Letters, Book X., Letter XCVII.

It is my invariable rule, Sir, to refer to you in all matters where I feel doubtful; for who is more capable of removing my scruples, or informing my ignorance? Having never been present at any trials concerning those who profess Christianity, I am unacquainted not only with the nature of their crimes, or the measure of their punishment, but how far it is proper to enter into an examination concerning them. Whether, therefore, any difference is usually made with respect to ages, or no distinction is to be observed between the young and the adult; whether repentance entitles them to a pardon; or if a man has been once a Chris-

tian, it avails nothing to desist from his error; whether the very profession of Christianity, unattended with any criminal act, or only the crimes themselves inherent in the profession are punishable; on all these points I am in great doubt. In the meanwhile, the method I have observed towards those who have been brought before me as Christians is this: I asked them whether they were Christians; if they admitted it, I repeated the question twice, and threatened them with punishment; if they persisted, I ordered them to be at once punished: for I was persuaded, whatever the nature of their opinions might be, a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved correction. There were others also brought before me possessed with the same infatuation, but being Roman citizens, I directed them to be sent to Rome. But this crime spreading (as is usually the case) while it was actually under prosecution, several instances of the same nature occurred. An anonymous information was laid before me, containing a charge against several persons, who upon examination denied they were Christians, or had ever been so. They repeated after me an invocation to the gods, and offered religious rites with wine and incense before your statue (which for that purpose I had ordered to be brought, together with those of the gods), and even reviled the name of Christ: whereas there is no forcing, it is said, those who are really Christians into any of these compliances: I thought it proper, therefore, to discharge them. Some among those who were accused by a witness in person at first confessed themselves Christians, but immediately after denied it: the rest owned, indeed, that they had been of that number formerly, but had now (some above three, others more, and a few above twenty years ago) renounced that error. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the gods, uttering imprecations at the same time against the name of Christ. They affirmed the whole of their guilt, or their error, was, that they met on a stated day before it was light, and addressed a form of prayer to Christ, as to a divinity, binding themselves by a solemn oath, not for the purposes of any wicked design, but never to commit any fraud, theft, or adultery, never to falsify their word,

nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble, to eat in common a harmless meal. From this custom, however, they desisted after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I forbade the meeting of any assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it so much the more necessary to endeavour to extort the real truth, by putting two female slaves to the torture, who were said to officiate in their religious rites: but all I could discover was evidence of an absurd and extravagant superstition. I deemed it expedient, therefore, to adjourn all further proceedings, in order to consult you. For it appears to be a matter highly deserving your consideration, more especially as great numbers must be involved in the danger of these prosecutions, which have already extended, and are still likely to extend, to persons of all ranks and ages, and even of both sexes. In fact, this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread its infection among the neighbouring villages and country. Nevertheless, it still seems possible to restrain its progress. The temples, at least, which were once almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred rites, after a long intermission, are again revived; while there is a general demand for the victims, which till lately found very few purchasers. From all this it is easy to conjecture what numbers might be reclaimed if a general pardon were granted to those who shall repent of their error.

Trajan to Pliny, ib., Letter XCVIII.

You have adopted the right course, my dearest Secundus in investigating the charges against the Christians who were brought before you. It is not possible to lay down any general rule for all such cases. Do not go out of your way to look for them. If indeed they should be brought before you, and the crime is proved, they must be punished; with the restriction, however, that where the party denies he is a Christian, and shall make it evident that he is not, by invoking our gods, let him (notwithstanding any former suspicion) be pardoned upon his repentance. Anonymous informations ought not to be received in any sort of prosecution. It is introducing a very dangerous precedent, and is quite foreign to the spirit of our age.

QUESTIONS.

1. Of what violation of the Roman law were the Christians guilty? 2. Why should obstinacy be considered an offence? 3. What was implied in their refusal to worship the Emperor's image? 4. Why were associations of any sort so strictly forbidden in the Roman Empire? 5. Would the fact that the meetings of the Christians were held before daylight tend to allay suspicion concerning their object? 6. Would the fellowship with slaves and the filling of offices by them impress the Romans favorably? 7. What did Tacitus think of even freedmen who filled offices? (Germ., Ch. XXV., et passim.) 8. When Pliny says that the "superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has [even] spread its infection among the neighbouring villages and country," what light does this throw on the manner in which early Christianity spread? 9. What are we informed concerning the numbers and condition of the Christians in this province? 10. Were the Romans entirely destitute of a feeling of justice, even towards Christians?

Suetonius, Claudius, Ch. XXV.

* * He [Claudius] banished from Rome all the Jews, who were continually making disturbances at the instigation of one Chrestus. * * *

QUESTIONS.

1. Is Suetonius correctly informed as to the time of Christ's appearance upon earth? 2. As to the place? 3. Is Chrestus a permissible substitute for Christus, or is this another indication of Suetonius's ignorance?* 4. Does he not, in fact, confess complete ignorance concerning the personality of Christ? 5. Is Tacitus equally ill informed? 6. Does Suetonius make any distinction between Christians and Jews?

Tertullian, Ad Nationes, Ch. XI.

In this matter we are [said to be] guilty not merely of forsaking the religion of the community, but of introducing a monstrous superstition; for some among you have dreamed that our god is an ass's head,—an absurdity which Cornelius Tacitus first suggested. In the fourth [fifth] book of his *Histories*, where he is treating of the Jewish war, he begins his description

* NOTE. Tertullian, Apologeticus, Ch. III. But Christian, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned, is derived from anointing. Yes, and even when it is wrongly pronounced by you "Chrestianus" (for you do not even know accurately the name you hate), it comes from sweetness and benignity.

with the origin of that nation, and gives his own views respecting both the origin and the name of their religion. He states that the Jews, in their migration in the desert, when suffering for want of water, escaped by following for guides some wild asses, which they supposed to be going in quest of water after pasture, and that on this account the image of one of these animals was worshipped by the Jews. For this, I suppose, it was presumed that we, too, from our close connection with the Jewish religion, have ours consecrated under the same emblematic form. * * *

QUESTION.

1. Did the Romans always distinguish clearly between the Christians and the Jews?

Tertullian, Ad Nationes, Ch. IX.

If the Tiber has overflowed its banks, if the Nile has remained in its bed, if the sky has been still [i. e., if there has been no rain], or the earth been in commotion, if death has made its devastations, or famine its afflictions, your cry immediately is, This is the fault of the Christians! As if they who fear the true God could have to fear a light thing, or at least anything else [than an earthquake or famine, or such visitations]. I suppose it is as despisers of your gods that we call down on us these strokes of theirs. * * *

QUESTIONS.

1. Make it clear from the extracts below why the Christians were thought to be more offensive to the gods than any of the other numerous religious sects in Rome, some of which were exceedingly vicious and immoral. 2. Would you expect to find on further investigation that religion and morals were not closely connected in the Roman mind? (Lecky, European Morals, I., Ch. III.) 3. Can you conceive of the separation of the two? 4. Do you think it indicates a high or low stage of religious development, when the chief function of religion is to propitiate an angry deity.

III. WHAT THE CHRISTIANS THOUGHT OF THE ROMANS, AND HOW THE CHRISTIANS BROUGHT PERSECUTION UPON THEMSELVES.

Tertullian, De Spectaculis, Ch. XXX.

But what a spectacle is that fast-approaching advent of our Lord, now owned by all, now highly exalted,

now a triumphant One! What that exultation of the angelic hosts! what the glory of the rising saints! what the kingdom of the just thereafter! what the city of New Jerusalem! Yes, and there are other sights. that last day of judgment, with its everlasting issues; that day unlooked for by the nations, the theme of their derision, when the world, hoary with age, and all its many products, shall be consumed in one great flame! How vast a spectacle then bursts upon the eye! What there excites my admiration? what my derision? Which sight gives me joy? which rouses me to exultation?—as I see so many illustrious monarchs, whose reception into the heavens was publicly announced, groaning now in the lowest darkness with great Jove himself, and those, too, who bore witness of their exultation; governors of provinces, too, who persecuted the Christian name, in fires more fierce than those with which in the days of their pride they raged against the followers of Christ! What world's wise men besides, the very philosophers, in fact, who taught their followers that God had no concern in ought that is sublunary, and were wont to assure them that either they had no souls, or that they would never return to the bodies which at death they had left, now covered with shame before the poor deluded ones, as one fire consumes them! Poets also, trembling not before the judgment-seat of Rhadamanthus or Minos, but of the unexpected Christ! I shall have a better opportunity then of hearing the tragedians, louder-voiced in their own calamity; of viewing the play-actors, much more "dissolute" in the dissolving flame; of looking upon the charioteer, all glowing in his chariot of fire; of witnessing the wrestlers, not in their gymnasia, but tossing in the fiery billows; unless even then I shall not care to attend to such ministers of sin, in my eager wish rather to fix a gaze insatiable on those whose fury vented itself against the Lord.

* * *

QUESTIONS.

1. How must the Romans have relished this prediction of the downfall of the Empire? of the fate in store for their most illustrious emperors, their philosophers, poets, etc.? of the destruction of all that they held dear? 2. May it possibly have been something of this sort which Pliny extorted by torture from the two deaconesses, and which seemed to him a vicious, extravagant superstí-

tion? 3. Could it have seemed less vicious from the exultation with which this destruction was predicted? 4. Are these the words of a "hater of the human race?" 5. The fall of the Empire was predicted in much more direct terms. Was this treason?

Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, Ch. II.

We are worshippers of one God, of whose existence and character nature teaches all men; at whose lightenings you tremble, whose benefits minister to your happiness. You think that others, too, are gods; the same we know to be devils. * * *

Tertullian, On Idolatry, Ch. I.

The principal crime of the human race, the highest guilt charged upon the world, the whole procuring cause of judgment, is idolatry. For, although each single fault retains its own proper feature, although it is destined to judgment under its own proper name also, yet it is marked off under the [general] count of idolatry. * * *

QUESTIONS.

1. Is Tertullian of the opinion that all religious systems contain at least some truth, and may therefore be regarded with a tolerant eye, and may even be studied with profit? (He would admit this, I think, of Judaism.) 2. Does he try to minimize the differences between the Christians and the Pagans? 3. Was a compromise with Paganism possible?

Tertullian, On Idolatry, Ch. VIII.

There are also other species of very many arts which, although they extend not to the *making* of idols, yet, with the same criminality, *furnish the adjuncts* without which idols have no power. For it matters not whether you erect or equip; if you have embellished his temple, or altar, or niche, if you have pressed out gold-leaf, or have wrought his insignia, or even his house: work of that kind, which confers not *shape*, but *authority*, is more important. If the necessity of maintenance is urged so much, the arts have other species withal to afford means of livelihood, without outstepping the path of discipline, that is, without the confiction of an idol. The plasterer knows both how to mend roofs, and lay on stuccoes, and polish a cistern, and traces ogees, and draw in relief on

party-walls many other ornaments beside likenesses. The painter, too, and the marble-mason, and the bronze-worker, and every graver whatever, knows expansions of his own art, of course much easier of execution. For how much more easily does he who delineates a statue overlay a sideboard! How much sooner does he who carves a Mars out of a lime-tree, fasten together a chest! * * *

Ib., Ch. X.

Moreover, we must inquire likewise touching schoolmasters; nor only them, but also all other professors of literature. Nay, on the contrary, we must not doubt that they are in affinity with manifold idolatry: first, in that it is necessary for them to preach the gods of the nations, to express their names, genealogies, honourable distinctions, all and singular; further, to observe the solemnities and festivals of the same, as of them by whose means they compute their revenues. What schoolmaster, without a table of the seven idols, will yet frequent the Quinquatria? The very first payment of every pupil he consecrates both to the honour and to the name of Minerva. * * * New-year's gifts likewise must be caught at, and the Septimontium kept; and all the presents of Mid-winter and the feast of Dear Kinsmanship must be exacted; the schools must be wreathed with flowers; the flamen's wives and the aediles sacrifice; the school is honoured on the appointed holy-days. The same thing takes place on an idol's birthday; every pomp of the devil is frequented. * * *

QUESTIONS.

1. What sort of employments did Tertullian consider to be inconsistent with the Christian faith? 2. Why should no Christian be a schoolmaster?

Tertullian, De Corona, Ch. XI. and XII.

To begin with the real ground of the military crown, I think we must first inquire whether warfare is proper at all for Christians. What sense is there in discussing the merely accidental, when that on which it rests is to be condemned? Do we believe it lawful for a human oath to be superadded to one divine, and for a man to come under promise to another man after Christ, and to abjure father and mother and all nearest kinsfolk, whom

even the law has commanded us to honour and love next to God Himself, to whom the gospel, too, holding them only of less account than Christ, has in like manner rendered honour? Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? And shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? And shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger even of his own wrongs? Shall he, forsooth, either keep watch-service for others more than for Christ, or shall he do it on the Lord's day, when he does not even do it for Christ Himself? And shall he keep guard before the temples which he has renounced? And shall he take a meal where the apostles have forbidden him? [1 Cor. VIII. 10.] And shall he diligently protect by night those whom in the day-time he has put to flight by his exorcisms, leaning and resting on the spear the while with which Christ's side was pierced? Shall he carry a flag, too, hostile to Christ? And shall *he* ask a watchword from the emperor who has already received one from God? Shall *he* be disturbed in death by the trumpet of the trumpeter, who expects to be aroused by the angel's trump? And shall the Christian be burned according to camp rule, when he was not permitted to burn incense to an idol, when to him Christ remitted the punishment of fire? Then how many other offenses there are involved in the performance of camp offices, which we must hold to involve a transgression of God's law, you may see by a slight survey. * * * (Ch. XI.)

When military service again is crowned with olive, the idolatry has respect to Minerva, who is equally the goddess of arms—but got a crown of the tree referred to, because of the peace she made with Neptune. In these respects the superstition of the military garland will be everywhere defiled and all-defiling. And it is further defiled, I should think, also in the grounds of it. Lo! the yearly public pronouncing of vows; what does that bear on its face to be? It takes place first in the part of the camp where the general's tent is, and then in the temples. In addition to the places, observe the words also: "We vow that you, O Jupiter, will then have an ox with gold-decorated horns." What

does the utterance mean? Without a doubt, the denial [of Christ]. Albeit the Christian says nothing in these places with the mouth, he makes his response by having the crown on his head. The laurel is likewise commanded [to be used] at the distribution of the largess. So you see idolatry is not without its gain, selling, as it does, Christ for pieces of gold, as Judas did for pieces of silver. * * * (Ch. XII.)

Tertullian, On Idolatry. Ch. XVII.

Hence arose, very lately, a dispute whether a servant of God should take the administration of any dignity or power, if he be able, whether by some special grace, or by adroitness, to keep himself intact from every species of idolatry; after the example that both Joseph and Daniel, clean from idolatry, administered both dignity and power in the livery and purple of the prefecture of entire Egypt and Babylonia. And so let us grant that it is possible for any one to succeed in moving, in whatsoever office, under the mere *name* of the office, neither sacrificing nor lending his authority to sacrifices; not farming out victims; not assigning to others the care of the temples; not looking after their tributes; not giving spectacles at his own or the public charge, or presiding over the giving them; making proclamation or edict for no solemnity; not even taking oaths: moreover (what comes under the head of *power*), neither sitting in judgment on any one's life or character (for you might bear with his judging about *money*); neither condemning nor fore-condemning; binding no one, imprisoning or torturing no one—if it is credible that all this is possible.

QUESTIONS.

1. Did the Romans especially prize military and civic virtues? 2. Could the Roman Empire have been built up without them, and could it hope to withstand the barbarians if they were undermined? 3. Would the Romans be able to appreciate Tertullian's point of view? 4. Would they regard such words as treasonable? 5. How may his expressions be justified? 6. Were there no Christian soldiers, and no Christian magistrates?

Tertullian, To his Wife, Book II., Ch. IV.

But let her [a Christian woman who marries an un-

believer] see to [the question] how she discharges her duties to her husband. To the Lord, at all events, she is unable to give satisfaction according to the requirements of discipline; having at her side a servant of the devil, *his* lord's agent for hindering the pursuits and duties of believers: so that if a station is to be kept, the husband at daybreak makes an appointment with his wife to meet him at the baths; if there are fasts to be observed, the husband that same day holds a convivial banquet; if a charitable expedition has to be made, never is family business more urgent. For who would suffer his wife, for the sake of visiting the bretheren, to go round from street to street to other men's, and indeed to all the poorer, cottages? Who will willingly bear her being taken from his side by nocturnal convocations, if need so be? Who, finally, will without anxiety endure her absence all the night long at the paschal solemnities? Who will, without some suspicion of his own, dismiss her to attend that Lord's Supper which they defame? Who will suffer her to creep into prison to kiss a martyr's bonds? nay, truly, to meet any one of the bretheren to exchange the kiss? to offer water for the saints' feet? to snatch [somewhat for them] from her food, from her cup? to yearn [after them]? to have [them] in her mind? If a pilgrim brother arrive, what hospitality for him in an alien home? If bounty is to be distributed to any, the granaries, the storehouses, are foreclosed.

QUESTIONS.

1. Is it any wonder that these peculiarities of the Christians were misunderstood, and that hideous rumors were circulated? 2. Does Tertullian realize the probability of their being misunderstood? 3. Is he convinced that no intimate social intercourse is possible between Christian and Pagan? 4. Does he dwell upon these facts in sorrow or in defiance?

Tertullian, On Idolatry, Ch. XXII.

Equally, one who has been initiated into Christ will not endure to be blessed in the name of the gods of the nations, so as not always to reject the unclean benediction, and to cleanse it out for himself by converting it Godward. To be blessed in the name of the gods of the nations is to be cursed in the name of God. If I have

given an alms, or shown any other kindness, and the recipient pray that his gods, or the Genius of the colony, may be propitious to me, my oblation or act will immediately be an honour to idols, in whose name he returns me the favour of blessing. * * *

Ib., Ch. XXIII.

In borrowing money from heathens under pledged securities, [Christians] give a guarantee under oath, * * * Christ prescribes that there is to be no swearing. * * * Pray we the Lord that no necessity for that kind of contract may ever encompass us, * * * lest those denying letters * * * be brought forward against us in the day of judgment, sealed with the seals, not now of witnesses, but of angels!

QUESTIONS.

1. Must it have been difficult for a Christian to engage in business if sworn contracts were not permitted them? 2. Must these prohibitions have served to mark them off as an unsociable religious sect?

GENERAL QUESTIONS.

1. Make it clear how the peculiarities of the early Christians, if misunderstood, could give rise to the charges (1) of gross licentiousness, (2) of hating the human race, (3) of bringing down the wrath of the gods upon the city, 4) of treason. 2. Make it clear that there was an irrepressible conflict between the old and new ideals, and that there could be no co-operation between Pagan and Christian either in public or in private life. 3. Can the persecutions be palliated from this point of view? 4. Has a society the right to defend itself from dissolution, and did the Romans use the only means of defense the ancient world knew? 5. What traits had the Jews and Christians in common which would lead the Romans sometimes to confuse them? 6. What facts can you suggest to explain why the Christians were persecuted fiercely, while the Jews escaped almost entirely? 7. Illustrate as many of these facts as possible by passages drawn from New Testament literature.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH. D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 2. OCTOBER, 1898

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

TEUTONIC BARBARIANS

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

EUROPEAN HISTORY STUDIES.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

II. The Teutonic Barbarians.

Tacitus. A Treatise on the Situation, Manners, and Inhabitants of Germany. In Vol. II. of the Works of Tacitus. The Oxford Translation, revised. London, 1889.

OUR only sources of information concerning the life of Tacitus are references contained in his own works and in the letters of his friend, the younger Pliny. These furnish us, however, with by no means all the information we could desire. He was born about A.D. 54, and died some time after A.D. 117. We infer from his early and rapid political advancement and from his marriage with the daughter of Agricola, that he was of good family. He filled, among others, the distinguished offices of praetor and consul. In the years 89–93 he was absent from Rome, and it has been surmised that he spent the time in Germany; but this can not be proved. On the contrary, the best authorities are inclined to the view that he never visited that country.

How then did he get his information for the Germania? It is clear that his prominence in public life would enable him to obtain all the information which Rome could offer, accounts of returning soldiers and travelers, descriptions by Germans visiting Rome, and the like. But there was another source of information, which was probably his chief one. There existed at his time a considerable Roman litera-

ture on the early Germans, of which, with the exception of Tacitus, Caesar, and Paterculus, nothing of very great importance remains. This literature Tacitus must have known and used, so that the Germania presents a summary of all that centuries of warfare had taught the Romans about their northern neighbors.

There have been a number of theories advanced as to the purpose of Tacitus in writing the Germania. One of these is to the effect that the work was intended to be nothing more nor less than an elaborate satire on the corrupt condition of Rome. The student should bear this theory in mind in his examination of the work, and should try to come to a definite conclusion concerning it. For if Tacitus intended not to describe the Germans but only to lay it over the backs of the Romans, the tendency would be for him not only to paint the Germans in a too favorable light, but even to idealize them beyond recognition. Certain French political philosophers of the last century idealized our Indians until they became models of sweetness and light. That the Germania contains much satire the student will soon convince himself, and will be on his guard accordingly. But is this the main purpose of the work, or is it an incident? Has Tacitus only praise to bestow upon the Germans? Does he fail to paint their squalor and vices as vividly as he paints their virtues? If so, his description must be exceedingly treacherous material for the historian.

If the student satisfies himself that in the main Tacitus was a very well-informed and conscientious writer, whose object, in spite of

his constant side-thrusts at the corruptions of Rome, was to portray the Germans as he saw them, he will be confronted with the further problem, how to bridge over the gulf between the Germans as they existed in the mind of Tacitus and the Germans as they were in reality. It would be very surprising indeed if Tacitus made no mistakes; and, in fact, investigators have no difficulty in convicting him of inaccuracies in detail. How may the student detect these inaccuracies? How may he sift the true from the false? This process is so difficult in the case of the Germania that the beginner had better not attempt it. He had better treat this not as an exercise in the Determination of the Fact, but chiefly as an exercise in Interpretation. His subject will be the early Teutons *as described by Tacitus.* Whether the description corresponds in every case to the facts is another problem of historical investigation.

The interpretation of the Germania offers great difficulties. On account of certain defects of style, viz., extreme condensation and frequent obscurities, many of its passages are down-right riddles. One must, of course, use the original Latin in cases where it is necessary to draw fine distinctions, but for rough purposes the translation may be made to serve.

One of the methods which the investigators of the early Teutons are attempting to apply in the Determination of the Fact is the examination of the Germania in the light of facts furnished by the science of Comparative Ethnology. Although this method is far beyond the average student, he may get a faint idea of it by comparing the Germans as portrayed by Tacitus

with some other race or races in approximately the same state of development. The Homeric Greeks, as shown in European History Studies Vol. I., No. 1., and our own North American Indians before they fell under the blight of European civilization will serve this purpose admirably. I have inserted a few questions for the purpose of this comparison, but of course the teacher will consult his own pleasure about using them.

4. I concur in opinion with those who believe the Germans never to have intermarried with other nations; but to be a race, pure, unmixed, and stamped with a distinct character. Hence a family likeness pervades the whole, though their numbers are so great: eyes stern and blue; ruddy hair; large bodies, powerful in sudden exertions, but impatient of toil and labor, least of all capable of sustaining thirst and heat. Cold and hunger they are accustomed by their climate and soil to endure.

QUESTIONS.

1. Does this description of the physical characteristics of the Teutons hold good at the present day? 2. Is it clear to you why the ideal German of literature and the drama is blond? 3. Show from Tacitus' description of Teutonic agriculture (*infra*) that the numbers of the Teutons must have been very small as compared with those of the present day.

5. The land, though varied to a considerable extent in its aspect, is yet universally shagged with forests, or deformed by marshes: moister on the side of Gaul, more bleak on the side of Noricum and Pannonia. It is productive of grain, but unkindly to fruit-trees. It abounds in flocks and herds, but in general of a small breed. Even the beeve kind are destitute of their usual stateliness and dignity of head: they are, however, numerous, and form the most esteemed, and, indeed, the only species of wealth. Silver and gold the gods, I know not whether in their favor or anger, have denied to this country. Not that I would assert that no veins of these metals are generated in Germany; for

who has made the search? The possession of them is not coveted by these people as it is by us. Vessels of silver are indeed to be seen among them, which have been presented to their embassadors and chiefs; but they are held in no higher estimation than earthenware. The borderers, however, set a value on gold and silver for the purposes of commerce and have learned to distinguish several kinds of our coin, some of which they prefer to others: the remoter inhabitants continue the more simple and ancient usage of bartering commodities. The money preferred by the Germans is the old and well-known species, such as the *Serrati* and *Bigati*. They are also better pleased with silver than gold; not on account of any fondness for that metal, but because the smaller money is more convenient in their common and petty merchandise.

QUESTIONS.

1. Does Tacitus mention elsewhere other species of wealth than flocks and herds? 2. Find other instances where Tacitus offers slight contradictions to his own generalizations, showing that he did not intend them to be taken too literally. 3. Are flocks and herds usually the first species of wealth among primitive tribes? 4. Trace the derivation of the word pecuniary. 5. Did the North American Indians have flocks and herds before the coming of the whites? 6. Why not? 7. Is Germany to-day universally shagged with forests or deformed by marshes? * 8. What must have been the state of agriculture under such conditions? 9. Could there have been much commerce? 10. Can manufacturers thrive to any extent without commerce? 11. Must the Germans not have been, according to our standards, miserably poor?

6. Even iron is not plentiful among them, as may be inferred from the nature of their weapons. Swords or broad lances are seldom used; but they generally carry a spear (called in their language *framea*), which has an iron blade, short and narrow, but so sharp and manageable, that, as occasion requires, they employ it either in close or distant fighting. This spear and a

* The forests have been in large measure cleared and the marshes drained. This seems to have had a permanent effect upon the climate. The Romans made military expeditions by water which are now impossible, and philology teaches us that the trees in Germany at that time were those which require much moisture.

shield are all the armor of the cavalry. The foot, have, besides, missile weapons, several to each man, which they hurl to an immense distance. They are either naked, or lightly covered with a small mantle; and have no pride in equipage: their shields only are ornamented with the choicest colors. Few are provided with a coat of mail; and scarcely here and there one with a casque or helmet. Their horses are neither remarkable for beauty or swiftness, nor are they taught the various evolutions practiced with us. The cavalry either bear down straight forward, or wheel once to the right, in so compact a body that none is left behind the rest. Their principal strength, on the whole, consists in their infantry: hence in an engagement these are intermixed with the cavalry; so well accordant with the nature of equestrian combats is the agility of those foot soldiers, whom they select from the whole body of their youth, and place in front of the line. Their number, too, is determined; a hundred from each canton; and they are distinguished at home by a name expressive of this circumstance; so that what at first was only an appellation of number, becomes thenceforth a title of honor. Their line of battle is disposed in wedges. To give ground, provided they rally again, is considered rather as a prudent stratagem than cowardice. They carry off their slain even while the battle remains undecided. The greatest disgrace that can befall them is to have abandoned their shields. A person branded with this ignomy is not permitted to join in their religious rites, or enter their assemblies; so that many, after escaping from battle, have put an end to their infamy by the halter.

QUESTIONS.

1. Which is the truer indication of the stage of development of a race, its use of the precious metals or its use of iron? 2. Did the Homeric Greeks use iron? 3. Did the North American Indians? 4. What is the state of agriculture and manufactures where iron is unknown? 5. Describe the military organization of the Germans. 6. Did they win their battles principally by skillful tactics or by hard fighting? 7. Is an elaborately planned battle possible where the generals command less through the force of authority than of example? (Ch. 7.) 8. Were the Germans personally brave? 9. How did they treat cowardice and

desertion? (Ch. 12.) 10. Describe their equipment. 11. Had the Romans a very great advantage over them with regard to equipment? 12. With regard to discipline and strategy? 13. It has been urged that the occurrence of the word *framea* shows that Tacitus knew at least something of the German language, and therefore must have been in Germany to learn it. What do you think of this argument? 14. It has also been urged that some of Tacitus's descriptions are so vivid that he must have been an eye-witness of the scenes he describes. What do you think of this argument?

7. In the election of kings they have regard to birth; in that of generals, to valor. Their kings have not an absolute or unlimited power; and their generals command less through the force of authority than of example. If they are daring, adventurous, and conspicuous in action, they procure obedience from the admiration they inspire. None, however, but the priests are permitted to judge offenders, to inflict bonds or stripes; so that chastisement appears not as an act of military discipline, but as the instigation of the god whom they suppose present with warriors. They also carry with them to battle certain images and standards taken from the sacred groves. It is a principal incentive to their courage, that their squadrons and battalions are not formed by men fortuitously collected, but by the assemblage of families and clans. Their pledges also are near at hand; they have within hearing the yells of their women, and the cries of their children. These, too, are the most revered witnesses of each man's conduct, these his most liberal applauders. To their mothers and their wives they bring their wounds for relief, nor do these dread to count or to search out the gashes. The women also minister food and encouragement to those who are fighting.

8. Tradition relates that armies beginning to give way have been rallied by the females, through the earnestness of their supplications, the interposition of their bodies, and the pictures they have drawn of impending slavery, a calamity which these people bear with more patience for their women than themselves; so that those states who have been obliged to give among their hostages the daughters of noble families, are the most effectually bound to fidelity. They even suppose somewhat of sanctity and prescience to be inherent in the

female sex; and therefore neither despise their counsels, nor disregard their responses. * * *

QUESTIONS.

Reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt, is the first sentence. They choose the kings on the basis of, or according to the degree of nobility, the generals on the basis of, or according to the degree of valor. 1. Was the participation of the people an essential element in the choice of their kings? 2. Did they have reference *only* to birth in their choice? 3. If so, must not the instances in which they really exercised any influence, viz., where there were candidates of equally exalted birth, have been very rare indeed? 4. Was rank ignored entirely in the selection of generals?* 5. Were there gradations of rank in the German nobility? 6. Do you infer that all the tribes had kings? (Ch. 25 and 43.) 7. Had none of the kings absolute or unlimited power? (Ch. 44.) 8. Did the priests form a separate class in the community? 9. Did they exercise public authority? (Also Ch. 11.) 10. Is a high or a low position of women indicated here? 11. Do primitive tribes, for example, the North American Indians, have similar ideas about the sanctity and prescience of the female sex? 12. Was the freedom of the individual in German society in danger of being crushed as it was in the Roman Empire, by its political organization? 13. Why was it possible for society to continue to exist with so little display of authority?

9. Of the gods, Mercury is the principal object of their adoration; whom, on certain days, they think it lawful to propitiate even with human victims. * * * They conceive it unworthy the grandeur of celestial beings to confine their deities within walls, or to represent them under a human similitude: woods and groves are their temples; and they affix names of divinity to that secret power, which they behold with the eye of adoration alone.

QUESTIONS.

1. Did the Germans worship Roman gods, or did Tacitus use Roman names to indicate resemblances between the Roman and the German deities? 2. Can you suggest another reason why the Germans did not build temples? (Ch. 16.) 3. Has not Tacitus suggested an ideal rather than a real explanation?

*It has been noticed that Tacitus never mentions generals who were not of the nobility, and that where the leaders of the Germans are mentioned he usually gives the descent. Hence, it is thought that what he means to say is, that the most valiant among the nobility were chosen for this office.

11. On affairs of smaller moment, the chiefs consult; on those of greater importance, the whole community; yet with this circumstance, that what is referred to the decision of the people is first maturely discussed by the chiefs. They assemble, unless upon some sudden emergency, on stated days, either at the new or full moon, which they account the most auspicious season for beginning any enterprise. Nor do they, in their computation of time, reckon, like us, by the number of days, but of nights. In this way they arrange their business; in this way they fix their appointments; so that, with them, the night seems to lead the day. An inconvenience produced by their liberty is, that they do not all assemble at a stated time, as if it were in obedience to a command; but two or three days are lost in the delays of convening. When they all think fit, they sit down armed. Silence is proclaimed by the priests, who have on this occasion a coercive power. Then the king, or chief, and such others as are conspicuous for age, birth, military renown, or eloquence, are heard; and gain attention rather from their ability to persuade, than their authority to command. If a proposal displease, the assembly reject it by an inarticulate murmur; if it prove agreeable, they clash their javelins; for the most honorable expression of assent among them is the sound of arms.

12. Before this council, it is likewise allowed to exhibit accusations, and to prosecute capital offences. Punishments are varied according to the nature of the crime. Traitors and deserters are hung upon trees: cowards, dastards, and those guilty of unnatural practices, are suffocated in mud under a hurdle. This difference of punishment has in view the principle, that villainy should be exposed while it is punished, but turpitude concealed. The penalties annexed to slighter offences are also proportioned to the delinquency. The convicts are fined in horses and cattle: part of the mulct goes to the king or state; part to the injured person, or his relations. In the same assemblies chiefs are also elected, to administer justice through the cantons and districts. A hundred companions, chosen from the people, attend upon each of them, to assist them as well with their advice as their authority.

QUESTIONS.

1. Is this a general council of all the Germans, or merely of each separate tribe? 2. How often did it meet? 3. Describe its procedure. 4. Was there freedom of speech in it for every freeman? 5. What sort of questions were brought before it? 6. Was it consulted by the chiefs merely as a matter of form, or did it have a real voice in public affairs? 7. Was there any restriction upon its power? 8. What form of government does this constitute? 9. Was the German criminal code severe?

13. The Germans transact no business, public or private, without being armed: but it is not customary for any person to assume arms till the state has proved his ability to use them. Then, in the midst of the assembly, either one of the chiefs, or the father, or a relation, equips the youth with a shield and javelin. These are to them the manly gown; this is the first honor conferred on youth; before this they are considered as part of a household; afterward, of the state. The dignity of chieftain is bestowed even on mere lads* whose descent is eminently illustrious, or whose fathers have performed signal services to the public; they are associated, however, with those of mature strength, who have already been declared capable of service; nor do they blush to be seen in the ranks of companions. For the state of companionship itself has its several degrees, determined by the judgment of him whom they follow; and there is a great emulation among the companions, which shall possess the highest place in the favor of their chief; and among the chiefs, which shall excel in the number and valor of his companions. It is their dignity, their strength, to be always surrounded with a large body of select youth, an ornament in peace, a bulwark in war. And not in his own country alone, but among the neighboring states, the fame and glory

*This is incorrectly translated. The meaning is, The dignity conferred by the chieftain mentioned above, *i. e.*, the dignity of bearing arms, is bestowed, etc. As the translation stands, is it possible to reconcile this sentence with the first sentence of chapter 7? After a few experiences of this sort, the student will readily see that though translations may be very useful for the purpose of instruction, yet if one intends to make oneself an authority in any field, one must be able to read the original records, no matter in what language they may be written. Even with the original record before them, investigators frequently enough base a theory upon a passage imperfectly or quite falsely understood.

of each chief consists in being distinguished for the number and bravery of his companions. Such chiefs are courted by embassies; and often by their reputation alone decide a war.

14. In the field of battle, it is disgraceful for the chief to be surpassed in valor; it is disgraceful for the companions not to equal their chief; but it is reproach and infamy during a whole succeeding life to retreat from the field surviving him. To aid, to protect him; to place their own gallant actions to the account of his glory, is their first and most sacred engagement. The chiefs fight for victory; the companions for their chief. If their native country be long sunk in peace and inaction, many of the young nobles repair to some other state then engaged in war. For, besides that repose is unwelcome to their race, and toils and perils afford them a better opportunity of distinguishing themselves; they are unable, without war and violence, to maintain a large train of followers. The companion requires from the liberality of his chief, the warlike steed, the bloody and conquering spear; and in place of pay he expects to be supplied with a table, homely indeed, but plentiful. The funds for this munificence must be found in war and rapine; nor are they so easily persuaded to cultivate the earth, and await the produce of the seasons, as to challenge the foe, and expose themselves to wounds; nay, they even think it base and spiritless to earn by sweat what they might purchase with blood.

QUESTIONS.

1. What was the chief employment of the Germans? 2. What determined the age at which the youth became a citizen? 3. Did the Germans look with distrust upon a chief who surrounded himself with a powerful retinue of warriors? 4. Would this be tolerated now-a-days? 5. What was the tie which bound the companion to his chief? 6. Was it mutual gain? 7. Did this institution (called *comitatus*) assume great proportions in German public life? 8. Did the Germans look upon this as unworthy personal dependence upon another? The student should pay particular attention to the constitution of the *comitatus*, since he will come upon it again in studying the origin of the feudal system.

15. During the intervals of war, they pass their time less in hunting than in a sluggish repose, divided between sleep and the table. All the bravest of the warriors, committing the care of the house, the family

affairs, and the lands, to the women, old men, and weaker part of the domestics, stupefy themselves in inaction: so wonderful is the contrast presented by nature, that the same persons love indolence, and hate tranquillity! It is customary for the several states to present, by voluntary and individual contributions, cattle or grain to their chiefs; which are accepted as honorary gifts, while they serve as necessary supplies. They are peculiarly pleased with presents from neighboring nations, offered not only by individuals, but by the community at large; such as fine horses, heavy armor, rich housings, and gold chains. We have now taught them also to accept of money.

QUESTIONS.

1. Would it be difficult to illustrate nearly every statement in this and the next half dozen or more chapters by examples from North American tribes? 2. What members of the family do the work among races in this stage of development? 3. Did the wife exercise practical control in the German household? 4. Is this usual among primitive races? 5. Must the German chiefs been held in high esteem? 6. Does Tacitus anywhere mention compulsory taxation? 7. Does this indicate a high or a low state of political development? 8. Do you think life was on a very high plane among the early Teutons?

16. It is well known that none of the German nations inhabit cities, or even admit of contiguous settlement. They dwell scattered and separate, as a spring, a meadow, or a grove may chance to invite them. Their villages are laid out, not like ours, in rows of adjoining buildings; but every one surrounds his house with a vacant space, either by way of security against fire, or through ignorance of the art of building. For, indeed, they are unacquainted with the use of mortar and tiles; and for every purpose employ rude unshapen timber, fashioned with no regard to pleasing the eye. They bestow more than ordinary pains in coating certain parts of their buildings with a kind of earth, so pure and shining that it gives the appearance of painting. They also dig subterraneous caves, and cover them over with a great quantity of dung. These they use as winter-retreats, and granaries; for they preserve a moderate temperature; and upon an invasion, when

the open country is plundered, these recesses remain unviolated, either because the enemy is ignorant of them, or because he will not trouble himself with the search.

QUESTIONS.

1. Is the fact that the Germans had no cities important? 2. How could this influence the political organization? 3. What art of industrial development does it indicate? 4. Does not Tacitus picture the Germans in rather squalid surroundings?

17. The clothing common to all is a sagum fastened by a clasp, or, in want of that, a thorn. With no other covering, they pass whole days on the hearth, before the fire. The more wealthy are distinguished by a vest, not flowing loose, like those of the Sarmatians and Parthians, but girt close, and exhibiting the shape of every limb. They also wear the skin of beasts, which the people near the borders are less curious in selecting or preparing than the more remote inhabitants, who can not by commerce procure other clothing, These make choice of particular skins, which they variegate with spots, and strips of the furs of marine animals, the produce of the exterior ocean, and seas to us unknown. The dress of the women does not differ from that of the men; except that they more frequently wear linen, which they stain with purple; and do not lengthen their upper garment into sleeves, but leave exposed the whole arm, and part of the breast.

QUESTIONS.

1. Was there any commerce whatever between the German tribes? 2. Was there very much? 3. Wherever the principal object of clothing is protection and not ornament, as among the Eskimos, it is found that men and women dress nearly alike. Would this lead you to infer that the Germans did not dress finely? 4. Were there outward distinctions in wealth among them?

18. The matrimonial bond is, nevertheless, strict and severe among them; nor is there any thing in their manners more commendable than this. Almost singly among the barbarians, they content themselves with one wife; a very few of them excepted, who, not through incontinence, but because their alliance is so-

licited on account of their rank, practice polygamy. The wife does not bring a dowry to her husband, but receives one from him. The parents and relations assemble, and pass their approbation on the presents—presents not adapted to please a female taste, or decorate the bride; but oxen, a caparisoned steed, a shield, spear, and sword. By virtue of these the wife is espoused; and she in her turn makes a present of some arms to her husband. This they consider as the firmest bond of union; these, the sacred mysteries, the conjugal deities. That the woman may not think herself excused from exertions of fortitude, or exempt from the casualties of war, she is admonished by the very ceremonial of her marriage, that she comes to her husband as a partner in toils and dangers; to suffer and to dare equally with him, in peace and in war: this is indicated by the yoked oxen, the harnessed steed, the offered arms. Thus she is to live; thus to die. She receives what she is to return inviolate and honored to her children; what her daughters-in-law are to receive, and again transmit to her grandchildren.

QUESTIONS.

1. Was the German wife merely a servant and a household drudge, or was she also a companion to her husband? 2. Can such a position of women be maintained with widely prevalent polygamy? 3. Why should the husband rather than the wife find it necessary to bring a dowry? 4. Who contributed chiefly to the support of the family, the husband or the wife? (Ch. 15.) 5. Would this enable her to protest effectively against the husband's taking a second wife, even if he wanted to do so? 6. Do you infer from the second sentence that rank was held in high esteem among the Teutons? 7. Has not Tacitus the domestic life of the Romans quite as much in mind in this chapter as the domestic life of the Germans?

20. In every house the children grow up, thinly and meanly clad, to that bulk of body and limb which we behold with wonder. Every mother suckles her own children, and does not deliver them into the hands of servants and nurses. No indulgence distinguishes the young master from the slave. They lie together amidst the same cattle, upon the same ground, till age separates, and valor marks out, the freeborn.

21. It is an indispensable duty to adopt the enmities of a father or relation, as well as their friendships: these, however, are not irreconciliable or perpetual. Even homicide is atoned by a certain fine in cattle and sheep; and the whole family accepts the satisfaction, to the advantage of the public weal, since quarrels are most dangerous in a free state. No people are more addicted to social entertainments, or more liberal in the exercise of hospitality. To refuse any person whatever admittance under their roof, is accounted flagitious. Every one according to his ability feasts his guests: when his provisions are exhausted, he who was late the host, is now the guide and companion to another hospitable board. They enter the next house uninvited, and are received with equal cordiality. No one makes a distinction with respect to the rights of hospitality, between a stranger and an acquaintance. The departing guest is presented with whatever he may ask for; and with the same freedom a boon is desired in return. They are pleased with presents; but think no obligation incurred either when they give or receive.

QUESTIONS.

1. Had the Germans risen to the idea that crime is an offense against society as well as against the injured person? 2. At the present day can a murderer secure his release by making a present to the family of his victim? 3. Was the crime of more frequent occurrence then than now, and was it regarded with greater lenience? (also Ch. 22.) 4. Is profuse hospitality common among primitive races? Give example. 5. Can you explain why this should be so?

23. Their drink is a liquor prepared from barley or wheat brought by fermentation to a certain resemblance of wine. Those who border on the Rhine also purchase wine. Their food is simple; wild fruits, fresh venison, or coagulated milk. They satisfy hunger without seeking the elegances and delicacies of the table. Their thirst for liquor is not quenched with equal moderation. If their propensity to drunkenness be gratified to the extent of their wishes, intemperance proves as effectual in subduing them as the force of arms.

QUESTIONS.

1. Is this an attractive picture of our Teutonic ancestors? 2. Can Tacitus show the unattractive as well as the attractive sides of German life?

24. * * * What is extraordinary, they play at dice, when sober, as a serious business: and that with such a desperate venture of gain or loss, that, when everything else is gone, they set their liberties and persons on the last throw. The loser goes into voluntary servitude; and, though the youngest and strongest, patiently suffers himself to be bound and sold. Such is their obstinacy in a bad practice—they themselves call it honor. The slaves thus acquired are exchanged away in commerce, that the winner may get rid of the scandal of his victory.

25. The rest of their slaves have not, like ours, particular employments in the family allotted to them. Each is the master of a habitation and household of his own. The lord requires from him a certain quantity of grain, cattle, or cloth, as from a tenant; and so far only the subjection of the slave extends. His domestic offices are performed by his own wife and children. It is usual to scourge a slave, or punish him with chains or hard labor. They are sometimes killed by their masters; not through severity of chastisement, but in the heat of passion, like an enemy; with this difference, that it is done with impunity. Freedmen are little superior to slaves; seldom filling any important office in the family; never in the state, except in those tribes which are under regal government. There, they rise above the free-born, and even the nobles: in the rest, the subordinate condition of the freedmen is a proof of freedom.

QUESTIONS.

1. What four classes existed in German society? 2. Did Tacitus intend to designate by the word noble, merely those who were prominent in council or in wars or did he conceive of them as forming a class separate and distinct from the free-born? 3. Is the first sentence of chapter 25 consistent with the third and fourth sentences of chapter 20? 4. What peculiarity of Tacitus's style does this illustrate? 5. Had a slave any legal rights whatsoever? 6. Can you find a reference

which leaves one to suppose that the human sacrifices offered to the gods were slaves? 7. Were the slaves, like the land, property of the community, or of individual masters? 8. Did Tacitus think the slaves formed a very numerous class? (Ch. 5.) 9. Do you suppose they were white or black? Why? 10. Do you know any facts of Roman History which will explain why Tacitus detested freedmen? 11. Do you infer that some tribes were not under regal government? 12. If so, how do you understand sentences one and two, of chapter 7?

26. Lending money upon interest, and increasing it by usury, is unknown among them; and this ignorance more effectually prevents the practice than a prohibition would do. The lands are occupied by townships, in allotments proportional to the number of cultivators; and are afterwards parcelled out among the individuals of the district, in shares according to the rank and condition of each person. The wide extent of plain facilitates this partition. The arable lands are annually changed, and a part left fallow; nor do they attempt to make the most of the fertility and plenty of the soil, by their own industry in planting orchards, inclosing meadows, and watering gardens. Corn is the only product required from the earth: hence their year is not divided into so many seasons as ours; for, while they know and distinguish by name Winter, Spring, and Summer, they are unacquainted equally with the appellation and bounty of Autumn.

QUESTIONS

1. Do primitive tribes always occupy the land in common? Why? 2. What makes them abandon this system of ownership? 3. What must be the state of agriculture under community of ownership? 4. Had the Germans made any progress whatever in the knowledge of agriculture?

33. Contiguous to the Tencteri were formerly the Bructeri; but report now says that the Chamavi and Angrivarii, migrating into their country, have expelled and entirely extirpated them, with the concurrence of the neighboring nations, induced either by hatred of their arrogance, love of plunder, or the favor of the gods towards the Romans. For they even gratified us with the spectacle of a battle, in which above 60,000 Germans were slain, not by Roman arms, but, what was still grander, by mutual hostilities, as it were for

our pleasure and entertainment. May the nations retain and perpetuate, if not an affection for us, at least an animosity against each other! since, while the fate of the empire is thus urgent, fortune can bestow no higher benefit upon us, than the discord of our enemies.

37. * * * It was in the 640th year of Rome that the arms of the Cimbri were first heard of, under the consulate of Caecilius Metellus and Papirius Carbo; from which era to the second consulate of the Emperor Trajan is a period of nearly 210 years. So long has Germany withstood the arms of Rome. During this long interval many mutual wounds have been inflicted. Not the Samnite, the Carthaginian, Spain, Gaul, or Parthia, have given more frequent alarms; for the liberty of the Germans is more vigorous than the monarchy of the Arsacidae. What has the East, which has itself lost Pacorus, and suffered an overthrow from Ventidius, to boast against us, but the slaughter of Crassus? But the Germans, by the defeat or capture of Carbo, Cassius, Scaurnae Aurelius, Servilius Caepio, and Cneius Manlius, deprived the Roman people of five consular armies, and afterward took from Augustus himself Varus with three legions. Nor did Caius Marius in Italy, the deified Julius in Gaul, or Drusus, Nero, or Germanicus, in their own country, defeat them without loss. The subsequent mighty threats of Caligula terminated in ridicule. Then succeeded tranquillity; till, seizing the occasion of our discords and civil wars, they forced the winter-quarters of the legions, and even aimed at the possession of Gaul; and, again expelled thence, they have in latter times been rather triumphed over than vanquished.

QUESTIONS

1. From the dates given, can you determine when the Germania was written? 2. Did Tacitus regard the Germans as merely a source of annoyance and expense to the Empire or as a menace to its very existence? 3. What was the greatest weakness of the Germans in their struggle with Rome? 4. Do barbarians usually show this weakness when confronted with civilized peoples? Cite some familiar examples. 5. On the other hand, what advantage in warfare had the Germans as compared with modern barbarians?

40. * * * In an island * of the ocean stands a sacred and unviolated grove, in which is a consecrated chariot, covered with a vail, which the priest alone is permitted to touch. He becomes conscious of the entrance of the goddess into this secret recess; and with profound veneration attends the vehicle, which is drawn by yoked cows. At this season all is joy; and every place which the goddess deigns to visit is a scene of festivity. No wars are undertaken; arms are untouched; and every hostile weapon is shut up. Peace abroad and at home are then only known; then only loved; till at length the same priest reconducts the goddess, satiated with mortal intercourse, to her temple. The chariot, with its curtain, and, if we may believe it, the goddess herself, then undergo ablution in a secret lake. This office is performed by slaves, whom the same lake instantly swallows up. Hence proceeds a mysterious horror; and a holy ignorance of what can be, which is held only by those who are about to perish. This part of the Suevian nation extends to the most remote recesses of Germany.

QUESTIONS

1. What can you find to admire in the religious ideas of the Teutons? 2. Did they believe in one or in many gods? 3. Did they have idols?

GENERAL EXERCISES

1. Select some of the passages in which the satirical element of the Germania is most clearly and strikingly shown.
2. Make a careful comparison of the government of the early Germans with that of the Homeric Greeks.
3. Collect facts to show that the Germans cherished personal liberty to an extreme degree, even to the extent of imperiling public order.
4. What virtues did the Germans admire most, and what vices seemed to them the most detestable? Do you detect a change in the moral ideas of the Teutonic race since that time? Are the moral ideas of a race always changing more or less?
5. Make a careful statement of the position of German women in society, and, if you are able, compare it with the position of Roman women.
6. Make an accurate statement of the condition of German agriculture and commerce.

* This island is Alsen, which corresponds exactly to the description. No other island does.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH. D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 3. NOVEMBER, 1898

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

SELECTIONS FROM THE KORAN

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents
Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

Selections From the Koran

The Koran: commonly called the Alkoran of Mohammed. Translated into English from the original Arabic, to which is prefixed a preliminary discourse. By George Sale. London and New York. No date.

THE collection of the revelations of Mohammed known as the Koran, was not made until after Mohammed's death. The revelations came to him at frequent intervals, as as the occasion demanded, and were dictated to an amanuensis, who wrote them down on parchment, palm-leaves, stones, bones, or whatever came to hand. Some parts were kept only in the memory of certain persons. The fragments preserved in this disorder were not only soon in utter confusion, but were in danger of being altogether lost. To avert such a calamity, the successor of Mohammed, the Calif Abou-Bekr (632–634) decided to have the fragments collected. The task was committed to the young Zaid ibn-Thabit, who had formerly served as secretary to Mohammed. The edition was intended merely for the private use of the Calif and was not authoritative. But soon embarrassing differences in the reading of the Koran arose, and Othman, the third Calif (644–656), decided upon an authoritative collection. This also was intrusted to Zaid, and all other copies were then destroyed to prevent disputes.

We cannot say whether Zaid was successful in admitting only the genuine sayings of the prophet, but we do know that he arranged the fragments very badly. The arrangement of the parts into chapters seems to have been quite arbitrary, and the only principle on which the chapters were arranged seems to have been that of length, the longest coming first, though even this was not strictly adhered to. The result is extremely confusing and unsatisfactory. Revelations widely differing in time are brought side by side, and we are left to solve their numberless contradictions as best we may. If the fragments could be rearranged in chronological order, the later passages could be taken as abrogating those which went before, and these very contradictions would be of extreme value to us as showing how the idea of Mohammed's mission gradually took form in his mind. But as yet these attempts at rearrangement have had but indifferent success. A great deal of the value of the Koran is thus lost through its incoherence, and its perusal is made exceedingly wearisome.

Inasmuch as the Koran is a divine revelation, the Mohammedans assert, logically enough, that it is perfect, not only in content, but also in form. It is a masterpiece of literature, its language is of the purest, it is a miracle of perfection, and one has but to read a fragment of it to be convinced of its divine origin. European scholars have hitherto been inclined to accept this as the universal judgment of critics best qualified to judge, namely, the Mohammedans themselves. But a competent scholar assures us (Dozy in Langlois's Histoire du Moyen Age)

that as a work of literature the Koran falls far below the standard of contemporary Arabian works. Its language is impure, and offends even against rules of grammar. Its style is pompous, inflated, and often empty. Its imagery is commonplace, its endless repetitions are exasperating. In form, it presents a distinct retrogression from the Arabian classics. Dozy gives us to understand that this opinion is shared by Arabian philologians, but they dare not express their opinion openly.

It is evident that the Koran stands in need of the most searching external criticism, and that until this work has been done we must draw only the most general conclusions which may be justified by the work as a whole. As historians, however, we must not let its unattractive form blind us to its vast historical importance.

1. DECLARATION OF GOD'S UNITY

Say, God is one God; the eternal God: he begetteth not, neither is he begotten: and there is not any one like unto him. (Ch. CXII.)

Verily the unbelievers are addicted to pride and contention. How many generations have we destroyed before them; and they cried for mercy, but it was not a time to escape They wonder that a warner from among themselves hath come unto them. And the unbelievers said, This man is a sorcerer and a liar: doth he affirm the gods to be but one God? Surely this is a wonderful thing. And the chief men among them departed, saying to one another, Go, and persevere in the worship of your gods: verily this is the thing which is designed. We have not heard anything like this in the last religion this is no other than a false contrivance. (Ch. XXXVIII.)

QUESTIONS

1. Was the declaration of God's unity an innovation in Arabia? 2. Can the Christian doctrine of the Trin-

ity be reconciled with Mohammed's statement of God's unity? 3. Who is the speaker throughout the Koran, and to whom are its words addressed?

2. MISSION OF MOHAMMED

Remember * * when Jesus the son of Mary said, O children of Israel, verily I am the apostle of God sent unto you, confirming the law which was delivered before me, and bringing good tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, and whose name shall be Ahmed [Mohammed]. (Ch. LXI.)

We have not sent thee otherwise than unto mankind in general, a bearer of good tidings, and a denouncer of threats: but the greater part of men do not understand. (Ch. XXXIV.)

Mohammed is no more than an apostle; the other apostles have already deceased before him: if he die therefore, or be slain, will ye turn back on your heels? (Ch. III.)

Wherefore warn thy people; for thou [Mohammed] art a warner only: thou art not empowered to act with authority over them. (Ch. LXXXVIII.)

O true believers, when ye discourse privily together, discourse not of wickedness, and enmity, and disobedience towards the apostle, but discourse of justice and piety: and fear God, before whom ye shall be assembled. Verily the clandestine discourse of the infidels proceedeth from Satan, that he may grieve the true believers: but there shall be none to hurt them in the least, unless by permission of God; wherefore in God let the faithful trust. O true believers, when it is said unto you, Make room in the assembly; make room: God will grant you ample room in paradise. And when it is said unto you, Rise up; rise up: God will raise those of you who believe, and those to whom knowledge is given, to superior degrees of honor: and God is fully apprised of that which ye do. O true believers, when ye go to speak with the apostle, give alms previously to your discoursing with him: this will be better for you and more pure. But if he find not what to give, verily God will be gracious and merciful unto you. Do ye fear to give alms previously to your discoursing with the prophet, lest ye should impoverish yourselves? Therefore if ye do it not, and God is gracious unto you,

by dispensing with the said precept for the future, be constant at prayer, and pay the legal alms; and obey God and his apostle in all other matters: for God well knoweth that which ye do. (Ch. LVIII.)

Verily we have granted thee a manifest victory: that God forgive the thy preceding and thy subsequent sin, and may complete his favor on thee, and direct thee in the right way; and that God may assist thee with a glorious assistance. (Ch. XLVIII.)

We have sent no warner into any city but the inhabitants thereof who lived in affluence said, Verily we believe not that with which ye are sent. And those of Mecca also say, We abound in riches and children more than ye, and we shall not be punished hereafter. (Ch. XXXIV.)

And call to mind when the unbelievers plotted against thee, that they might either detain thee in bonds, or put thee to death, or expel thee the city; and they plotted against thee: but God laid a plot against them, and God is the best layer of plots. (Ch. VIII.)

QUESTIONS

1. What did Mohammed conceive to be the nature of his mission? 2. Was his message confined to the Arabians? 3. Do you find that his ideas changed on the subject of his mission? 4. What was Mohammed's conception of Christ's mission? 5. In what relation did he think Christ stood to him? 6. Is there any passage in the New Testament predicting the coming of Mohammed or of any other prophet? 7. Did Mohammed lay claim to a blameless character? 8. Were his revelations received without opposition? 9. What class was universally opposed to him? 10. What ceremonies did he prescribe? 11. Did he teach the existence of Satan?

3. ATTITUDE TOWARDS CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM

They are sure infidels, who say, Verily God is Christ the son of Mary; since Christ said, O children of Israel, serve God, my Lord and your Lord; whoever shall give a companion unto God, God shall exclude him from paradise, and his habitation shall be hell fire; and the ungodly shall have none to help them. They are certainly infidels, who say, God is the third of three: for there is no God besides one God; and if they refrain not from what they say, a painful torment shall surely be

inflicted on such of them as are unbelievers. Will they not therefore be turned unto God, and ask pardon of him? since God is gracious and merciful. Christ the son of Mary is no more than an apostle; other apostles have preceded him; and his mother was a woman of veracity: they both ate food. Behold, how we declare unto them the signs of God's unity; and then behold, how they turn aside from the truth. Say unto them, Will ye worship, besides God, that which can cause you neither harm nor profit? God is he who heareth and seeth. (Ch. V.)

And when God shall say unto Jesus, at the last day, O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto men, Take me and my mother for two gods, beside God? He shall answer, Praise be unto thee! it is not for me to say that which I ought not; if I had said so, thou wouldst surely have known it: thou knowest what is in me, but I know now what is in thee; for thou art the knower of secrets. I have not spoken to them any other than what thou didst command me; namely, Worship God, my Lord and your Lord: and I was a witness of their actions while I stayed among them; but since thou hast taken me to thyself, thou has been the watcher over them; for thou art witness of all things. If thou punish them, they are surely thy servants; and if thou forgive them, thou art might and wise. (Ch. V.)

Say, we believe in God, and that which hath been sent down unto us, and that which was sent down unto Abraham, and Ismael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and that which was delivered to Moses, and Jesus, and the prophets from their Lord; we make no distinction between any of them; and to him are we resigned. Whoever followeth any other religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him: and in the next life he shall be of those who perish. How shall God direct men who have become infidels after they had believed, and borne witness that the apostle was true, and manifest declarations of the divine will had come unto them? For God directeth not the ungodly people. Their reward shall be, that on them shall fall the curse of God, and of angels, and of all mankind: they shall remain under the same forever; their torment

shall not be mitigated, neither shall they be regarded; except those who repent after this and amend; for God is gracious and merciful. (Ch. III)

Therefore for that they [the Jews] have made void their covenant. and have not believed in the signs of God, and have slain the prophets unjustly. and have said, Our hearts are uncircumcised (but God hath sealed them up, because of their unbelief; therefore they shall not believe, except a few of them): and for that they have not believed on Jesus, and have spoken against Mary a grievous calumny: and have said, Verily we have slain Christ Jesus the son of Mary, the apostle of God: yet they slew him not, neither crucified him, but he was represented by one in his likeness. (Ch. IV.)

Thou shalt surely find the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers, to be the Jews and the idolaters: and thou shalt surely find those among them to be the most inclinable to entertain friendship for the true believers, who say, We are Christians. This cometh to pass, because there are priests and monks among them; and because they are not elated with pride. (Ch. V.)

The Jews say, Our hearts are uncircumcised: but God hath cursed them with their infidelity, therefore few shall believe. And when a book came unto them from God, confirming the scriptures which were with them, although they had before prayed for assistance against those who believed not, yet when that came unto them which they knew to be from God, they would not believe therein: therefore the curse of God shall be on the infidels. For a vile price have they sold their souls, that they should not believe in that which God hath sent down; out of envy, because God sendeth down his favors to such of his servants as he pleaseth: therefore they brought on themselves indignation on indignation; and the unbelievers shall suffer an ignominious punishment. When one sayeth unto them, Believe in that which God hath sent down; they answer, We believe in that which hath been sent down to us: and they reject that which hath been revealed since, although it be the truth, confirming that which is with them. Say, Why therefore have ye slain the prophets

of God in times past, if ye be true believers? Moses formerly came unto you with evident signs, but ye afterwards took the calf for your god and did wickedly. And when we accepted your covenant, and lifted the mountain of Sinai over you, saying, Receive the law which we have given you, with a resolution to perform it, and hear; they said, We have heard, and have rebelled: and they were made to drink down the calf into their hearts for their unbelief. Say, a grievous thing hath your faith commanded you, if ye be true believers. Say, if the future mansion with God be prepared peculiarly for you, exclusive of the rest of mankind, wish for death, if ye say truth: but they will never wish for it, because of that which their hands have sent before them; God knoweth the wicked doers; and thou shalt surely find them of all men the most covetous of life, even more than the idolaters: one of them would desire his life to be prolonged a thousand years, but none shall reprieve himself from punishment, that his life may be prolonged: God seeth that which they do. (Ch. II.)

QUESTIONS

1. Was it possible to obtain salvation without the acceptance the Koran? 2. Did Mohammed believe that Christ was crucified and rose again? 3. How can his different treatment of Christ and of the Christians be explained? 4. Would he have considered Tertullian to be an idolater? (First pamphlet). 5. What was the great charge which he brought against the Christians and the Jews? 6. Why did he dislike the Jews more than the Christians?

4. MIRACLES

And they say, We will by no means believe on thee, until thou cause a spring of water to gush forth for us out of the earth; or thou have a garden of palm-trees and vines, and thou cause rivers to spring forth from the midst thereof in abundance; or thou cause the heaven to fall down upon us, as thou hast given out, in pieces; or thou bring down God and the angels to vouch for thee; or thou have a house of gold; or thou ascend by a ladder to heaven: neither will we believe thy ascending thither alone, until thou cause a book to descend unto us, bearing witness of thee, which we may

read. Answer, My Lord be praised! Am I other than a man, sent as an apostle? And nothing hindereth men from believing, when a direction is come unto them, except that they say, Hath God sent a man for his apostle? (Ch. XVII.)

They have sworn by God, by the most solemn oath, that if a sign came unto them, they would certainly believe therein: Say, Verily signs are in the power of God alone; and he permitteth you not to understand that when they come, they will not believe. (Ch. VI.)

These are the signs of the book of the Koran: and that which hath been sent down unto thee from thy Lord is the truth; but the greater part of men will not believe. It is God who hath raised the heavens without visible pillars; and then ascended his throne, and compelled the sun and the moon to perform their services: every one of the heavenly bodies runneth an appointed course. He ordereth all things. He showeth his signs distinctly, that ye may be assured ye must meet your Lord at the last day. It is he who hath stretched forth the earth, and placed therein steadfast mountains, and rivers; and hath ordained therein of every fruit two different kinds. He causeth the night to cover the day. Herein are certain signs unto people who consider. And in the earth are tracts of land of different natures, though bordering on each other; and also vineyards, and seeds, and palm-trees springing several from the same root, and singly from distinct roots. They are watered with the same water, yet we render some of them more excellent than others to eat. Herein are surely signs unto people who understand. If thou dost wonder at the infidels denying the resurrection, surely wonderful is their saying. After we shall have been reduced to dust, shall we be restored in a new creature? These are they who believe not in their Lord; these shall have collars on their necks, and these shall be the inhabitants of hell fire: therein shall they abide forever. They will ask of thee to hasten evil rather than good: although they have already been example of divine vengeance before them. The Lord is surely endued with indulgence towards men, notwithstanding their iniquity; but the Lord is also severe in punishing. The infidels say,

Unless a sign be sent down unto him from his Lord, he will not believe. Thou art commissioned to be a preacher only, and not a worker of miracles: and unto every people hath a director been appointed. (Ch. XIII.)

On a certain day [the day of Judgment] shall God assemble the apostles and * * shall say, O Jesus son of Mary, remember my favor towards thee, and towards thy mother; when I strengthened thee with the holy spirit, that thou shouldst speak unto men in the cradle, and when thou wast grown up; and when I taught thee the scripture, and wisdom, and the law and the gospel; and when thou didst create of clay as it were the figure of a bird, by my permission, and didst breathe thereon, and it became a bird by my permission; and thou didst heal one blind from his birth and the leper, by my permission; and when thou didst bring forth the dead from their graves, by my permission; and when I withheld the children of Israel from killing thee, when thou hadst come unto them with evident miracles, and such of them as believed not, said, This is nothing but manifest sorcery. (Ch. V.)

QUESTIONS

1. Did Mohammed claim the power of miracles? 2. To what did he appeal instead? 3. Can you name any other great religion whose origin was not accompanied with miracles? 4. Did Mohammed deny the miracles of Christ? 5. Did he admit that Christ performed them of his own power? 6. Did Mohammed teach the resurrection of the body?

5. THE KORAN

Say, Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel (for he hath caused the Koran to descend on thy heart, by the permission of God, confirming that which was before revealed, a direction, and good tidings to the faithful); whosoever is an enemy to God, or his angels, or his apostles, or to Gabriel, or Michael, verily God is an enemy to the unbelievers. And now we have sent down unto thee evident signs, and none will disbelieve them but the evil-doers. (Ch. II.)

The unbelievers say, Unless the Koran be sent down unto him entire at once, we will not believe. But in this manner have we revealed it, that we might con-

firm thy heart thereby, and we have dictated it gradually, by distinct parcels. (Ch. XXV.)

When our evident signs are recited unto them, they who hope not to meet us at the resurrection, say, Bring a different Koran from this; or make some change therein. Answer it is not fit for me, that I should change it at my pleasure: I follow that only which is revealed unto me. Verily I fear, if I should be disobedient unto my Lord, the punishment of the great day, Say, If God had so pleased, I had not read it unto you, neither had I taught you the same. I have already dwelt among you to the age of forty years, before I received it. Do ye not therefore understand? And who is more unjust than he who deviseth a lie against God, or accuseth his signs of falsehood? Surely the wicked shall not prosper. (Ch. X.)

This Koran could not have been composed by any except God; but it is a confirmation of that which was revealed before it, and an explanation of the scripture; there is no doubt thereof; sent down from the Lord of all creatures. Will they say, Mohammed hath forged it? Answer, Bring therefore a chapter like unto it; and call whom ye may to your assistance, besides God, if ye speak truth. But they have charged that with falsehood, the knowledge whereof they do not comprehend, neither had the interpretation thereof come unto them. In the same manner did those who were before them, accuse their prophets of imposture; but behold what was the end of the unjust. (Ch. X.)

The Koran is not a new invention; but a confirmation of those scriptures which have been revealed before it, and a distinct explication of everything necessary, either in respect to faith or practice, and a direction and mercy unto people who believe. (Ch. XIII.)

Thus have we sent down the book of the Koran unto thee: and they unto whom we have given the former scriptures, believe therein: and of these Arabians also there is who believeth therein: and none reject our signs except the obstinate infidels. Thou couldst not read any book before this; neither couldst thou write it with thy right hand: then had the gainsayers justly doubted of the divine original thereof. (Ch. XXIX.)

Say, O men, Verily I am the messenger of God unto

you all: unto him belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth; there is no God but he; he giveth life, and he causeth to die. Believe therefore in God and his apostle, the illiterate prophet, who believeth in God and his word; and follow him, that ye may be rightly directed. (Ch. VII.)

QUESTIONS

1. In what manner did God reveal the Koran to Mohammed? 2. At what age did Mohammed receive his first revelation? 3. What is his proof that these are divine revelations? 4. What bearing does his illiteracy have on his argument? 5. Where is the fallacy in the argument? 6. Is disbelief in the Koran a sin? 7. What was supposed to be its relation to the other sacred writings?

6. SOME RELIGIOUS AND MORAL CONCEPTIONS

On that day the heaven shall be shaken, and shall reel; and the mountains shall walk and pass away. And on that day woe be unto those who accused God's apostles of imposture; who amused themselves in wading in vain disputes! On that day shall they be driven and thrust into the fire of hell; and it shall be said unto them, This is the fire which ye denied as a fiction. Is this a magic illusion? Or do ye not see? Enter the same to be scorched: whether ye bear your torments patiently, or impatiently, it will be equal unto you: ye shall surely receive the reward of that which ye have wrought. But the pious shall dwell amidst gardens and pleasures; delighting themselves in what the Lord shall have given them: and the Lord shall deliver them from the pains of hell. (Ch. LII.)

Hath the news of the overwhelming day of judgment reached thee? The countenances of some, on that day, shall be cast down; laboring and toiling: they shall be cast into scorching fire to be broiled: they shall be given to drink of a boiling fountain: they shall have no food, but of dry thorns and thistles; which shall not fatten, neither shall they satisfy hunger. But the countenances of others, on that day, shall be joyful; well pleased with their past endeavor: they shall be placed in a lofty garden, wherein thou shalt hear no vain discourse: therein shall be a running fountain: therein shall be raised beds, and goblets placed before

them, and cushions laid in order, and carpets ready spread. (Ch. LXXXVIII.)

But as for those who believe, and do good works, and humble themselves before their Lord, they shall be the inhabitants of paradise; they shall remain therein forever. (Ch. XI.)

Say, O men, verily I am only a public preacher unto you. And they who believe and do good works, shall obtain forgiveness and an honorable provision (Ch. XXII.)

Regularly perform thy prayer at the declension of the sun, at the first darkness of the night, and the prayer of daybreak; for the prayer of daybreak is borne witness unto by the angels. And watch some part of the night in the same exercise, as a work of supererogation for thee; peradventure thy Lord will raise thee to an honorable station. (Ch. XVII.)

And whomsoever God shall please to direct, he will open his breast to receive the faith of Islam: but whomsoever he shall please to lead into error, he will render his breast straight and narrow, as though he were climbing up to heaven [i.e., as though he were attempting something impossible. Knowledge of the truth is to him equally impossible.] (Ch. VI.)

And whoso judgeth not according to what God hath revealed, they are infidels. We have therein commanded them, that they should give life for life, and eye for eye, and nose for nose, and ear for ear, and tooth for tooth; and that wounds should also be punished by retaliation: but whoso should remit it as alms, it should be accepted as an atonement for him. (Ch. V.)

Whatever things are given you, they are the provision of this present life: but the reward which is with God is better and more durable, for those who believe and put their trust in their Lord; and who avoid heinous and filthy crimes, and when they are angry, forgive; and who hearken unto their Lord, and are constant at prayer, and whose affairs are directed by consultation among themselves, and who give alms out of what we have bestowed on them; and who, when an injury is done them, avenge themselves (and the retaliation of evil ought to be an evil proportionate thereto): but he who forgiveth, and is reconciled unto his enemy,

shall receive his reward from God; for he loveth not the unjust doers. And whoso shall avenge himself, after he hath been injured; as to these it is not lawful to punish them for it: but it is only lawful to punish those who wrong men, and act insolently in the earth, against justice; these shall suffer a grievous punishment. And whoso beareth injuries patiently, and forgiveth; verily this is a necessary work. (Ch. XLII.)

Whoever shall take a vengeance equal to the injury which hath been done him, and shall afterwards be unjustly treated: verily God will assist him: for God is merciful and ready to forgive. (Ch. XXII.)

When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them; and bind them in bonds: and either give them a free dismission afterwards, or exact a ransom; until the war shall have laid down its arms. This shall ye do: Verily if God pleased, he could take vengeance on them, without your assistance; but he commandeth you to fight his battles, that he may prove the one of you by the other. And as to those who fight in defense of God's true religion, God will not suffer their works to perish: he will guide them, and will dispose their heart aright; and he will lead them into paradise, of which he hath told them. O true believers, if ye assist God, by fighting for his religion, he will assist you against your enemies; and will set your feet fast: but as for the infidels, let them perish and their works shall God render vain. This shall befall them, because they have rejected with abhorrence that which God hath revealed: wherefore their works shall become of no avail. (Ch. XLVII.)

QUESTIONS

1. Did Mohammed teach the immortality of the soul? 2. What virtue does he dwell most upon? 3. Is there any justice in punishing for disbelief those whom God has denied the power of believing? 4. Was there a strain of fatalism in his belief?

GENERAL EXERCISES

1. Make an accurate statement of Mohammed's attitude towards Christ and the Christians. Of his attitude towards the Jews

2. Cite passages which indicate his indebtedness to these earlier religions. Does he deny his indebtedness to them? Does he appear to have taken more from the Christians or from the Jews.

3. Compare, so far as you are able, his moral teachings with those of Christianity.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH. D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 4. DECEMBER, 1898

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

CHIVALRY AND THE MODE OF WARFARE

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents
Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

Chivalry and the Mode of Warfare

Froissart, Sir John: Chronicles of England, France, Spain, and the adjoining countries, from the latter part of the reign of Edward II. to the coronation of Henry IV. Translated from the French by Thomas Johnes, Esq. New York, 1884.

I HAVE chosen the inimitable story-teller Froissart to illustrate the medieval mode of warfare, notwithstanding the fact that he comes at the end of the Middle Ages, and the events he describes mark the decline of this method of fighting. The medieval knight never recovered his prestige after the battles of Creçy and Poitiers. Nevertheless, the old military structure, though undermined, was still standing, and is clearly described in Froissart's pages. No one was ever more steeped in the spirit of Chivalry than he, and no better type of the feudal host could be desired than the French at Creçy.

Froissart was born about the year 1337, at Valenciennes, and died at Chimay, about the year 1410. He was educated for the Church, but from his youth his mind was filled more with the lighter things of life, with dances and tourneys, with amours and brave deeds of arms. His naive delight in these things led him to spend a large part of his life traveling through the principal countries of Europe, with an insatiable and vagabond curiosity for everything pertaining to Chivalry. He was an entertaining person and knew how to ingratiate himself

with princes and knights, and to draw their experiences from them. On hearing a good tale he did not neglect immediately "to write all down, whether it was late or early, that posterity might have the advantage of it, for there is nothing like writing for the preservation of events." (III., Ch. VIII.) In this manner he collected the materials for his Chronicles. He has himself described briefly how it was done.

"Now, you that read, or shall read this history, consider in your own minds, how I could have known and collected such facts as I treat of, and of so many different parties. In truth, I must inform you that I began at the early age of twenty years, and came into the world at the time these events were passing, in the knowledge of which I have always taken greater pleasure than in anything else. God has been so gracious to me, that I was well with all parties, and of the household of kings; more especially of King Edward, and of the noble queen his lady, Madam Philippa of Hainault, queen of England, lady of Ireland and Aquitaine, to whom in my youth I was secretary and amused her with handsome ditties and madrigals of love; and through affection to the service of that noble and puissant lady to whom I belonged, all the other great lords, dukes, earls, barons, and knights, of whatever nation they might be, loved me, saw me with pleasure, and were of the greatest utility to me. Thus under the protection of this good lady, and at her costs, as well as at the expenses of great lords, I have searched in my time the greater part of Christendom (in truth who seeks will find;) and wherever I came, I make inquiry after those ancient knights and squires who had been present at these deeds of arms, and who were well enabled to speak of them. I sought also for heralds of good repute, to verify and confirm what I might have heard elsewhere of these matters. In this manner have I collected the materials for this noble history: . . and as long as through God's grace I shall live, I shall continue it, for the more I work at it, the greater pleasure I receive."

Froissart has left more than one version of certain parts of his Chronicles, and the differences between these versions show clearly that he is merely a chronicler, and is not a critical historian. "Froissart never attempts to examine evidence; his later editions are not improved and corrected editions of the earlier, but simply 'other accounts.' Each is but a well-written reproduction of the story told by the men around him."

I have included among these extracts from Froissart an account of the knighting of the German Emperor, William of Holland, by the Medieval chronicler John of Beka, translated from Albert Richter's Quellenbuch für den Unterricht in der deutschen Geschichte. Leipzig, 1893. The account of the tourney of Ploermel is taken from W. J. Ashley's Edward III. and his Wars, London, 1887, in the series, English History by contemporary writers. It is not to be found in Johnes' translation.

1. THE KNIGHTING OF WILLIAM IV., EMPEROR OF GERMANY, 1247

Inasmuch as this youth was still only an esquire at the time of his election, preparations were hastened that he might be made knight before his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle, according to the custom of the Christian Emperors. When all had been made ready, the King of Bohemia presented the candidate William to the ambassador of Pope Innocent IV., Petrus Capuzius, after the reading of the gospel in the church at Cologne, with these words: "We present this chosen esquire, venerable father, most humbly begging thy paternal favor to receive his solemn oath, to the end that he may be worthily received into our order of knighthood."

The Cardinal, arrayed in priestly robes, addressed the candidate, and, playing upon the letters of the Latin word *miles* (which signifies knight), said: "Whoever

would be a knight must be high-minded, noble, rich, distinguished and spirited; *high-minded in adversity, noble in ancestry, rich in integrity, distinguished in conduct, and spirited in manly virtues. Before taking the oath, listen with careful meditation to the demands of the knightly order. Its rules are, above all to hear mass daily in humble remembrance of Christ's passion, to risk life boldly for the Faith, to shield the Holy Church and her servants from violence, to protect widows and orphans in need, to avoid unrighteous war, to refuse unrighteous service and corrupt rewards, to do wager of battle for the innocent, to tourney only for the sake of knightly skill, to obey the Roman Emperor with all reverence, to do no injury to the imperial domains, to alienate in no manner a feudal estate of the King or the Emperor, and to walk innocently in the sight of God and men. If thou obeyest humbly the commandments of the knightly order, and fullfilest them so far as in thy power lies, so wilt thou win temporal honor upon earth, and eternal rest in heaven."

Thereupon the Cardinal placed the folded hands of the esquire upon the missal and the gospel and said, "Wilt thou receive the honor of knighthood humbly before God, and follow its rules according to thy power?" The esquire answered, "I will."

Thereupon the Cardinal handed to the esquire the following oath, who read it aloud to all present. "I, William, Count of Holland, free vassal of the Holy Empire, solemnly promise to observe the rules of knighthood, in the presence of Peter, Cardinal and Legate from the papal throne, by the holy gospel upon which my hand rests." Then the Cardinal said: "This humble promise shall give thee true remission of thy sins. Amen."

After these things had been said, the King of Bohemia gave the esquire a mighty stroke on the neck and said: "I make thee knight to the honor of the Almighty God, and receive thee with felicitations into our brotherhood; but remember how before Annas the high priest the Savior of the World was smitten for thee-how before Pilate he was reviled and scourged and

*The Latin words are *magnanimus, ingenuus, largifluus, egregius* and *strenuus*. Their initial letters form the word *miles*.

crowned with thorns, how before Herod he was clothed in a mantle and mocked, and how before all people he was nailed upon the cross. I beg of thee to remember this shame; I council thee to bear this cross; I exhort thee to revenge this death."

After the ceremony and mass had been read, the new knight jousted three times against the son of the King of Bohemia, amidst the loud sounds of trumpets and of drums, and then fought a mock battle with gleaming swords. A costly festival of three days followed, and those present received rich gifts. (Translated from Richter's Quellenbuch, No. 52.)

QUESTIONS

1. Was the order of knighthood held in high esteem? 2. In what did knightly service consist? 3. What seems to you the significance of the religious character of the ceremony and the oath? 4. Why should the knights tourney only for the sake of knightly skill? 5. What parts of the oath show that the oath varied somewhat according to locality? 6. Do people of the present day still find the knightly ideal of conduct an attractive one? Answer by references to modern literature.

2. THE TOURNEY OF PLOERMEL, 1351

In this same season there took place in Brittany a very great deed of arms that ought never to be forgotten, but rather ought to be put forward to encourage all young squires, and to give them an example. And that you may the better understand the matter you must know that there were wars continually between the parties of the two ladies Joan of Montfort and Joan of Blois, because that the lord Charles of Blois was imprisoned. And the parties of these same ladies warred on each other by means of their garrisons, which kept themselves within their castles and their strong towns both on the one side and on the other.

It chanced one day that the lord Robert of Beaumanoir, a right valiant knight of the most high lineage in Brittany, who was seneschal of the castle which has to name the castle Josselin, and who had with him a goodly company of men-of-arms of his own lineage and others who were mercenaries, came before the town and the castle of Ploërmel. Its captain was a man named Bramborough, and he had with him a

great company of mercenaries, German, English, and Breton, who were of the party of the countess of Montfort. And this same lord Robert with his company an before the barriers, and would gladly have seen those within sally forth, but not one stirred. When sir Robert saw this, he approached yet a little nearer and called to the captain. And he came before the gate to speak with the said sir Robert, on the safe assurance on the one hand and on the other.

"Bramborough," said sir Robert, "are there no men of arms within your walls, either you or other two or three, who would joust with lances against other three on our party for the love of their friends?"

Bramborough answered and said, "Their friends would never wish that they should be evilly killed in a single joust, for that would be a chance of fortune too soon over, and would win the name of foolhardiness and folly, rather than bring them renown. But I will tell you what we will do, an it please you. You shall take twenty or thirty of your companions from your garrison, and I will take as many from mine. And let us go to a fair field, where none shall hinder or trouble us, and command our companions, on pain of hanging, on the one side and on the other, and also all those who stand and watch us, that none shall give aid or comfort to any of the combatants. And there straitly in that place let us prove ourselves and do such things that in the time to come men shall speak of us in halls and in palaces, in public places and in all other parts of the world. And let the renown and the good-luck be to those to whom God shall award it. . .

When the day came Bramborough's thirty companions heard mass; then armed themselves and went to the place where the battle was to be, and there alighted on foot; and they straitly forbade all those who were there that they should come between them for whatever chance or peril they might see befall to their companions. And thus likewise did the thirty companions of the lord Robert of Beaumanoir. And these thirty companions, that we call the English, awaited for a great space those others that we call the French. When the thirty Frenchmen were come, they alighted from their horses and gave to their followers the same commandment that the Eng-

lish knights had given. Each side agreed that five of them should remain on horseback at the entrance of the place, and that the other twenty-five should alight. And when they were each before the other, the whole sixty held parley together for a short space; then they drew back on the one side and on the other, and made all their followers withdraw to a greater distance. Then one of them made a sign, and forthwith they ran forward, and fiercely they fought in the press, and nobly they succoured each the other, where they saw their companions in great straits. . .

And of the Frenchmen there were slain four, and of the Englishmen two. Thus they rested on both sides for a long space, and drank wine that was brought to them in bottles, rebuckled their disordered armor, and dressed their wounds. When they were thus refreshed, the first party which arose made a sign and called on the other. Then began as before a sore and fierce battle which lasted a long while. They fought with the short swords of Bordeaux, strong and sharp, and with lances and daggers, and others with axes, and they gave each other marvellous great blows, and one and all threw themselves into the battle, and smote each other without sparing. You may well believe they did right noble deeds of arms for man, body to body, and hand to hand. There has never been heard tell of such deeds for this hundred years past. Thus they fought together like good champions, and maintained this second encounter right valiantly, but finally the English were worsted. For thus have I heard it related how that one of the Frenchmen who was on horseback broke and scattered them so fiercely that Bramborough, their captain, and eight of their companions were there slain; and the others yielded themselves prisoners when they saw how their defence would not aid them, for they could not and would not fly. And the same lord Robert and his companions who were yet alive took them, and led them to the castle Josselin as their prisoners, and afterward put them to ransom courteously when that they were all cured of their hurts; for there were none who were not sore wounded, Frenchmen no less than Englishmen.

And since that time I have seen sitting at the table

of Charles king of France a Breton knight, sir Evan of Charuel who had been there; and he had his face so cut about and hacked that it plainly showed how that the encounter had been nobly fought. And in many places was this adventure related and recorded, and some thought it prowess and others foolhardiness. (I., Ch. CCCXXXV. VII.)

QUESTIONS

1. The great struggle between England and France was continued in this local manner, notwithstanding the truce between the French and English kings. What characteristic of the feudal system of government does this illustrate? 2. Do you see any similarity between this tourney and the old wager of battle, which was an appeal to the judgment of God? 3. Did Froissart look upon it as an instance of divine justice or as a noble feat of arms? 4. How did the knights regard it? 5. What did the world say about it? 6. Did the knight love fighting for its own sake? 7. Did they care for their reputations? 8. Why did Sir Robert run before the barriers with his company? 9. Could the knights place implicit confidence upon each other's word? 10. Could they be depended to fight according to rule, and to take no mean advantage? 11. How did they treat their captives? 12. Did they always treat those not belonging to the knightly order with the same consideration? (other extracts) 13. What weapons did the knights use? 14. How did Froissart learn of this tourney? 15. Even if we were to assume that he is misinformed as to details, what value would the account still have for us?

3. CONDUCT OF A CAMPAIGN

a. Edward III., in Normandy, 1346

He then held another council respecting the order of march, and determined to divide the army into three battalions; one of which should advance on his right, following the sea-coast, and another on his left; and he himself, with the prince his son, and the main body, in the centre. Every night, the marshal's battalion was to retire to the quarters of the king. They thus began their march, as they had resolved upon: those who were on board the fleet coasted the shores, and took every vessel, great and small, they met with. Both the armies of sea and land went forward, until they came to a strong town, called Barfleur, which they soon gained; the inhabitants having surrendered

immediately, for fear of losing their lives: but that did not prevent the town from being pillaged and robbed of gold, silver, and everything precious that could be found therein. There was so much wealth, that the boys of the army set no value upon gowns trimmed with fur. . . . In this manner did they plunder and burn a great many towns in that country: and acquired so much riches that it would have been difficult to have counted their wealth. . . . Sir Godfrey, as marshal, advanced before the king, with the vanguard of five hundred armed men and two thousand archers, and rode on for six or seven leagues' distance from the main army, burning and destroying the country. They found it rich and plentiful, abounding in all things: the barns full of every sort of corn, and the houses with riches: the inhabitants at their ease, having cars, carts, horses, swine, sheep, and everything in abundance which the country afforded. They seized whatever they chose of all these good things, and brought them to the king's army; but the soldiers did not give any account to their officers, or to those appointed by the king, of the gold and silver they took, which they kept to themselves. In this manner did sir Godfrey, every day, proceed to the left of the king's army; and each night returned, with his party, to the place where he knew the king intended fixing his quarters. Sometimes, when he found great plenty of forage and booty, he was two or three days before he returned. The king, therefore, with his army and baggage, advanced toward St. Lo, in Coutantin; but, before he arrived there, he took up his quarters on the banks of the river, to wait for the return of that part of his army which he had sent along the sea-coast. When they were come back, with all their booty safely packed in wagons, the earl of Warwick, the earl of Suffolk, the lord Thomas Holland, and the lord Reginald Cobham, took their march, with their battalion, on the right, burning and destroying the country in the same way that sir Godfrey de Harcourt was doing. The king marched, with the main body, between these two battalions and every night they encamped together. (I., Ch. CXXI.)

b. The Black Prince in Central France, 1356

The king [of France] gave orders for all the towns in Anjou, Poitou, Maine and Touraine, to be well garrisoned and provided with all things, especially those on the borders, by which it was hoped the English would pass, that they might be enclosed, and cut off from any subsistence for themselves and horses. In spite of this, however, the prince who had with him two thousand men-at-arms and six thousand archers, rode on at his ease, and collected everywhere provisions in plenty. They found the country of Auvergne, which they had entered and overrun, very rich, and all things in great abundance; but they would not stop there, as they were desirous of combating their enemies. They burnt and destroyed all the countries they passed through, and when they entered any town which was well provisioned, they rested there some days to refresh themselves, and at their departure destroyed what remained, staving the heads of wine casks that were full, burning the wheat and oats, so that their enemies could not save anything. They kept advancing, and found plenty everywhere; for the countries of Berry, Poitou, Touraine and Maine are very rich, and full of forage for men-at-arms.

The English advanced so far that they came to the good city of Bourges, where there was a great skirmish at one of the gates. Two knights, the lord de Cousant and the lord Hutin de Memelles, had charge of the city. Many gallant deeds were performed; but the English left it without doing any damage, and went to Issodun, where there was a strong castle. They attacked it very briskly, with their whole army, but they could not gain it; for the governor and the knights who were with him too valiantly defended themselves. The English therefore passed on, and came to a large town and castle: the town, being weakly fortified and badly defended, was taken by storm. They found there great plenty of wines and other provisions, and remained three days to repose themselves. News was brought there to the prince of Wales, that the king of France was in the city of Chartres, with a very large army, and that all the passes and towns on that side of the Loire were secured, and so well guarded no one could cross the river. The

prince had held a council, when it was resolved he should set out on his return to Bordeaux, whence he had come, through Touraine and Poitou, and destroy all the country as he passed. They began their retreat after they had all done their pleasure with the town; and this day they gained the castle, and slew the greater part whom they found in it. (I., Ch. CLVI.)

QUESTIONS

1. What was Edward's object in dividing his army on the march? 2. What were Edward III. and the Black Prince trying to do in these campaigns? What was their military objective? 3. Did they find it possible to take cities and castles which were properly fortified and bravely defended? Why not? 4. Do you see a connection between the practical impregnability of the cities and castles and the apparent aimlessness of their campaigns? 5. What did they do with a conquered city or castle? Did they leave a garrison in it to control the surrounding country? 6. Did knightly honor prevent the robbing and murdering of inoffensive peasants and citizens?

4. THE BATTLE OF CREÇY, 1346

a. The English Order of Battle

The king of England, as I have mentioned before, encamped this Friday on the plain: for he found the country abounding in provisions; but, if they should have failed, he had plenty in the carriages which attended on him. The army set about furbishing and repairing their armor; and the king gave a supper that evening to the earls and barons of his army, where they made good cheer. On their taking leave, the king remained alone, with the lords of his bed-chamber: he retired into his oratory, and, falling on his knees before the altar, prayed to God, that, if he should combat his enemies on the morrow, he might come off with honor. About midnight he went to bed; and, rising early the next day, he and the prince of Wales heard mass, and communicated. The greater part of his army did the same, confessed, and made proper preparations. After mass, the king ordered his men to arm themselves, and assemble on the ground he had before fixed on. He had enclosed a large park near a wood, on the rear of his army, in which he placed all his baggage-wagons and horses; and this park had but one entrance: his men-at-arms and archers remained on foot.

The king afterwards ordered, through his constable and his two marshals, that the army should be divided into three battalions. In the first, he placed the young prince of Wales, and with him the earls of Warwick and Oxford, sir Godfrey de Harcourt, the lord Reginald Cobham, lord Thomas Holland, lord Stafford, lord Mauley, the lord Delaware, sir John Chandos, lord Bartholomew Burgherst, lord Robert Neville, lord Thomas Clifford, the lord Bourchier, the lord Latimer, and many other knights and squires whom I cannot name. There might be, in this first division, about eight hundred men-at-arms, two thousand archers, and a thousand Welshmen. They advanced in regular order to their ground, each lord under his banner and pennon, and in the centre of his men. In the second battalion were the earl of Northampton, the earl of Arundel, the lords Roos, Willoughby, Bassett, Saint Albans, sir Lewis Tufton, lord Multon, the lord Lascels, and many others; amounting, in the whole, to about eight hundred men-at-arms, and twelve hundred archers. The third battalion was commanded by the king, and was composed of about seven hundred men-at-arms, and two thousand archers.

The king then mounted a small palfrey, having a white wand in his hand, and attended by his two marshals on each side of him: he rode a foot's pace through all the ranks, encouraging and entreating the army, that they would guard his honor and defend his right. He spoke this so sweetly, and with such a cheerful countenance, that all who had been dispirited were directly comforted by seeing and hearing him. When he had thus visited all the battalions, it was near ten o'clock; he retired to his own division, and ordered them all to eat heartily, and drink a glass after. They ate and drank at their ease; and, having packed up pots, barrels, &c., in the carts, they returned to their battalions, according to the marshals' orders, and seated themselves on the ground, placing their helmets and bows before them, that they might be the fresher when their enemies should arrive. (I., Ch. CXXVII.)

QUESTIONS

1. Did the feudal armies pay for what they took while passing through a hostile country? 2. What was the

relative numbers of knights and archers in the English army? 3. Cite facts which indicate that Edward III. was a skillful commander. 4. What was his idea in dismounting his men-at-arms? 5. Was the plan successful? 6. What do you find in the demeanor of the English that presages victory? 7. Draw a diagram of the English order of battle.

b. The French in Disorder

That same Saturday, the king of France rose betimes, and heard mass in the monastery of St. Peter's in Abbeville, where he was lodged: having ordered his army to do the same, he left that town after sunrise. When he had marched about two leagues from Abbeville, and was approaching the enemy, he was advised to form his army in order of battle, and to let those on foot march forward, that they might not be trampled on by the horses. The king, upon this, sent off four knights, the lord Moyne of Bastleberg, the lord of Noyers, the lord of Beaujeu, and the lord of Aubigny, who rode so near to the English that they could clearly distinguish their position. The English plainly perceived they were come to reconnoitre them: however, they took no notice of it, but suffered them to return unmolested. When the king of France saw them coming back, he halted his army; and the knights, pushing through the crowds, came near the king, who said to them, "My lords, what news?" They looked at each other, without opening their mouths: for neither chose to speak first. At last, the king addressing himself to the lord Moyne, who was attached to the king of Bohemia, and had performed very many gallant deeds, so that he was esteemed one of the most valiant knights in Christendom. The lord Moyne said, "Sir, I will speak, since it pleases you to order me, but under the correction of my companions. We have advanced far enough to reconnoitre your enemies. Know, then, that they are drawn up in three battalions, and are waiting for you. I would advise, for my part, (submitting, however, to better counsel,) that you halt your army here, and quarter them for the night; for before the rear shall come up, and the army be properly drawn out, it will be very late, your men will be tired and in disorder, while they will find your enemies fresh and properly arrayed. On the morrow, you may draw up

you army more at ease, and may reconnoitre at leisure on what part it will be most advantageous to begin the attack; for, be assured they will wait for you." The king commanded that it should so be done: and the two marshals rode, one toward the front, and the other to the rear, crying out, "Halt banners, in the name of God and St. Denis." Those that were in the front halted; but those behind said they would not halt, until they were as forward as the front. When the front perceived the rear pressing on, they pushed forward; and neither the king nor the marshals could stop them, but they marched without any order until they came in sight of their enemies. As soon as the foremost rank saw them, they fell back at once, in great disorder, which alarmed those in the rear, who thought they had been fighting. There was then space and room enough for them to have passed forward, had they been willing to do so; some did so, but others remained shy. All the roads between Abbeville and Crecy were covered with common people, who, when they were come within three leagues of their enemies, drew their swords, bawling out, "Kill, kill;" and with them were many great lords that were eager to make show of their courage. There is no man, unless he had been present, that can imagine, or describe truly, the confusion of that day; especially the bad management and disorder of the French, whose troops were out of number. What I know and shall relate in this book, I have learnt chiefly from the English, who had well observed the confusion they were in, and from those attached to sir John of Hainault, who was always near the person of the king of France. (I., Ch. CXXVIII.)

QUESTIONS

1. Did the French king show any skill in arranging for the attack at Crecy? 2. Why did not the French knights halt when commanded to do so? 3. Did the French King choose either the time or the manner of attack? 4. Was a carefully planned battle possible with such ill-disciplined troops? 5. What was there in the organization of the feudal army which made strict discipline very difficult? (next pamphlet). 6. Compare the conduct of the English and French knights and their method of fighting. 7. Which of the two armies was more national in its composition? 8. Have you

found other mention in these extracts to mercenary troops? 9. Was Froissart an eye witness of these events?

c. *The Defeat of the Fr nch*

The English, who were drawn up in three divisions, and seated on the ground, on seeing their enemies advance, rose undauntedly up, and fell into their ranks. That of the prince was the first to do so whose archers were formed in the manner of a portcullis, or harrow, and the men-at-arms in the rear. The earls of Northampton and Arundel, who commanded the second division, had posted themselves in good order on his wing, to assist and succor the prince, if necessary.

You must know, that these kings, earls, barons and lords of France, did not advance in any regular order, but one after the other, or any way most pleasing to themselves. As soon as the king of France came in sight of the English, his blood began to boil, and he cried out to his marshals, "Order the Genoese forward, and begin the battle, in the name of God and St. Denis. There were about fifteen thousand Genoese cross-bowmen; but they were quite fatigued, having marched on foot that day six leagues, completely armed and with their cross-bows They told the constable, they were not in a fit condition to do any great things that day in battle. The earl of Alencon hearing this, said, "This is what one gets by employing such scoundrels, who fall off when there is any need for them." During this time a heavy rain fell, accompanied by thunder and a very terrible eclipse of the sun; and before this rain a great flight of crows hovered in the air over all those battalions, making a loud noise. Shortly afterwards it cleared up, and the sun shone very bright; but the Frenchmen had it in their faces, and the English in their backs. When the Genoese were somewhat in order, and approached the English, they set up a loud shout, in order to frighten them; but they remained quite still, and did not seem to attend to it. Then they set up a second shout, and advanced a little forward; but the English never moved.

Then they hooted a third time, advancing with their cross-bows presented, and began to shoot. The English archers then advanced one step forward, and shot

their arrows with such force and quickness, that it seemed as if it snowed. When the Genoese felt these arrows, which pierced their arms, heads, and through their armor, some of them cut the strings of their cross-bows, others flung them on the ground, and all turned about and retreated quite discomfited. The French had a large body of men-at-arms on horseback, richly dressed, to support the Genoese. The king of France, seeing them thus fall back, cried out, "Kill me those scoundrels; for they stop up their road, without any reason." You would then have seen the above-mentioned men-at-arms lay about them, killing all they could of these runaways.

The English continued shooting as vigorously and quickly as before; some of their arrows fell among the horsemen, who were sumptuously equipped, and, killing and wounding many, made them caper and fall among the Genoese, so that they were in such confusion they could never rally again. In the English army there were some Cornish and Welshmen on foot, who had armed themselves with large knives: these advancing through the ranks of the men-at-arms and archers, who made way for them, came upon the French when they were in this danger, and, falling upon earls, barons, knights and squires, slew many, at which the king of England was afterwards much exasperated. The valiant king of Bohemia was slain there. . . .

This battle, which was fought on the Saturday between la Broyes and Creçy, was very murderous and cruel; and many gallant deeds of arms were performed that were never known. Toward evening, many knights and squires of the French had lost their masters: they wandered up and down the plain, attacking the English in small parties: they were soon destroyed; for the English had determined that day to give no quarter, or hear of ransom from any one.

Early in the day, some French, Germans, and Savoyards, had broken through the archers of the prince's battalion, and had engaged with the men-at-arms; upon which the second battalion came to his aid, and it was time, for otherwise he would have been hard pressed. . . . (Ch. CXXIX.)

When, on the Saturday night, the English heard no

more hooting or shouting, nor any more crying out to particular lords or their banners, they looked upon the field as their own, and their enemies as beaten. They made great fires, and lighted torches because of the obscurity of the night. King Edward then came down from his post, who all that day had not put on his helmet, and, with his whole battalion advanced to the prince of Wales, whom he embraced in his arms and kissed, and said, "Sweet son, God give you good perseverence: you are my son, for most loyally have you acquitted yourself this day: you are worthy to be a sovereign." The prince bowed down very low, and humbled himself, giving all the honor to the king his father. The English, during the night, made frequent thanksgivings to the Lord, for the happy issue of the day, and without rioting; for the king had forbidden all riot or noise. (Ch. CXXX.)

QUESTIONS

1. Explain the manner in which the English archers and men-at-arms supported each other. 2. Did the knights despise and maltreat the archers? 3. Which did the most execution against the French, the knights or archers? 4. Would it be correct to say that the battle was won by the archers alone? 5. Was the chief strength of the French army in its infantry or in its cavalry? 6. How did the French employ their infantry? 7. Did the knights despise the infantry? 9. Did knightly honor permit such deeds as the murder of the cross-bowmen? 10. Which was a more typical feudal army, the English or the French? 11. Make it clear that the day of the mailed horseman, with his jousts and tourneys, was going fast. 12. Why was Edward III. exasperated at his footmen for slaying the French knights?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What are the distinctive features of medieval as compared with modern warfare?
2. Point out some of the admirable qualities of chivalry. Wherein does the knightly ideal seem to us inadequate?
3. What part did castles and fortified cities play in medieval warfare?
4. Characterize briefly the state of medieval military science as illustrated by these extracts, noting (*a*) the conduct of a campaign, (*b*) the conduct of a battle.
5. What sort of military skill was shown in the Tourney of Ploërmel?

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH.D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 5. JANUARY, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

FEUDALISM

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH.D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

Selections Illustrating Feudalism

Zeller B. et Luchaire A. Les premiers Capétiens, Paris, 1883. Les Capétiens du XII e siècle, Louis VI et Louis VII, Paris, 1882. In L' histoire de France racontée par les contemporains.

Recueil Général des anciennes lois françaises depuis l'an 420 jusqu'a la révolution de 1789. Vol. II. Paris, no date.

THE famous statesman and abbot Suger (1081–1151), friend and counsellor of two successive kings of France, was educated at St. Denis, where he was probably the intimate companion of the young prince Louis, later Louis VI., or Louis the Fat. He was of humble origin and had to struggle against the disadvantages of a puny body and ill health, but he rose to be the confidant of the abbot Adam of St. Denis, and in 1122 was elected his successor. Suger was the chief adviser of Louis the Fat in his struggle against the independence of the feudal nobility, and on Louis VII.'s departure for the second crusade was made sole regent during the royal absence. Shortly after the death of Louis the Fat in 1137, Suger wrote the panegyric, the History of Louis the Fat, from which three of the following selections are taken.

It has long been disputed whether the collection of laws known as the Etablissements of St. Louis is really what it has been assumed to be, *i. e.*, the official promulgation by that prince of a

legal code. The researches of the last editor of the Establissements, M. Paul Viollet, have made it clear that it is not such an official code, but simply a private compilation by some one for the purposes of instruction, a text book. M. Viollet's penetrating criticism has established the following facts: (1) Chapters 1–9 of Book I. are copied from a regulation concerning the provostship of Paris and from a royal ordinance; (2) chapters 10–175 of Book I. are copied from a collection of the customs of Anjou; (3) Book II. is largely copied from a collection of the customs of Orléanais; (4) the compilation was very probably made after the octave of All Saints, 1272, since three references are made to a decision of Philip the Bold in Parliament on that day, and it must have been finished before June 19, 1273, the date of one of the manuscripts.

The History of the Normans by Guillaume de Jumiège, from which the account of the peasants' revolt is taken, the first peasants' revolt of the Middle Ages, was written in the twelfth century and covers the period from 851 to 1137. The early part of the work is based upon other writers, notably Dudo, Dean of St. Quentin, whose record of the tenth century is that of a contemporary and very important. (Zeller and Luchaire.)

1. LOUIS THE FAT TAKES PRISONER HUGH THE YOUNGER, LORD OF PUISET, 1111

As delicious fruit preserves its fragrant savor when the tree is transplanted or its branches grafted, so iniquity and vice, which should everywhere be rooted out, are transmitted, like the taste for bitter absinthe, through a long line of evil men to the last of their de-

scendants. Thus it was with that outcast, Hugh of Puiset, rich in his own iniquity and the iniquity of his forefathers. Having received the fief of Puiset from his uncle Guy (his father, most arrogant of men, had taken arms at the beginning of the Crusade), he ceased not, like a hateful offspring, to imitate his father in all kinds of malice; but those whom his father had torn with whips, he, more cruel still, destroyed with the stings of scorpions. Exulting at having escaped punishment for his inhuman cruelties against the poor of the churches and monastaries, he advanced to that point in the path of crime where those who follow it can no longer continue, but must fall.

Having regard neither for the King of the Nations nor for the King of the French, he attacked the very noble Countess of Chartres and her son Thibaut, who was distinguished as well for his beauty as for his military valor, ravaged their lands as far as Chartres, pillaging and burning. The noble Countess and her son sought revenge as best they could, but they had waited a little too long, and had not sufficient forces. They could scarcely venture nearer than eight or ten miles of Puiset. Hugh's audacity and arrogant power had reached such a pitch, that, though he had few friends, he had many supporters. Many hastened to his defence who secretly longed for his downfall. He was much less loved than feared.

The said Count Thibaut soon perceived that he could accomplish little alone against his enemy, but much with the aid of the King. Accordingly, he sought him, with his noble mother, who had ever shown herself devoted to the royal house, and pressed him most earnestly for aid, reminding him that Thibaut's family merited this favor by its numerous services to the royal house, and calling to his memory some of the misdeeds of Hugh, of Hugh's father, grandfather and ancestors. "Recall, my lord King," said Thibaut, "how ill suited to the royal dignity was the affront and shame inflicted by the ancestor of Hugh upon your father Philip, who, in seeking to avenge all the injuries he had received, was ignominiously driven out of Puiset, his army pursued in disorder as far as Orleans by a factious coalition of Hugh's relations as evil as Hugh himself,

how the Count of Nevers, Lancelin of Beaugency and nearly one hundred knights were taken prisoner, and how (unparalled infamy!) some of the bishops were even thrown into a vile prison." Continuing his charge, Thibaut explained to the King the true origin of this Castle of Puiset, how it had been built by the Queen Constance in the heart of the territory of St. Denis for its protection, how afterwards the castle had been usurped, leaving only to the King these outrages which he had been forced to endure. He added that now the men of Chartres, Blois and Châteaudun, whom Hugh was in the habit of calling to his aid, were now disposed not only to remain neutral, but even to turn against him, so that it would be easy for the King to destroy the castle and despoil the lord of Puiset if he chose, thus avenging the outrages against Thibaut and his own father Philip. But if he refused to punish the outrages which not only he himself but also those who had merited well of him had endured, he must at least look upon the oppression of the Churches as his own, and put an end to this pillage of the poor, this molestation of widows and orphans, and all the misdeeds of Hugh against the lands of the martyred saints and their cultivators.

The King, moved by these and other exhortations, appointed a day for Thibaut to present these matters to us, and we assembled at Melun. There came together many archbishops, bishops, clerks and monks who accused Hugh, this ravishing wolf who devoured their lands, and throwing themselves at the feet of the King (who bad them rise), prayed him to punish this insatiable brigand, to snatch from the mouth of this dragon the pretends in Beauce, lands rich in wheat, which the liberality of the King had assigned to the servants of God, to free the estates of the priests from the yoke of this cruel Pharaoh, to liberate the possessions of God, whose vicar he was, whose image he bore. The King heard their complaints with an overflowing heart. The prelates of the Church, the Archbishop of Sens, the Bishop of Orleans, and the venerable Yves of Chartres, whom Puiset had imprisoned and in spite of his protests thrown violently into a dungeon, these all returned to their duties. Then on the favorable advice of the

abbot Adam, my predecessor of happy memory, he sent me to Toury in Beauce, over which I was given command. This domain of the blessed Denis, rich and fertile in grain, was not fortified in any manner. While the King cited Hugh to appear at his court to answer these charges, he ordered me to watch over the city, to furnish it with as large a garrison as possible of royal and abbatial troops, and to prevent Hugh from coming there and burning the country: for the King proposed to gather troops here and there, following the example of his father, and then proceed to attack the castle.

In a short time I succeeded through divine assistance in collecting a large troop of men-at-arms and footmen. Hugh having in the meanwhile lost his case by default, the king joined us at Toury with a considerable force and summoned the rebel to surrender the castle of which he had been deprived by royal sentence. He refused. The king immediately ordered his men-at-arms and foot soldiers forward to begin the assault upon the castle. All his numerous engines, arrows, swords and shields, in a word, war itself was hurled against the culprit. It would have caused you the greatest astonishment had you seen the shower of arrows fall upon the two armies, striking sparks upon the glistening helmets, piercing and shattering the shields under a shower of blows. What a spectacle would this have offered to your astonished gaze! The enemy was driven at the very first from the great gate leading to the interior of the castle, but then fought our men from the tops of the ramparts, raining down a horrible shower of missles, scarcely to be borne by the most daring, throwing down beams and logs, until we were well nigh brought to a standstill, though not entirely so. On the other hand, the King's knights fought valiantly with all the vigor of body and soul. When their shields were broken they used any board, plank or beam they could find to protect themselves and to force the gates. Some of our carts brought a large quantity of dry wood, which we mixed with grease, to burn out this den of wolves (for they were all excommunicated and true sons of the devil!) and placed against the gates with the purpose of kindling a fire that could not be put out, and at the same time protecting our men who were behind the

piles of wood. While this dangerous struggle was going on, one side trying to kindle the fire, the other to put it out, Count Thibaut, full of resentment at the injuries he had endured, attacked the castle from the side which looks towards Chartres. A large number of horse and footmen went with him. He incited his men to mount the steep sides of the moat, but soon moaned at the sight of them retiring and even tumbling back. He had intended them to creep softly, keeping close to the ground, but almost immediately he saw them fall and lie prostrate below. He tried to recognize those who had been killed by the fall, or crushed by falling stones. Then some knights of the castle on fast horses, who were making a tour of the castle for its defence, fell upon them unawares, killed and mutilated them, and threw to the bottom of the moat those whom they had wounded.

Already the falling arms and sinking knees foretold the failure of the assault, when the strong arm and omnipotence of Almighty God, wishing to take upon Himself the execution of so great and just a vengeance revived the courage and the sturdy faith of a shaven priest who had come with the communicants of some parishes of the French country. He made possible it for him to do, against all human expectation, what the Count and his men-at-arms had found to be impossible. This priest, with bare head and with no protection save a frail board, mounted rapidly until he had reached the palisade. Here he screened himself behind some trees which hid him from the openings in the castle and began to tear down the palisade, piece by piece. Delighted at his easy success, he signaled to the King's men, who were hesitating below and doing nothing, to come to his help. At sight of this unarmed priest bravely destroying the palisade, they sprang to join him, with their arms in their hands, and with their axes and weapons of iron, broke down the obstruction. It was as though it were the walls of another Jericho which fell, for at the same time the gates were at last broken down and the King's and the Count's troops poured into the enclosure. A large number of the besieged, caught between two fires, were quickly taken and delivered over to punishment. The others, among

them Hugh, seeing that the interior wall of the castle was no longer a sufficient protection, retired to the highest wooden tower, built upon the mound. But terrified by the menacing blows of his pursuers, he soon surrendered. He was placed in irons and kept prisoner in his own house, where he confessed with sorrow what adversities followed in the train of pride. After the victory, the King led away his noble captives, worthy prey of royal majesty, and gave orders that all the material of the castle, with its treasures, should be sold at auction and that the castle itself, except the keep, should be burned. (Suger.)

2. SECOND WAR AGAINST HUGH OF PUISET, WHO BESIEGES TOURY. SUGER SUCCEEDS IN ENTERING THE TOWN, 1112

At so great a distance, I had no other means of knowing whether the castle still held out, except by watching constantly whether its three-storied tower still appeared on the horizon, because our enemy would certainly burn this as soon as they got possession. I could not persuade any of the men whom I had gathered together to follow me thither, because the enemy held the entire country and was devastating it with his brigands. But the less numerous one's party is, the less likely it is to be observed. At the setting of the sun, when our enemies, who had been waging the assault all day, were forced by fatigue to relinquish the attack, I mingled in their ranks as one of them, until espying a favorable moment, I darted, not without peril, for the middle gate, which one of the guardians of the rampart had happily opened at a sign from me. In this manner, by God's aid, I succeeded in entering the castle. (Suger.)

QUESTIONS

1. Had the fiefs become hereditary in France by the twelfth century? 2. How did some of them originate? 3. Do you find anything peculiar in the arguments Thibaut uses before the King? 4. Did the clergy sometimes hold their lands on feudal tenure? 5. Did they sometimes have troops at their command? 6. Did the clergy take part freely in secular affairs? 7. Can you explain why the clergy were the most valuable councilors of the Kings during the Middle Ages? 8. Did they have much influence over Louis the Fat? 9. Was his

confidence in them justified? 10. Were they jealous of their rights? 11. Why did the Medieval Church usually, as it did in this case, support the Kings against the barons? 12. Why were these private wars so oppressive to the peasants? 13. Since the King appears as the protector of the poor, why did not the lower classes elsewhere rise to support him? 14. Did the Church urge upon the King the duty of defending the poor? 15. How did the writer get his information of these events? 16. Do you look upon this as an impartial account of the quarrel between Louis the Fat and Hugh of Puiset? 17. Does the writer betray a clerical bias throughout? (Cite passages.) 18. What traits of character does he admire most in a King?

3. HOW A FEUDAL ARMY WAS ASSEMBLED

When a baron calls upon his provosts to assemble all his vassals, in obedience to a proclamation from the king, the prevots should conduct his vassals to him from each place in his jurisdiction, and then return to their homes. Women, bakers, millers and those who have the care of ovens and mills do not owe any services of ban or arriere-ban. If any one who has been summoned fails to come, he shall be fined 60 sous. The prevot of the baron should then conduct all the men from the jurisdiction of the baron to the court of the prevot of the king, and then return home. It is in this manner that all the feudal men of the castle owe the barons service of arriere-ban, and the prevots of the vavasseur bring them to the castle of the baron at his first summons. The baron must not summon them to a place so distant that they could not return the same day. If he does so, they may refuse to accompany him, without fear of punishment. The baron and all the vassals of the king must appear before him when summoned, and serve him at their own expense for the space of sixty days and sixty nights, with the knights whose duty it is to accompany them, and the king may demand these services whenever he pleases and so often as he has need of them. If the king wants to keep them more than sixty days at their cost and expense, they are free to remain or not, but if he wishes to keep them at his expense and for the defense of the kingdom, then they must remain; nevertheless, if the king wishes to conduct them out of the kingdom, they may refuse since they have already served sixty days and sixty

nights. No women owes service of ban and arriere-ban, except the queen, but must send as many knights as go with the land, and the king must not molest her. If the servants of the king, in their circuits, find in the castles some feudal men who did not come when summoned and who are not exempt from service, they shall be fined 60 sous, and the barons shall be allowed to indemnify them. The feudal men remain in the service of the king forty days and forty nights and if any return home before this period they shall be fined sixty sous. (Etablissements, I., 61.)

QUESTIONS

1. Did the king summon his warriors directly? 2. What limitations were placed upon the amount of military service the king could command? 3. Who bore the expense of maintaining a feudal army? 4. Describe the method by which a feudal host was assembled. 5. At what time and in what place were these rules in force?

4. THE GERMAN INVASION OF 1124—A FEUDAL ARRAY

The Emperor Henry had an old grudge against the lord King Louis, for the Pope Calixtus had held the Council which had anathematized the Emperer in the kingdom of France, at Reims. So the Emperor collected as large an army as he needed, of Lorranians, Germans, Swabians, Bavarians and Saxons, although many of these people were his enemies, and, following the counsel of Henry, King of England, whose daughter he had married, and who was also at war with our King, he feigned an attack in another quarter: for he intended to throw himself suddenly on the city of Reims, and either destroy it a blow, or besiege it and do it as much injury as he could for a space of time equal to that in which it had shown hospitality to the lord Pope during the Council. When the servants of the lord King Louis brought him news of these preparations, he boldly collected and improvised an army in all haste, and summoned his nobles to explain to them the cause of these measures. As he knew so well, not only from having so often heard it, but also from his own experience, that the blessed Denis was the special patron and protector of the kingdom after God, he was

anxious to visit the Saint, to beseech him from the bottom of his heart and to move him by prayers and gifts to defend the country, to save the royal person, and to drive back, as he was wont to do, the enemies of France. The French had received from the Saint the privilege in case of invasion of taking his relics and those of his companions down from the alter. The King wanted this ceremony to take place in his presence, with equal pomp and devoutness. Placing on the alter the banner of the county of Vexin, for which he owed homage to the abbey, he received it according to his vows from the hands of the Saint himself, as from his own suzerain. He wished with the handful of men to encounter his enemies, in order to parry the danger which menaced him, and he summoned earnestly all of France to follow him.

The habitual courage of the French rose in indignation at the unheard of insolence of these strangers. From all parts of France the elite of the soldiers came together. From every part they sent their forces and its valiant knights, who had not forgotten the ancient valor and the victories of their ancestors. When this numerous army had assembled at Reims from all parts of the country, there were so many men-at-arms and foot soldiers that they seemed to hide the earth like a cloud of locusts, covering not merely the banks of the rivers, but also the mountains and the plains. Here the King awaited the arrival of the Germans for an entire week. During this time the grandees of the kingdom prepared for the battle and deliberated thus among themselves: "Let us march boldly on them that they may not return with impunity to their own country, that they may be punished for the presumption with which they have attacked France, the sovereign of the world. Let us punish their arrogance as it deserves, not in our country, but in their own, which by the royal right of the French has so often submitted to France. In this manner let us begin openly the attack on them which they secretly planned against us." But others more sober and experienced counseled waiting until our enemies had penetrated the interior of the march, when they could be surprised without knowing whither to flee. Then we could attack them and throw them

into confusion, and butcher them without pity like Saracens, and leave the bodies of these barbarians unburied, to their eternal shame, the prey of wolves and of vultures. If we awaited the attack in this manner, this massacre of so many men and the use of such severity would be justified by the necessity of legitimate defence.

In the meantime the grandees of the kingdom prepared the order of battle, in the palace, in the presence of the King himself, and decided what troops should act together. The first corps was composed of the men of Reims and of Châlons, whose number exceeded sixteen thousand, as many knights as footmen, and the second was composed of those of Laon and of Soissons, equally numerous; the third were the men of Orleans, of Etampes and of Paris. This numerous array was entirely under the King and the blessed Denis. The King trusting that his Protector would watch over him, intended to place himself at the head of his troops. "I will fight with equal courage and security," said he, "because without counting the protection of our lords the saints, those of my compatriots among whom I have been reared from my infancy will second me so long as I live, and will bear my body hence if I fall." The fourth corps was formed by the command under the Count Pallatine Thibaut, with his uncle Hugh, the noble Count of Troyes. He had come at the summons of France, although at the time he was waging war against the King, in alliance with his other uncle, the King of England. In the fifth corps were placed the Dukes of Bourgogne, and the Count of Nevers. The valiant Count of Vermandois, Raoul, a near relative of the King, led the militia armed with cuirasses furnished by St. Quentin.

The left wing was composed of men of Ponthieu, of Amienois, and of Beuvaisis. The noble Count of Flanders with ten thousand trained soldiers (he could have brought three times as many if he had known in time) was placed as rear guard. Near them, William, Duke of Aquitaine, the valiant Count of Brittany, the warlike Count of Anjou, Foulques, who could only rival each other in zeal, since the length of the road they had to travel and the suddenness of the summons

had not permitted their bringing any considerable force to help punish the injury done to the French. It was decided further that wherever the armies should come to battle, carts and wagons filled with water and wine for the wounded and the fatigued should be formed in circles as a sort of castle, if the ground permitted, so that those whose wounds forced them to retire from the field might retire here and refresh themselves and dress their wounds, and thus revive strength to conquer anew the palm of victory. The noise of these extensive preparations and the collection of such a large and valiant army, could not fail to spread. It came like a thunder-bolt even to the ears of the Emperor, who feigned and pretended, I know not what pretext to hide the shame of his flight; for he took another direction, and submitted rather to disgrace and retreat than to expose his empire and his person to the terrible vengeance of the French. When these heard of his flight, it required the prayers of the archbishops, the bishops and the clergy to prevent them from devasting the kingdom of the enemy and from oppressing the poor of the neighboring country. (Suger.)

QUESTIONS

1. Were not the French in this episode rather more valiant in words than in deeds? 2. Did the King command the entire French army when it assembled? Did anyone? 3. What troops did the King command? 4. Was there a feeling of nationality among the French at this time? 5. Did the French seem to detest the Germans more than they did the English?

5. FEALTY AND HOMAGE

Whoever owes fealty and homage shall have fifteen days in which to offer them to his lord, and if he does not do this within a fortnight, the lord may and should seize his fief and lay hands upon whatever he finds there, and the vassal shall none the less be compelled to pay the purchase money. If a vassal desires to offer fealty and homage to his lord, he shall demand of him thus, and say,—"Sir, I demand of you, as of my lord, to receive me into your fealty and homage, for such and such property, which I have bought in your fief." He then names the person from whom he receives it, and such person ought to be present if it is by pur-

chase; but if the fief comes by succession or inheritance, he explains this, and places his hands in those of his Lord, and continuing thus: "Sir, I become your man and promise to serve you henceforth as my lord, against all men, in such services as the fief demands, paying to you the purchase money as lord." The lord replies: "And on my part, I receive you and accept you as my man, I give you this kiss in sign of my fealty, saving my right and those of others," according to the custom of the different countries. * * * (Establissements II., 18.)

QUESTION

1. What are fealty and homage?

6. SOME FEUDAL PRIVILEGES

Any lord exercising justice in his territory may oblige all the inhabitants of his territory to grind their grain in his mill. If any one refuses, the lord shall summon him to appear and shall forbid him to have his grain ground elsewhere. If, in spite of this prohibition, he is found going to another mill, the grain which he carries shall be confiscated as a fine for the benefit of the lord. If it happens that the miller is guilty of deception towards any one who brings his grain to be ground, the injured one complains to the lord and says to him, "Sir, your miller has defrauded me, I demand that you require him to make good my loss." The lord shall come to the miller and say to him, "Such a one complains of you and claims that you have defrauded him of his grain." If the miller denies it, and the plaintiff offers to prove his case, his loss shall be made good. If the loss is more than twelve deniers, he shall take oath concerning the matter but if the loss is less, his word shall suffice. Thus the miller is not permitted to defend himself when the complaint concerns fraud done in his mill, and he who makes the complaint ought to swear or give his word as to the extent of the damage suffered. In this manner all damage done to those who grind their grain in the lord's mill should be made good. If the lord refuses to do justice to those who make complaint, they shall be free to have their grain ground elsewhere, until the miller has been punished, and the lord shall have no right to interfere with them (Etablissements I., 107.)

No vavasseur who is not lord of a castle or of a part of a castle may have an oven or force his subjects to bake in it; but if he has a castle or a part of a castle, he may keep an oven, and if he exercises justice in his lands, he may compel his subjects to bake in it. If any one bakes in another oven, the lord may seize the bread and keep it as a fine. If the baker injures or defrauds anyone, the lord shall compel him to make the injury good, and his subjects shall not be compelled to bake in his oven until the injury has been made good. (Etablissements I., 110.)

QUESTIONS

1. Can you suggest a reason why mills and ovens were made monopolies at this time? 2. Why was a miller not allowed to defend himself? 3. How long did these monopolies last in France? 4. Was their long continuance justifiable? 5. In later times, could the peasants go to another mill or bakery if they had been defrauded?

7. REVOLT OF THE NORMAN PEASANTS, 997

Although Richard, the young duke of Normandy, abounded in virtue and uprightness, there arose pestilential disorders in his territories, for the peasants had come together in the several counties of the Norman country and resolved unanimously to follow henceforth no law but their own lusts. They declared they should no longer obey the established laws, which forbad them the free use of the forests and the right to fish in the streams, but that they should govern themselves according to laws of their own. Each band of these mad people elected two envoys to a general assembly to meet in the heart of the country and draw up these laws. When the Duke heard of these things, he immediately sent Count Rudolf against them with a large number of soldiers to break up their assembly and to quell their rustic ferocity. The Count obeyed without delay, and seized all the delegates and many others, and ordered their hands and their feet to be cut off and sent them back to their masters in this condition, in order to discourage such actions in the future and to teach them wisdom by experience, lest a worse fate o'ertake them. The peasants, profiting by this expe-

rience, immediately abandoned their assembly and returned to their fields. (Guillaume de Jumiège.)

QUESTIONS

1. Is this an unbiased account of the revolt? 2. Was the uprising a mere blind war of revenge, or had the peasants a definite program of reform? 3. So far as you can judge by the meagre account, were the peasants' demands feasible? 4. Were they reasonable? 5. Can you suggest a reason why all peasant revolts of the time must fail?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Make a list of the limitations upon the royal power as shown in these extracts.
2. What was the position of the clergy in the feudal State?
3. What was the condition of the peasantry under the feudal system?
4. Describe some of the methods employed in taking and in defending a medieval castle.

GUERNSEY JONES.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH.D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 6. FEBRUARY, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

MONASTICISM.

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH.D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Monastic Orders

Henderson, Ernest F., Select Documents of the Middle Ages. London. 1892.

Zeller, B. et Bayet, C., Les derniers Carolingiens. Paris, 1884. Zeller, B. et Luchaire, A., Philippe-Auguste et Louis VIII, la royauté conquérante. Paris, 1884. In the series, l'histoire de France raconteé par les contemporains.

THE first two selections given in this pamphlet are from the cartulary of the Monastery of Cluny, edited according to the original documents by M. Bruel. I have used Mr. Henderson's translation of the Foundation Charter and have turned into English MM. Zeller and Bayet's French translation of the Donation of Lands (935).

While Monasticism originated in the East, it was in the West that it was reduced to a system and became an institution. Benedict of Mursia (died in 543) may be considered as the father of western Monasticism. The Rule which he drew up for his own monastery was generally taken as a model by the western World, until St. Francis and St. Dominic, in the late Middle Ages, organized their Order on an entirely different plan. Of course the student will readily see that these Rules represent the ideal of Monasticism, what the founders of the Orders had in mind. In how far the Rules were observed is a different matter, and there were great differences in this regard according to time and locality.

St. Francis made several attempts to provide a Rule for his Order. The first Rule (1210) has been lost. The second (1221) is not properly a Rule but "a series of impassioned appeals . . . a medley of outbursts of joy and bitter sobs, of hopes and regrets." St. Francis had not the legal turn of mind necessary to the task. Sabatier therefore sees in the third Rule, which is given here in Henderson's translation, the influence of other minds. It is not purely Franciscan, but bears throughout evidences of the controlling and directing influence of the Church. It received the papal sanction on the 20th of November, 1223, and became the official Rule of the Order.

Jacques de Vitry "was born at Vitry-sur-Seine, became Curé of Argenteuil, near Paris; Canon of Oignies, in the diocese of Namur, preached the crusade against the Albigenses, and accompanied the Crusaders to Palestine; having been made Bishop of Acre, he was present in 1219 at the siege and at the capture of Damietta and returned to Europe in 1225; created Cardinal-bishop of Frascati in 1229, he died in 1244, leaving a number of writings." The short account of the Dominicans which follows is from his *Historia Occidentalis*. He was an enthusiastic admirer of the Mendicant Orders.

1. DONATION OF LANDS TO A MONASTERY.

a. The Foundation Charter of the Order of Cluny, September 11, 910 A.D.

To all right thinkers it is clear that the providence of God has so provided for certain rich men that, by means of their transitory possessions, if they use them well, they may be able to merit everlasting rewards. . . . I, William, count and duke by the grace of God,

diligently pondering this, and desiring to provide for my own safety while I am still able, have considered it advisable—nay, most necessary, that from the temporal goods which have been conferred upon me I should give some little portion for the gain of my soul. . . . And this is my trust, this my hope, indeed, that although I myself am unable to despise all things, nevertheless, by receiving despisers of the world, whom I believe to be righteous, I may receive the reward of the righteous. Therefore be it known to all who live in the unity of faith and who await the mercy of Christ, and to those who shall succeed them and who shall continue to exist until the end of the world, that, for the love of God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, I hand over from my own rule to the holy apostles, Peter, namely, and Paul, the possessions over which I hold sway, the town of Cluny, namely, with the court and demesne manor, and the church in honor of St. Mary the mother of God and of St. Peter the prince of the apostles, together with all the things pertaining to it, the vills, indeed, the chapels, the serfs of both sexes, the vines, the fields, the meadows, the woods, the waters and their outlets, the mills, the incomes and revenues, what is cultivated and what is not, all in their entirety. Which things are situated in or about the country of Macon, each one surrounded by its own bounds. I give, moreover, all these things to the aforesaid apostles—I, William, and my wife Ingelberga—first for the love of God; then for the soul of my lord king Odo, of my father and my mother; for myself and my wife—for the salvation, namely, of our souls and bodies;—and not least for that of Ava who left me these things in her will; for the souls also of our brothers and sisters and nephews, and of all our relatives of both sexes; for our faithful ones who adhere to our service; for the advancement, also, and integrity of the catholic religion. Finally, since all of us Christians are held together by one bond of love and faith, let this donation be for all,—for the orthodox, namely, of past, present or future times. I give these things, moreover, with this understanding, that in Cluny a regular monastery shall be constructed in honor of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and that there the monks shall congregate and live according to

the rule of St. Benedict, and that they shall possess, hold, have and order these same things unto all time. In such wise, however, that the venerable house of prayer which is there shall be faithfully frequented with vows and supplications, and that celestial converse shall be sought and striven after with all desire and with the deepest ardor; and also that there shall be sedulously directed to God prayers, beseechings and exhortations as well for me as for all, according to the order in which mention has been made of them above. And let the monks themselves, together with all the aforesaid possessions, be under the power and dominion of the abbot Berno, who, as long as he shall live, shall preside over them regularly according to his knowledge and ability. But after his death, those same monks shall have power and permission to elect any one of their order whom they please as abbot and rector, following the will of God and the rule promulgated by St. Benedict,—in such wise that neither by the intervention of our own or of any other power may they be impeded from making a purely canonical election. Every five years, moreover, the aforesaid monks shall pay to the church of the apostles at Rome ten shillings to supply them with lights; and they shall have the protection of those same apostles and the defence of the Roman pontiff; and those monks may, with their whole heart and soul, according to their ability and knowledge, build up the aforesaid place. We will, further, that in our times and in those of our successors, according as the opportunities and possibilities of that place shall allow, there shall daily, with the greatest zeal be performed there works of mercy towards the poor, the needy, strangers and pilgrims. It has pleased us also to insert in this document that, from this day, those same monks there congregated shall be subject neither to our yoke, nor to that of our relatives, nor to the sway of the royal might, nor to that of any earthly power. And, through God and all his saints, and by the awful day of judgment, I warn and adjure that no one of the secular princes, no count, no bishop whatever, not the pontiff of the aforesaid Roman see, shall invade the property of these servants of God, or alienate it, or diminish it, or exchange it,

or give it as a benefice to anyone, or constitute any prelate over them against their will. [Here follow threats of divine vengeance upon anyone who should violate these immunities.]

b. Donation of Lands and Serfs to the Order of Cluny, 935 A.D.

It is known to all the wise that God permits His faithful to redeem their sins and to merit eternal rewards through the bestowal of their temporal goods. Therefore I, Antigius, for the salvation of my soul, and those of my relations, living or dead, and especially those of my father and mother, and lastly, those of all the catholic faithful, give and make over to the monastery of Cluny, the properties which belong to me, to-wit, one courtil with the neighboring vineyard, and the serfs Gerard, his wife and children and Vuelmar, his wife and daughter; also, another courtil with the vineyard which belongs to it. These properties are situated in the country of Macon, in the domain of Varingo, at the place called Breia. I give still a third courtil situated in the same place on the condition that I shall have the enjoyment use of it during my life, on paying the annually quit rent of four setiers of wine; after my death, these properties shall revert to the monastery, and no one may oppose its possession. . .

QUESTIONS

1. What was the motive of these donations? 2. Was the new foundation subject to the control of either the local bishop or the pope of Rome? 3. What do you suppose the significance was of the annual payment of ten shillings to the Church of the Apostles at Rome? 4. Were serfs looked upon as property?

2. THE RULE OF ST. BENEDICT

Prologue. . . we are about to found, therefore, a school for the Lord's service; in the organization of which we trust that we shall ordain nothing severe and nothing burdensome. But even if, the demands of justice dictating it, something a little irksome shall be the result, for the purpose of amending vices or preserving charity;—thou shalt not therefore, struck by fear, flee the way of salvation, which cannot be entered upon except through a narrow entrance. . .

2. *What the Abbot should be like.* . . . He [the abbot] shall make no distinction of persons in the monastery. One shall not be more cherished than another, unless it be the one whom he finds excelling in good works or in obedience. A free-born man shall not be preferred to one coming from servitude, unless there be some other reasonable cause. But if, justice demanding that it should be thus, it seems good to the abbot, he shall do this no matter what the rank shall be. But otherwise they shall keep their own places; for whether we be bond or free we are all one in Christ; and, under one God, we perform an equal service of subjection; for God is no respecter of persons. . . .

3. *About calling in the brethren to take council.* As often as anything especial is to be done in the monastery, the abbot shall call together the whole congregation, and shall himself explain the question at issue. And, having heard the advice of the brethren, he shall think it over by himself, and shall do what he considers most advantageous. And for this reason, moreover, we have said that all ought to be called to take counsel: because often it is to a younger person that God reveals what is best. The brethren, moreover, with all subjection of humility, ought so to give their advice, that they do not presume boldly to defend what seems good to them, but it should rather depend on the judgment of the abbot; so that whatever he decides to be the more salutary, they should all agree to it. But even as it behoves the disciples to obey the master, so it is fitting that he should providently and justly arrange all matters. In all things, indeed, let all follow the Rule as their guide; and let no one rashly deviate from it. Let no one in the monastery follow the inclination of his own heart; and let no one boldly presume to dispute with his abbot, within or without the monastery. But, if he should so presume, let him be subject to the discipline of the Rule. The abbot, on the other hand, shall do all things fearing the Lord and observing the Rule; knowing that he, without a doubt, shall have to render account to God as to a most impartial judge, for all his decisions. But if any lesser matters for the good of the monastery are to be decided upon, he shall employ the

counsel of the elder members alone, since it is written: "Do all things with counsel, and after it is done thou wilt not repent."

33. *Whether the monks should have anything of their own.* More than any thing else is this special vice to be cut off root and branch from the monastery, that one should presume to give or receive anything without the order of the abbot, or should have anything of his own. He should have absolutely not anything: neither a book, nor tablets, nor a pen—nothing at all.—For indeed it is not allowed to the monks to have their own bodies or wills in their own power. But all things necessary they must expect from the Father of the monastery; nor is it allowable to have anything which the abbot did not give or permit. All things shall be common to all, as it is written: "Let not any man presume or call anything his own." But if any one shall have been discovered delighting in this most evil vice: being warned once and again, if he do not amend, let him be subject to punishment.

48. *Concerning the daily manual labor.* Idleness is the enemy of the soul. And therefore, at fixed times, the brothers ought to be occupied in manual labor; and again, at fixed times, in sacred reading. Therefore we believe that, according to this disposition, both seasons ought to be arranged; so that, from Easter until the Calends of October, going out early, from the first until the fourth hour they shall do what labor may be necessary. Moreover, from the fourth hour until about the sixth, they shall be free for reading. After the meal of the sixth hour, moreover, rising from table, they shall rest in their beds with all silence; or, perchance, he that wishes to read may so read to himself that he do not disturb another. And the nona (the second meal) shall be gone through with more moderately about the middle of the eighth hour; and again they shall work at what is to be done until Vespers. But, if the exigency or poverty of the place demands that they be occupied by themselves in picking fruits, they shall not be dismayed: for then they are truly monks if they live by the labor of their hands; as did also our fathers and the apostles. Let all things be done with moderation, however, on account of the faint-hearted. From the

Calends of October, moreover, until the beginning of Lent they shall be free for reading until the second full hour. At the second hour the tertia (morning service) shall be held, and all shall labor at the task which is enjoined upon them until the ninth. The first signal, moreover, of the ninth hour having been given, they shall each one leave off his work; and be ready when the second signal strikes. Moreover after the refection they shall be free for their readings or for psalms. But in the days of Lent, from dawn until the third full hour, they shall be free for their readings; and, until the tenth full hour, they shall do the labor that is enjoined on them. In which days of Lent they shall all receive separate books from the library; which they shall read entirely through in order. These books are to be given out on the first day of Lent. Above all there shall certainly be appointed one or two elders, who shall go round the monastery at the hours in which the brothers are engaged in reading, and see to it that no troublesome brother chance to be found who is open to idleness and trifling, and is not intent on his reading; being not only of no use to himself, but also stirring up others. If such a one—may it not happen—be found, he shall be admonished once and a second time. If he do not amend, he shall be subject under the Rule to such punishment that the others may have fear. Nor shall brother join brother at unsuitable hours. Moreover on Sunday all shall engage in reading: excepting those who are deputed to various duties. But if any one be so negligent and lazy that he will not or can not read, some task shall be imposed upon him which he can do, so that he be not idle. On feeble or delicate brothers such a labor or art is to be imposed, that that they shall neither be idle, nor shall they be so oppressed by the violence of labor as to be driven to take flight. Their weakness is to be taken into consideration by the abbot.

55. Vestments shall be given to the brothers according to the quality of the places where they dwell, or the temperature of the air. For in cold regions more is required; but in warm, less. This, therefore, is a matter for the abbot to decide. We nevertheless consider that for ordinary places there suffices for the monks a cowl

and gown apiece—a cowl, in winter hairy, in summer plain or old,—and a working garment, on account of their labors. As clothing for the feet, shoes and boots. . . . As trappings for the beds, moreover, shall suffice a mat, a woollen covering, a woollen cloth under the pillow, and the pillow. And these beds are frequently to be searched by the abbot on account of private property; least he find some. And, if anything be found belonging to any one which he did not receive from the abbot, he shall be subjected to the most severe discipline. And, in order that this special vice may be cut off at the roots, there shall be given by the abbot all things which are necessary: that is, a cowl, a gown, shoes, boots, a binder for the loins, a knife, a pen, a needle, handkerchief, tablets: so that all excuse of necessity shall be removed. . . .

57. *Concerning the artificers of the monastery.* Artificers, if there are any in the monastery, shall practice with all humility their special arts, if the abbot permit it. But if any one of them becomes inflated with pride on account of knowledge of his art, to the extent that he seems to be conferring something on the monastery: such a one shall be plucked away from that art; and he shall not again return to it unless the abbot perchance again orders him to, he being humiliated. . . . In the prices themselves [of articles sold], moreover, let not the evil of avarice crop out: but let the object always be given a little cheaper than it is given by other and secular persons; so that in all things God shall be glorified.

64. *Concerning the ordination of an abbot.* In ordaining an abbot this consideration shall aways be observed: that such a one shall be put into office as the whole congregation, according to the fear of God, with one heart—or even a part, however small, of the congregation with more prudent counsel—shall have chosen. He who is to be ordained, moreover, shall be elected for merit of life and learnedness in wisdom; even though he be the lowest in rank in the congregation.

66. *Concerning the doorkeepers of the monastery.* At the door of the monastery shall be placed a wise old man who shall know how to receive a reply and to return one; whose ripeness of age will not permit him to

trifle. Which doorkeeper ought to have a cell next to the door; so that those arriving may always find one present from whom they may receive a reply. . . A monastery, moreover, if it can be done, ought so to be arranged that everything necessary,—that is, water, a mill, a garden, a bakery,—may be made use of, and different arts be carried on, within the monastery; so that there shall be no need for the monks to wander about outside. For this is not at all good for their souls. . .

QUESTIONS

1. Point out some of the democratic features of St. Benedict's Rule. 2. How was a Benedictine monastery governed? 3. Were the monasteries independent of each other? 4. Is the ascetic element very prominent in the Benedictine Rule? Were unnecessary hardships and penances imposed for the sake of severer discipline and self-renunciation? 5. Describe the daily life of a Benedictine monk. 6. Was it assumed that every monk could read? 7. How much of his time did a Benedictine monk devote to manual labor and how much to reading? 8. Why was manual labor commanded? 9. Did a monk labor in order to enjoy the fruits of his labor? 10. Were not the monastic orders the sole element of Medieval society who appreciated the dignity of manual labor? 11. Did it occur to the monks that they would injure secular laborers by systematically underselling them in the market? 12. What vice were they trying to avoid? 13. What were the provisions of the Rule concerning private property? 14. Could the monastery own property? 15. Were the monks expected to take an active part in the life around them?

3. THE MENDICANT ORDERS

a. The Rule of St. Francis of Assisi.

1. This is the rule and way of living of the minorite brothers: namely to observe the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, living in obedience, without personal possessions, and in chastity. Brother Francis promises obedience and reverence to our lord pope Honorius, and to his successors who canonically enter upon their office, and to the Roman Church. And the other brothers shall be bound to obey brother Francis and his successors.

2. If any persons shall wish to adopt this form of living, and shall come to our brothers, they shall send them to their provincial ministers; to whom alone, and

to no others, permission is given to receive brothers. But the ministers shall diligently examine them in the matter of the catholic faith and the ecclesiastical sacraments. . . . But, when the year of probation is over, they shall be received into obedience; promising always to observe that manner of living, and this Rule. And, according to the mandate of the lord pope, they shall never be allowed to break these bonds. For according to the holy Gospel, no one putting his hand to the plough and looking back is fit for the kingdom of God. And those who have now promised obedience shall have one gown with a cowl, and another, if they wish it, without a cowl. And those who are compelled by necessity may wear shoes. And all the brothers shall wear humble garments, and may repair them with sack cloth and other remnants, with the benediction of God. And I warn and exhort them lest they despise or judge men whom they shall see clad in soft garments and in colors, using delicate food and drink; but each one shall rather judge and despise himself.

4. I firmly command all the brothers by no means to receive coin or money, of themselves or through an intervening person But for the needs of the sick and for clothing the other brothers, the ministers alone and the guardians shall provide through spiritual friends, as it may seem to them that necessity demands, according to time, place and cold temperature. This one thing being always regarded, that, as has been said, they receive neither coin nor money.

5. Those brothers to whom God has given the ability to labor, shall labor faithfully and devoutly; in such way that idleness, the enemy of the soul, being excluded, they may not extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion; to which other temporal th ngs should be subservient. As a reward, moreover, for their labor, they may receive for themselves and their brothers the necessaries of life, but not coin or money; and this humbly, as becomes the servants of God and the followers of most holy poverty.

6. The brothers shall appropriate nothing to themselves, neither a house, nor a place, nor anything; but as pilgrims and strangers in this world, in poverty and humility serving God, they shall confidently go seek

ing for alms. Nor need they be ashamed, for the Lord made Himself poor for us in this world. This is that height of most lofty poverty, which has constituted you my most beloved brothers heirs and kings of the kingdom of Heaven, has made you poor in possessions, has exalted you in virtues. . . .

8. All the brothers shall be bound always to have one of the brothers of that order as general minister and servant of the whole fraternity, and shall be firmly bound to obey him. When he dies, the election of a successor shall be made by the provincial ministers and guardians, in the chapter held at Pentecost; in which the provincial ministers are bound always to come together in whatever place shall be designated by the general minister. And this, once in three years; or at another greater or lesser interval, according as shall be ordained by the aforesaid minister. And, if, at any time, it shall be apparent to the whole body of the provincial ministers and guardians that the aforesaid minister does not suffice for the service and common utility of the brothers: the aforesaid brothers to whom the right of election has been given shall be bound, in the name of God, to elect another as their guardian. But after the chapter held at Pentecost the ministers and the guardians can, if they wish it and it seems expedient for them, in that same year call together, once, their brothers, in their districts, to a chapter.

9. The brothers may not preach in the bishopric of any bishop if they have been forbidden to by him. And no one of the brothers shall dare to preach at all to the people, unless he have been examined and approved by the general minister of this fraternity, and the office of preacher have been conceded to him. I also exhort those same brothers, that, in the preaching which they do, their expressions shall be chaste and chosen, to the utility and edification of the people; announcing to them vices and virtues, punishment and glory, with briefness of discourse; for the words were brief which the Lord spoke upon earth.

10. The brothers who are the ministers and servants of the other brothers shall visit and admonish their brothers and humbly and lovingly correct them; not teaching them anything which is against their soul

and against our Rule. But the brothers who are subjected to them shall remember that, before God, they have discarded their own wills. Wherefore I firmly command them that they obey their ministers in all things which they have promised God to observe and which are not contrary to their souls and to our Rule. . . . I warn and exhort, moreover, in Christ Jesus the Lord, that the brothers be on their guard against all pride, vain-glory, envy, avarice, care and anxiety for this world, detraction and murmuring. And they shall not take trouble to teach those ignorant of letters, but shall pay heed to this that they desire to have the spirit of God and its holy workings; that they pray always to God with a pure heart; that they have humility, patience, in persecution and infirmity; and that they love those who persecute, revile and attack us. . .

12. . . Furthermore, through their obedience I enjoin on the ministers that they demand from the lord pope one of the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, who shall be the governor, corrector and protector of that fraternity, so that, always subjected and lying at the feet of that same holy Church, steadfast in the catholic faith, we may observe poverty and humility, and the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; as we have firmly promised.

b. The Order of St. Dominic.

They seek to revive the poverty and humility of the primitive church by observing not only the precepts but also the recommendations of the Gospel. The pope has confirmed their Rule and has given them authority to preach everywhere, but with the consent of the prelates. They are sent out in companies of two. They are not provided with knapsacks, nor money, nor bread, nor shoes, since the possession of these things is forbidden them. They have neither monastery, nor church, nor lands, nor herds. They wear neither fur nor linen, but only a tunic of wool furnished with a hood, without cope, or mantle or any other apparel. If they are offered food they eat what is set before them. If they are given anything, they keep nothing for the morrow. Once or twice a year they come together for

their general chapter, after which their superior sends them out by twos or more to the various provinces. By their preaching they add to their number: by their example they incite many to despise the world, not merely common men, but nobles, who leave their lands, their cities, their vast properties and content themselves with the garb of the minorite brothers, that is to say, with one wretched tunic bound by a cord. The Order has so grown in a short time that there is not a province in Christendom where they are not to be found; for they reject no one who is not hindered by marriage or by connection with another Order, and they receive new brothers the more readily, since they leave the care of their subsistence to divine Providence. (Jacques de Vitry.)

QUESTIONS

1. How were the Franciscans organized? 2. Were they more dependent upon the papal authority than the Benedictines were? 3. Wherein were the Rules of the friars severer than that of the monks? 4. Could the friars own private property? 5. Why were they forbidden to accept money as alms? 6. Could the Order own property? 7. What did St. Francis enjoin concerning manual labor? 8. Did he lay great stress upon learning? 9. Did the friars try to influence the life around them?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Why did the monasteries receive such lavish grants of land during the Middle Ages?

2. Describe the organization of the Benedictine Monasteries.

3. Describe the organization of the Mendicant Orders. How did the monks and friars differ in their relation to the papacy?

4. Compare the purpose and the discipline of the Benedictines and the Franciscans.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH.D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 7. MARCH, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

THE JEWS OF ANGEVIN ENGLAND.

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH.D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER. Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

EUROPEAN HISTORY STUDIES.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Jews of Angevin England

Jacobs, Joseph. The Jews of Angevin England. Documents and Records from Latin and Hebrew Sources, printed and manuscript, for the first time collected and translated. In the series, English History by Contemporary Writers. London, 1893.

THE annals of Roger de Hovenden, or Hoveden, or Howden, cover the period from the year 732 to the year 1201. Only the part covering the years 1192–1201, however, is very valuable. From 1169 to 1192 he abridges or transcribes the Chronicle attributed to Benedict, Abbot of Peterborough, or uses material common to both. Hoveden includes, however, many letters, charters, etc., omitted or abridged by Benedict, which make this part of his Annals of some use. Of the personal history of Hoveden, nothing certain is known. He appears to have lived in the north of England, and to have occupied a position of confidence as king's clerk.

The Chronicle of Jocelin de Brakelond "extends from the year 1173 to the year 1202, and chiefly relates to the history of the abbey of St. Edmundsbury, and presents a curious picture of the economy of one of the large religious houses. * * * Of the personal history of the author nothing is known, except that he was chaplain to Abbot Samson, whose acts he commemorates, and almoner of the monastery."

Under the term Rolls we include official doc-

uments pertaining to the conduct of royal affairs, either by the royal officers or by the royal courts. The different sorts of Rolls are too numerous to be mentioned here even by name. The Pipe Rolls are the most important, reaching in almost unbroken series from the second year of the reign of Henry II. to the third and fourth years of the reign of William IV. They relate chiefly to the royal revenues, and contain notices of all sorts of payments to the crown. In the Patent Rolls are enrolled the letters patent of the king to his subjects, granting them some privilege or commanding them to do something, together with many other matters. The Oblate Rolls record the fines paid for some privilege or for evading some penalty.

Very little is known of the personal history of William of Newbury. He was born in Yorkshire about the year 1135 or 1136, and lived his whole life near the scenes of the Jewish massacres which he describes. He was a canon of the Augustinian priory of Bridlington. His History ends with the year 1198, the year of his death, so these descriptions are very nearly, if not quite, contemporary.

My indebtedness to Mr. Jacobs is, I trust, too patent to need further acknowledgement. At the end of each selection is placed in parentheses the page of his book where the selection may be found.

1. THE CHURCH CONDEMNS USURY

a. Gratian explains the nature of Usury, 1140 A. D.

But that to seek profit beyond the sum [lent] is to demand usury is proven by the authority of Austin, who on Psalm XXXVI., on the verse "All day" writeth saying—

"If you lend a man on usury, *i. e.*, if you have given him your money from whom you expect more than you gave, and not money alone but everything more than you have given, whether corn, or wine, or oil, or anything else, if you expect to receive aught more than you have given, you are an usurer, and for that to be reproved and not praised."

* * *

So too Pope Julius: "Whoever at harvest time or vintage, not from necessity but from cupidity, buys corn or wine, let us say at twopence the measure, and keeps it till it may be sold at fourpence or sixpence or more, this we call filthy lucre."

And so too Ambrose in the book on the good of death, "If any accept usury, he doeth plunder, he lives not in life." And so too Austin to Macedonius: "What shall I say of usury which even the very laws and judges order to be returned. Is he more cruel that takes or snatches something from the rich than he who destroys the poor with interest?" (p. 16).

b. Decree of Pope Alexander III., 1179 A.D.

Since in almost all places the crime of usury waxes so that many, leaving business, exercise usury as if 'twas lawful, and do not observe how it is condemned by the pages of both Testaments, therefore we decree that manifest usurers shall not be received at the communion of the altar, nor receive Christian burial, if they die in this sin, and no offering of theirs shall be received. And he that receives them or gives them Christian burial, shall both return what he has taken from then, and shall remain suspended from his office till he has made satisfaction in the opinion of his bishop.—*Hoveden, from Benedict.* (*p. 63*).

QUESTIONS

1. What *is* usury? 2. On what grounds did the Church condemn it? 3. Was it treated as a serious offense? 4. Did the Church find any difficulty in enforcing its prohibition? 5. Would a medieval Christian care anything for the penalties imposed by Pope Alexander III? 6. Was there any class in medieval society which the Church could not control? 7. How would this affect the business of money-lending?

2. THE JEWS WERE USURERS

a. How the Abbey of St. Edmund's became in debt to the Jews, 1173–80 A.D.

But things outside were badly handled, since each one, serving under a master simple-minded and now growing old, did as it liked, not as it beseemed him. The homesteads and all the hundreds of the abbot were given out to farm; the woods were cut down, the manor houses went to ruin; all things got into worse condition from day to day. There was only one solace and remedy for the abbot—to borrow money, so that at least he might keep up the honor of his house. Not an Easter or Michaelmas term for eight years before his death but a hundred or two hundred pounds were added to the debt. The deeds were always being renewed, and the usury that accrued was changed into a capital charge. This complaint spread from the head to the limbs, from the prelate to his subjects. Hence it came to pass that each obedientiary had his own seal and got into debt with Christians as well as Jews at his own pleasure. The silk cups and gold goblets and other ornaments of the church used often to be pledged without the knowledge of the convent. I have seen a deed made to William fitz Isabel, of one thousand pounds and forty, and I know neither the cause nor origin thereof. I saw too another deed made out to Isaac, son of Rabe Joce, of four hundred pounds, but I know not why. I saw also a third deed made out to Benedict, Jew of Norwich, of eight hundred pounds and eighty, and this was the origin and cause of that debt. Our hall was destroyed and William the sacristan had it to restore, willy-nilly, and he secretly borrowed on usury forty marks from Benedict the Jew, and made over to him a deed signed with a seal that used to hang by the window of St. Edmund, and by it gilds and fraternities used to be sealed, but afterwards, though too late, it was broken up to the joy of the whole convent. But when the debt had come to one hundred pounds the Jew came bearing the letters of our lord the king about the sacristan's debt, and then at last was made clear what had escaped the abbot and the convent. But the abbot in wrath wished to depose the sacristan, producing the privilege of our lord the pope, that he could

depose William his sacristan whenever he would. But a certain one came to the abbot and, speaking for the sacristan, so got round the abbot that he allowed a deed to be made out to Benedict the Jew for four hundred pounds to be paid at the end of four years, *i. e.*, for a hundred pounds, which had now grown by usury, and another hundred, with which the Jew accommodated the sacristan for the needs of the abbot. And the sacristan undertook to return the whole of that debt in full chapter, and a deed was made, signed with the seal of the convent, the abbot pretending and not affixing his seal, as if that seal did not apply to him. But at the end of four years there was no means of paying that debt, and a new deed was made of eight hundred pounds payable at fixed dates, four score pounds per annum. And the same Jew had also several other deeds for smaller debts, and another deed fourteen years old, so that the sum owed to that Jew was twelve hundred pounds besides the money that had accrued.*

In those days the cellarer, like the rest of the officials, borrowed money from Jurnet, the Jew [of Norwich], without permission of the convent, on a deed signed with the seal aforementioned. But when that debt had grown to sixty pounds the convent was summoned to pay the debt of the cellarer. The cellarer was deposed although he softened the charge by saying that for three years he had received all the guests in the guests' house at the command of the abbot, whether he were present or not, though that abbot should have received them according to the custom of his office. Master Dionisius took his place, who, by his prudence and caution, reduced the debt of sixty pounds to thirty. Out of this debt we handed over thirty marks, which Benedict de Blakeham gave to the convent for the manors of Neutone and Wapstede. But the deed of the Jew has remained in his hands up to this day, and in it are twenty-six pounds of the capital and debt of the cellarer.—*Joc. de Brakelond.* (*p. 59*).

b. A new Abbot is elected, who has the Jews expelled, 1182–1190 A. D.

But William, the Sacristan, had a suspicion of his

*The whole revenue of the Abbey was £325 12s. 4d.—*Jacobs.*

associate, Samson, and so had many others who favored the side of the said William, both Christians and Jews. Jews, I say, for to them the Sacristan was said to be a father and a patron. They used to enjoy his protection, and had free entrance and exit, and often went through the monastery, wandering through the altars and around the shrine while the solemnities of the Mass were being celebrated. And their moneys were placed in our treasury in the charge of the sacristan, and, what was more absurd, their wives and little ones were received in our refectory in time of war.

[Sampson however is elected and begins his reforms.]

Lastly, he deposed William himself: whereat certain who favored William said, "There's an abbot for you! This is the wolf of which he dreamt. See how he rages!" and some wished to make a conspiracy against him. And when this was made known to the abbot, wishing not to be altogether silent nor to disturb the convent, he entered the chapter on the morrow, bringing out a little bag full of concealed deeds with the seals still hanging to them, viz., those of his predecessor and of the prior, the sacristan, the chamberlain and other officials. The sum total of these was £3,025 and one mark of pure gold, apart from the usury which had accrued, the amount of which could never be known. For all these he had made terms within a year of his election, and within twelve he had cleared them off. "Behold," said he, "the wisdom of our sacristan William. See how many deeds signed with his seal; together with them he has pledged the silk caps, dalmatics, silver candlesticks and golden texts, without the knowledge of the convent, and all these I have released and consigned again to you".

* * *

Whenever the abbot went at that time both Jews and Christians used to meet him demanding their debts, disturbing and vexing him so that he could not sleep, and was made pale and lean, saying "My heart will never be at rest till I shall know the end of my debt." —*Ibid.* (*p. 78*).

The Lord abbot sought from the King a writ whereby the Jews might be ejected from the town of

St. Edmond, alleging that whatever is in the town of St. Edmond or within its banlieu is under the jurisdiction of St. Edmond: therefore the Jews ought either to be men of St. Edmond or be ejected from the town. License was therefore given him that he should eject them, but on condition that they should have their chattels as well as the price of their houses and lands. And when they were sent forth and conducted with an armed band to various cities the abbot ordered that excommunication should be declared in all churches and at all altars against anyone should henceforth take in Jews or give them lodging in the town of St. Edmond. But this was afterwards modified by the justiciars of the King to the effect that if Jews should come to the great pleas of the abbot to demand their debts from their debtors on such occasions they might be lodged for two days and two nights in the town, but freely depart on the third day.*—*Ibid.* (*p. 141*).

QUESTIONS

1. What rate of interest did Benedict of Norwich get? 2. Do you consider it exorbitant under the circumstances? 3. Did he have any trouble in getting his money back? 4. Why did the King interfere in his favor? 5. Did he sometimes take the side of the debtor? (*supra*) 6. Why? 7. Was it from motives of humanity that he saved the Jews their property on their expulsion from St. Edmundsbury? 8. What was the state of discipline in this monastery? 9. From this incident, can you justify in some measure the Church's prohibition of usury?

3. THE KINGS PROTECT THE JEWS

a. The Reason Why.

Be it also known, that all Jews, wheresoever they are in the kingdom, are to be under the tutelage and lawful protection of the king; and no one can serve under any rich man without the king's leave; for the Jews and all their property belong to the king. And if any person shall lay hands on them or their money, the king is to demand restitution thereof, if he so pleases, as of his own. Laws of Henry II., A.D. 1180. *Hovenden.*

* The Jewish Synagogue at Edmundsbury is still in existence, being used as a police station under the name of Moyses' Hall.—*Jacobs.*

He [Henry II.] favored more than was right a people treacherous and unfriendly to Christians, namely Jewish usurers because of the great advantages which he saw were to be had from their usuries: so much so that they become proud and stiffnecked against Christians and brought many exactions upon them. In fact in demanding money he was a little too immoderate, but the evil increasing beyond bounds at a later time in this regard justified him and proved that he had kept within limits.—*William, of Newbury.* (*p. 94*).

b. Selections from the Rolls.

Rubi Gotsce and other Jews to whom earl Randulf was indebted, owe 10 marks of gold for that the king might help them to recover their debts against the earl. P. R. 31 Hen. I. (p. 15).

Abraham and Deuslesalt, Jews, render account of one mark of gold that they might recover their debts against Osbert de Leicester. P. R. 31 Hen. I. (p. 15).

Solomon and Jacob, Jews of Bedford, owe 3 marks for right to six marks and 3 shillings against William Williamson. P. R. 31 Hen. II. (p. 85).

Joce le Salvage owes 2 marks for right to 7 marks against Ralph of Cornwall of the debt of Nigel de Flobose. P. R. 31 Hen. II. (p. 85).

Benedict son of Aaron owes 20 marks for right to £4 8s. 8d. against Meno Jew of Lincoln.* P. R. 31 Hen. II. (p. 86).

Aaron brother of Leon of Dunstable owes 20s. for having right to 30s. against Hugh fil Yvon and for 20s. against Ric. fil Essvj and for 2 marks against Robert Blund. Mosse son of Mosse owes 20s. for a debt of 5 marks against Calford de Lega. Josce son of Mosse owes 4 shillings for 20s. against Gilbert Passelewe. P. R. 5 Ric. I. (p. 160).

Samuel de Stanford owes 10 marks for having his debts against William de Colville. But he is dead and his chattels and pledges are in the King's hand. P. R. 1 Ric. I. (p. 138).

The King., &c., to Benedict of Talemunt the Jew

* Benedict does not seem to gain much by his action, having to pay four times as much as the debt.—*Jacobs.*

&c. Know that we have freed our dear faithful William Mansey 50 pounds of Poitou which he owes to thee and other Jews of Rochelle. * * Pat. R. [6 July, 1202.] (p. 221).

The lord King has pardoned by his letters patent William Earl of Arundell of all debts to Jews which he owed them up to St. Lawrence's feast in the fourth year of his reign. At Alençon, 8 Aug. [1202.] Pat. R. (p. 221).

The King &c. to all &c. Know that we have quit claimed Saher de Quincy of 300 marks that he owes to the Jews. And thereon give him quittance for one year from Michaelmas. And he has as a witness of the King these letters patent addressed to the Earl of Leicester, at present guarding them. Pat. R. [28 May, 1203.] (p. 222).

The King, &c., to G. fils Peter, &c. Know that we have acquitted our dear and faithful William de Breos of £50 sterling which a certain Jew of Northampton claims from him by the surety of Ranulf de Glanvile and Walter de Clifford. And therefore we order you to acquit him and cause the charter which the Jew has to be returned to him. Pat. R. [7 June, 1 03.] (p. 222).

The Jews of England give our Lord the King four thousand marks to have their charters confirmed, and the charters were sent to Godfrey son of Peter by Stephen de Portico that they should cause them to be read in their presence and in the presence of the Lord Bishops of London and Norwich and when they have received security for the payment of these four thousand marks, viz., 1000 immediately, 1000 at Michaelmas, 1000 at Easter, 1000 at Michaelmas, then they shall deliver to them the Charters in the presence of the aforesaid. Obl. R. 2 Jo. (p. 215).

Of the debts of the Jews we take no account for the present because the lord our king has taken a quarter of their chattels. P. R. 33 Hen. II (p. 91).*

Avigay, who was the wife of Jacob, owes 200 marks to have custody of her boys. P. R. 21 Hen. II. (p. 56).

* It amounted to £60,000. The rest of the king's subjects paid tenths, which amounted to £70,000.—*Jacobs.*

Samuel, Jew of Northhampton, owes one mark for Margaret, Jewess of London, to have license for an agreement of marriage of his son and Margaret's daughter. P. R. 30 Hen. II. (p. 85).

Sancto, Jew of Edmundsbury, renders account of 5 marks to be acquitted of taking in pledge vessels appointed for the service of the altar. P. R. 29 Hen. II. (p. 83).

Hakelin son of Josce Quatrebuches £?8 15s. 8d. that he may be quits for the soldier whom he struck. P. R. 28 Hen. II (p. 74).

Richard son of William renders count of 20 shillings for a slain Jew. P. R. 2 Hen. II. (p. 28).

c. *The Jewry is organized.*

All the debts, pledges, mortgages, lands, houses, rents, and possessions of the Jews shall be registered. The Jew who shall conceal any of these shall forfeit to the King his body and the thing concealed, and likewise all his possessions and chattels, neither shall it be lawful to the Jew to recover the thing concealed.

Likewise six or seven places shall be provided in which they shall make all their contracts, and there shall be appointed two lawyers that are Christians and two lawyers that are Jews, and two legal registrars, and before them and the clerks of William of the Church of St. Mary's and William of Chimilli, shall their contracts be made.

And charters shall be made of their contracts by way of indenture. And one part of the indenture shall remain with the Jew, sealed with the seal of him to whom the money is lent, and the other part shall remain in the common chest: wherein there shall be three locks and keys, whereof the two Christians shall keep one key, and the two Jews another, and the clerks of William of the Church of St. Mary and of William of Chimilli shall keep the third. And moreover there shall be three seals to it, and those who keep the seals shall put the seals thereto.

Moreover the clerks of the said William and William shall keep a roll of the transcripts of all the charters, and as the charters shall be altered so let the roll be likewise. For every charter there shall be three-pence

paid, one moiety thereof by the Jews and the other moiety by him to whom the money is lent; whereof the two writers shall have twopence and the keeper of the roll the third.

And from henceforth no contract shall be made with, nor payment made to, the Jews, nor any alteration made in the charters, except before the said persons or the greater part of them, if all of them cannot be present. And the aforesaid two Christians shall have one roll of the debts or receipts of the payments which from henceforth are to be made to the Jews, and the two Jews one and the keeper of the roll one.

Moreover every Jew shall swear on his Roll, that all his debts and pledges and rents, and all his goods, and his possessions, he shall cause to be enrolled, and that he shall conceal nothing as is aforesaid. And if he shall know that anyone shall conceal anything he shall secretly reveal it to the Justices sent to them, and that they shall detect and shew unto them all falsifiers, or forgers of the charters and clippers of money, where or when they shall know them, and likewise all false charters.—*Hoveden. (p. 156.)*

QUESTIONS

1. What profit did the King derive from the usury of the Jews? 2. If the Jews were the King's chattels, why did he not confiscate their entire property once for all? 3. When the King enforced the payment of a Jewish debt, about how much of it did he claim for his own? 4. Could he free a subject from the payment of usury due to a Jew? 5. Could he free a subject from the re-payment of the principal loaned by a Jew? 6. Enumerate some of the ways in which the King fleeced his Jewish subjects. (The student will remember that the King's Christian subjects were fleeced in ways not always so very different, though to a less degree.) 7. Why was the Jewry so organized?

4. THE JEWS ARE PERSECUTED

a. The Riot at Lynn. February, 1190 A. D.

While this was going on in France, the zeal of the Christians against the Jews in England, which had been kindled a little before at London, as has been mentioned, broke out fiercely. It was not indeed sincere, *i. e.*, solely for the sake of the faith, but in rivalry for the luck of others or from envy of their good for-

tune. Bold and greedy men thought that they were doing an act pleasing to God, while they robbed or destroyed rebels against Christ and carried out the work of their own cupidity with savage joy and without any, or only the slightest, scruple of conscience, God's justice, indeed, by no means approving such deeds but cunningly ordaining that in this way the insolence of that perfidious people might be checked and their blaspheming tongues curbed.

The first outburst against them occurred, we have heard, at Lynn, a city renowned for its thriving commerce, where many of this people dwelt, overbearing by their numbers, the greatness of their wealth and the protection of the King. When a certain one of them was converted from their superstition to the Christian faith, they, thirsting for his blood as that of a deserter and traitor, sought for an opportunity of gratifying their malice, and on a certain day seizing their arms attacked him as he was passing, but he retreated to the nearest church. But the madmen did not desist, but began to besiege the church with perverse fury and attack in order to break the doors and drag the fugitive out to punishment. A huge clamor is raised by those who were in the same church. Christian help was demanded with loud voice. The shouting and the reports inflame the Christian folk; those who were near run up in arms on hearing the shouts, those afar off when they heard the rumors. The inhabitants of the place went to work half-heartedly for fear of the King, but the young foreigners, of whom a great many had come there on business, attacked the insolent assailants more stoutly. They, however, giving up their siege of the church commenced to fly when they could no longer support the attack of the Christians. A few being slain during the fight, their houses were stormed and pillaged by the Christians, and burnt by the avenging flames and many of them fell victims to the fire or sword of the enemy. On the following day a certain Jew coming up, a distinguished physician, who was friendly with and honored by the Christians, for the sake both of his art and of his own modesty, commenced to deplore the slaughter of his people rather strongly, and as if prophesying vengeance, aroused the still smouldering rage. The

Christians soon seized him and made him the last victim of Jewish insolence. The young foreigners, loaded with booty, sought their ships and quickly went away to avoid inquiry by the King's officers. But the inhabitants of the place when they were interrogated about the matter by the officials, attributed the deed to the foreigners who had already gone away.—*William of Newbury (p. 115).*

b. The Riot at Stamford, 7 March, 1190 A.D.

After this a new rising of the mob against the Jews took place at Stamford. When the accustomed fair was being held there at Quadragesima [March 7] a number of youths who had taken the Lord's sign to start for Jerusalem came together from different provinces. They were indignant that the enemies of the cross of Christ who dwelt there should possess so much when they had not enough for the expenses of so great a journey. They considered they ought to extort from them as unjust possessions whatever they could apply to the necessary uses of the pilgrimage they had undertaken. Considering, therefore, that they could be doing honor to Christ if they attacked his enemies, whose goods they were longing for, they boldly rushed upon them, nobody either of the inhabitants of the place or of those who had come to the fair opposing such daring persons and some even helping them. Some of the Jews were slain, but the rest escaped with some difficulty by retreating to the Castle. Their houses were pillaged and a great quantity of money captured.—*William of Newbury. (p. 115).*

c. The Massacre at York, March, 1190 A.D.

But the men of York were restrained neither by fear of the hot-tempered King nor the vigor of the laws, nor by feelings of humanity, from satiating their fury with the total ruin of their perfidious fellow-citizens and from rooting out the whole race in their city. And as this was a very remarkable occurrence, it ought to be transmitted to posterity at greater length. Of the Jews of York, as we said, the foremost were Benedict and Joce, men of great riches and great usurers. Now they had built in the middle of the city at very great expense large houses, like royal palaces, and there they

dwelt like two princes of their own people and tyrants of the Christians, behaving with almost royal state and pomp and exercising harsh tyranny against those whom they oppressed with their usuries. And when they were at London at the solemnity of the anointing of the King, Benedict, as we mentioned above, by the judgment of God, met with a most wretched end and might be called Maledict. But Joce, escaping with difficulty on that occasion, returned to York, and as the King after the London riot issued a decree for the protection of the Jews, he, together with the rest of the Jews throughout England, continued to act confidently according to their old ways. But when the King had established himself across the sea many of the province of York plotted against the Jews, not being able to suffer their opulence when they themselves were in need, and without any scruple of Christian conscience thirsting for the blood of infidels from greed for booty. The leaders of this daring plan were some of the nobles indebted to the impious usurers in large sums, some of whom having given up their estates to them for the money they had received, were now oppressed by great want, some bound by their own sureties were pressed by the exactions of the Treasury to satisfy the royal usurers; some, too, of those who had taken the cross and were on the point of starting for Jerusalem were more easily induced to defray the expenses of the journey undertaken for the Lord's sake out of the booty taken from the Lord's enemies, especially as they had little fear of being questioned for the deed when they had started on their journey.

[They accordingly plundered and burned the houses of the richest Jews and slew the occupants. The Jews took refuge in the royal tower where, without arms or provisions, they withstood a siege for several days. Rather than abandon their faith, part of them set fire to the tower and died by their own hand. The rest were promised safety if they would accept Christianity, but on surrendering were immediately slain.]

The deeds done at York were soon carried across the sea to the prince, who had guaranteed peace and security to the Jews in his kingdom after the rising at Lon-

don. He is indignant and in a rage both for the insult to his royal majesty and for the great loss to the treasury, for to the treasury belonged whatever the Jews, who are known to be the royal usurers, seem to possess in the way of goods. Soon giving a mandate to the Bishop of Ely [William Longcamp] the Royal Chancellor and regent of the Kingdom, that such a great deed of daring should be punished with a suitable revenge, the said bishop, a man of fierce mind and eager for glory, comes to the city of York about Ascension day [May 3] with an army, and began an inquiry to the great fear of the burgesses. But the chief and best known actors of the deeds done, leaving everything they had in the country, fled before his face to Scotland. —*William of Newbury.* (*pp. 117, 131*).

QUESTIONS

1. Did William of Newbury sympathize entirely with the persecutions against the Jews? 2. What does he give as the motives of them? 3. Did he dislike the Jews? 4. Why? 5. Is the crusading spirit clearly to be detected in these persecutions? 6. Why was the king angry? 7. Did the Jews sometimes carry themselves insolently?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Can you suggest reasons why the medieval Jews were not liked (*a*) by the clergy, (*b*) by the nobility, (*c*) by the common people?

2. How did the king profit by the presence of the Jews? Make the answers very full.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH.D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 8. APRIL, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

THE RISE OF CITIES.

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH.D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Rise of Cities

Zeller, B. et Luchaire, A. Les Capétiens du XII esiècle. Louis VI et Louis VII. Paris, 1882. In the series l'Histoire de France racontée par les contemporains.

THERE is such a diversity in the charters of medieval cities that the student will find it impossible to generalize upon the movement as a whole from the few examples here placed before him. Not only do the cities of the different parts of Europe differ widely in origin and in organization, but even in the same locality uniformity is hardly to be looked for. Indeed, so great is the diversity and so confused are the types that historians have not yet discovered a satisfactory scheme of classification. The system now in vogue makes a distinction between communes, which have wrested more or less political autonomy and local government from the lords, and those cities not communes, *villes de bourgeoisie*, which have not become political entities at all, but whose citizens, as individuals, have received commercial, fiscal, and other concessions, sometimes of very great value. A special kind of *ville de bourgeoisie* is the *ville-neuf*, purposely founded by some lord upon his domain for the purpose of adding to his resources. These three sorts are illustrated in the following pages, yet the illustrations may be taken as types only with the understanding that there is a very great diversity within each type and that some charters can not satisfactorily be

classed according to this system at all. Some historians have gone to the length of saying that in fact there are as many different types as there are charters. This, however, is clearly an exaggeration. It was a common custom to take the charter of some city as a model in making grants to others, and it was usual, sometimes obligatory, for the offspring to appeal to the mother-city for explanations or interpretations of obscure provisions in the charter. Thus the celebrated charter of Lorris, which follows, was widely adopted over northern France, and that of Soissons, also given below, spread throughout the Duchy of Burgundy.

While the student will be able to analyze the forces involved in the rise of a single city, it is clear from this diversity that he can not be sure that his observations hold good for more than the particular instance at hand. Some observations concerning the city of Lorris may not be true of another city not far distant. For these generalizations, it is necessary to turn to some secondary account. The fifteenth chapter of Emerton's Mediaeval Europe will be found to serve the purpose admirably. It will be noticed that the following charters are all from one locality, the northern part of France.

1. A MANORIAL CHARTER, GRANTED BY HENRY COUNT OF TROYES. 1175 A.D.

I, Henry, Count of Troyes, make known to all men present and future, that I have established the following customs for the inhabitants who shall come to my ville-neuve, near Pont-sur-Seine. All persons living in the said city shall pay each year twelve deniers and a measure of oats as the price of his domicile; and if he wishes to have a portion of ground or of meadow, he shall pay four deniers rent per acre, and the owner

shall have power to sell or to transfer at will his house, wines or meadows. The inhabitants of the said town shall not be forced to make war nor go on any expedition, unless I myself am at their head. I grant them besides the right to have six *échevins*, who shall administer the common affairs of the town and assist my prévôt in his courts. No lord, cavalier or other shall take from the town any of its inhabitants for any reason whatever, unless he be his serf or unless he owes him arrears of his *taille*. Done at Provins, in the year 1175. (Z. et L., p. 154, from *Recueil des ordonnances des rois de Fr.*, t. XI., p. 198.)

QUESTIONS

1. What concessions did the Count of Troyes make to induce men to come to his new town? 2. Were the townsmen allowed to become proprietors in the sense of controlling their property and disposing of it at will? 3. Would a serf better his condition in this regard by becoming a townsman? 4. Were the serfs free to make use of every opportunity to better their conditions? 5. Did the Count still retain his sovereignty over the town; *i. e.*, did he retain the right of taxation, of military service, and of administering justice? 6. By what means did he maintain his control? 7. Can we tell how the *échevins* were elected? 8. If the town grew, how would the Count be richer and stronger?

2. CHARTER OF THE TOWN OF LORRIS, GRANTED BY LOUIS VII. 1155 A.D.

Louis, by the grace of God, King of the Franks, etc.

Be it known to all that whoever owns a house in the parish of Lorris shall pay a quit rent of six deniers and no more for his house and each acre of land which he owns in this parish; and if he acquire such property [by improving waste land?] this shall be the amount of rent due upon it.

No inhabitant of the parish of Lorris shall pay either a tariff or any other tax upon his food, nor shall he pay any tax for measuring the grain which his labor brings him or the labor of any beasts which he may have, nor shall he pay any tax upon the wine which he makes from his vineyards.

No inhabitant shall be compelled to go on an expedition afoot or by horse where he may not return home the same day if he so desires.

5 No inhabitant shall pay tolls as far as Etamps, nor as far as Orleans, nor as far as Milly, which is in Gâtinais, nor as far as Melun.

6 Whoever owns property in the parish of Lorris shall not be deprived of it for any offense whatever, unless the offense be committed against us, or our tenants.

7 No one shall be annoyed or arrested while going to the fairs and markets of Lorris, or while returning from them, unless he has committed some offense that same day.

8 Fines of sixty sous shall be reduced to five sous, those of five sous to twelve deniers, and the fee of the prévôt in case of complaint to four deniers.

9 No man of Lorris shall be obliged to quit Lorris in order to plead in the court of the lord king.

10 No one, neither ourselves nor anyone else, shall demand of the men of Lorris any taille or exaction.[1]

11 No one shall sell wine in Lorris with public proclamation,[2] except the King, who shall sell his wine in his cellar with such proclamation.

12 We shall be furnished at Lorris fifteen full days maintenance for our attendants and those of the Queen.

13 If anyone has had a quarrel with another, but without being guilty of house-breaking, and they shall patch up their quarrel without bringing it before the prévôt, they shall not be compelled to pay to us or to our prévôt any fine by reason of it. And if complaint has been made, they may nevertheless agree between themselves, provided they pay the fine. And if one has loged complaint against the other, and the fine has not yet been pronounced against the one or the other, they shall not owe anything by reason of this, either to ourselves or to our prévôt.

14 No man of Lorris shall labor for us unless it be two times a year to bring our wine to Orleans, and not otherwise. Only those shall perform this service who

1. Besides the payments whose amounts were fixed by custom, there were direct contributions, the *exactions*, of which the *taille* and the *tolte*, so often mentioned in the royal charters, were the chief sorts. The king collected them from the tenants of his domains either at will or at certain intervals. No tax was more unpopular. As is well known, the motive of the communal revolution was largely the desire of the citizens and peasants to exchange the arbitrary taille for a payment fixed by contract. Hence this article in the charter of Lorris.—*Z. et L.*

2. Cum edicto. While the proclamation lasted no wine could be sold by others.

have horses and carts, and they shall receive previous notice; but they shall not receive lodging from us. The villains shall also bring wood for our kitchen.

15 No one shall be kept in prison if he is able to furnish bail.

16 Whoever wishes to sell his goods may do so, and having received the purchase price, he may leave the city freely and undisturbed if he choose, unless he has committed some crime in the city.

17 Whoever shall have lived one year and a day in the parish of Lorris without any demand having been made for him, and without the privilege having been denied him either by us or by our prévôt, shall remain here free and undisturbed.

18 No one shall lodge a complaint against another except to recover or to have observed what is due him. When the men of Lorris go to Orleans with merchandise, they shall pay on leaving the city one denier for their cart, unless they go by reason of the fair. And if they go by reason of the fair and the market, they shall pay on leaving Orleans, four denier per cart, and on entering, two denier.

19 The public crier and the public watch shall have no right to fees from weddings in Lorris.

20 No peasant of the parish of Lorris cultivating his land with a plow shall give at harvest time more than one half measure of rye to all the sergeants of Lorris.

21 If some chevalier or sergeant find horses or other animals in our forests belonging to the men of Lorris he must conduct them to the prévôt of Lorris and to no one else, and if some animal of the parish of Lorris, fleeing from bulls or assailed by flies, enters our forest or leaps over our hedges, the owner of the animal shall pay no fine to the prévôt if he can swear that the animal entered in spite of his keeper; but if the animal enters with the knowledge of his keeper, the proprietor shall pay twelve deniers, and so much for each animal, if there are several.

22 There shall be at Lorris no payment for the carrying of bread to the ovens.

23 There shall be at Lorris no payment for the watch.

24 All men of Lorris who bring salt and wine to Orleans shall pay only one denier for each cart.

25 No man of Lorris shall make payment to the prévôt of Etampes, nor to the prévôt of Pithiviers, nor in all Gatinais.[1]

26 No one of them shall pay toll on entering Ferrières, nor Château-Landon, nor Puiseaux nor Nibelle.

27 The men of Lorris may gather dead wood in the forest for their own use.

28 Whoever in the market of Lorris buys or sells something and by inadvertence fails to pay the duty, may make payment within eight days without being molested, if he is able to swear that he has not retained the money intentionally.

29 No man of Lorris having a house, a vinyard, a meadow, a field, or building whatsoever in the domains of St. Benedict, shall be under the jurisdiction of the abbot of Benedict nor of his sergeant, unless it be for failure to pay the rent or the sheaves by which the property is held. And in this case, he shall not be compelled to leave Lorris for trial.

30 If one of the men of Lorris shall be accused of something and the matter cannot be proven by witnesses, he shall purge himself by his own oath against the affirmation of the accuser.

31 No man of this parish shall pay any duty for what he buys or sells for his own use in the territory of the banlieu, nor for what he buys at the Wednesday market.

32 These customs are granted to the men of Lorris, and they are the same as those granted to the men who live at Courtpalais, at Chanteloup, and in the bailiwick of Harpard.

33 We ordain that every time the prévôt is changed in the city, he shall swear to observe faithfully these customs and the new sergeants shall do the same every time they are installed. (Z. et L., p. 147, from Loysel, *Memoires de Beauvais*, p. 271, translated by Guizot.)

QUESTIONS

1. Are the provisions of this charter arranged logically? 2. Are not certain trivial matters mentioned and other essential ones omitted? 3. How do you ac-

1. They should make payments only to the prevot of Lorris. The purpose of this provision is to prevent prevots from encroaching upon each others territory.—*Z. et L.*

count for these peculiarities of form? 4. What is the character of the concessions made to the men of Lorris? Were they political? 5. Is there any concession made to the town of Lorris as such, apart from the individual townsmen? 6. Is there mention of any government except that of the King's officials? 7. What were the King's officers called? 8. Did the King relinquish the right to the military services of his subjects? 9. Did he still tax the townsmen directly, or did the town pay the King a lump sum? 10. Did the King retain the right of administering justice? 11. Cite some admirable provisions governing the administration of justice. 12. Is it the King's purpose to encourage or discourage the growth of Lorris? 13. Is it the King's purpose to encourage or discourage trade and industry? 14. Where is Lorris? Was it on the King's own domain, or on the domain of an unruly vassal? 15. What was the King's purpose in making these liberal concessions? 16. Prepare a short outline, showing the concessions made to the men of Lorris.

3. ORIGIN OF THE COMMUNE OF LAON. 1108–1115 A. D.

Thefts and depredations were committed publicly by the first citizens of the town or by their domestics, so that no one could walk the streets in safety at night but must expect at any moment to be plundered, taken prisoner, or slain. The clergy, with the archdeacons and the lords, having considered these things and seeking an opportunity to wring money from the people, sent messengers to them offering to consent to the formation of a commune, if they would give sufficient money for the license. But a commune (new and execrable word!) consists in this: that the tributaries shall be obliged to pay only once a year to their masters the accustomed debt of servitude; if they commit an offense they shall be punished for it by a fine fixed by law, and they are exempted entirely from all the other tributary exactions customarily demanded of serfs. When this opportunity to purchase their freedom occurred, the people sacrificed all the heaps of money which they had in reserve for the purpose of closing these insatiable mouths, and these mouths, satisfied by such a rich feast, took oath to keep faith in this transaction. (Z. et L., p. 140, from Guibert de Nogent, t. XII., p. 250.)

QUESTIONS

1 Compare the motives of these lords and clergy with the motives of the Court of Troyes and Louis VII. above. 2. Compare the method of collecting money from the townsmen. 3. Did the lords and clergy welcome the formation of this commune? 4. Why were the townsmen willing to pay dearly for their charter? What advantages had they over the neighboring peasants?

4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMUNE OF SOISSONS BY LOUIS VI. 1126 A.D.

All the men living within the walls of the city of Soissons and without the walls in the suburb, to whatever manor they may belong, shall take oath to the commune; and if any one of them refuse, those who shall have taken the oath shall exercise justice over his house and his money.

All the men living within the boundaries of the commune shall render mutual aid to each other to the extent of their ability, and not permit anyone to carry anything away or to collect taxes from any one of them.

When the clock shall summon the commune to assembly, ony one who fails to appear shall pay a fine of twelve deniers.

If any one of the commune has committed an offense in anything and refuses to give satisfaction before the aldermen, the men of the commune shall do justice in the case.

The men of this commune shall take to wife the women whom they desire, after having demanded permission of the lords to whom the women belong; but if the lords refuse, and if without the consent of the lord some one marries a woman belonging to another manor, the fine which he shall pay in this case on the complaint of her lord, shall be five sols only.

If a stranger brings his bread and his wine into the city as a place of security and afterwards a difference arises between his lord and the men of this commune, he shall have fifteen days in which to sell his bread and his wine in the city and take away the money, unless he has committed some crime or has been accomplice in some crime.

If the bishop of Soissons sends inadvertently into the

city a man who has injured a member of this commune, he may recall him this time, after being advised that the man is an enemy of the commune, but he shall not send him again in any capacity, except with the consent of those who are given the authority of the commune.

All forfeiture except offenses against the commune, shall be punished by a fine of 5 sols. (Z. et L., p. 141, from *Recueil des ordonnances des rois de France*, t. XI., p. 219.)

QUESTIONS

1. Had the commune a government of its own? 2. How was it organized? 3. Is there any mention of a royal officer residing in the city? 4. Is it clear how the magistrates were chosen? 5. Had the commune an *esprit de corps?* 6. Did the commune include every one living within its limits? 7. Why should a lord object to one of his serfs marrying a man of the commune? 8. Were strangers encouraged to carry on their business in the city?

5. LOUIS VII. CONFIRMS AND GUARANTEES THE CHARTER TO THE COMMUNE OF BEAUVAIS. 1144 A.D.

In the name of the Holy and Invisible Trinity, we, Louis, by the Grace of God King of the Franks and Duke of the Aquitanians, make known to all, present and future, that we grant and confirm, saving the fealty due us, in the same manner as has been instituted and sworn, and with the same customs, the charter given a long time before by our father Louis to the men of Beauvais. These customs are as follows:–

All the men living within the walls of the city and in the suburbs, to what ever lord the land upon which they dwell may belong, shall take oath to the commune, unless some of them abstain by the advice of the peers[1] and of those who have taken oath to the commune.

In all the extent of the city, each shall succor the others loyally according to his power.

If any one shall do injury to a man who has taken oath to this commune, the peers of the commune, if complaint is made to them, shall according to their judgment do justice to his body and his goods, unless

1. Those who administer the commune.

he shall make good the injury according to their judgment.

If he who has committed the injury shall take refuge in some strong castle, the peers of the commune shall confer with the lord of the castle, or whoever may be in his place, concerning the matter, and if satisfaction is made to them by the enemy of the commune, according to their judgment this shall be sufficient. But if the lord refuses satisfaction, they shall seize his goods or his men according to their judgment.

If some stranger merchant comes to Beauvais for the market, and some one does him an injury within the limits of the banlieu, and complaint is made before the peers, and the merchant is able to find the guilty party in the city, the peers shall give him assistance according to their judgment, unless, however, this merchant should be an enemy of the commune.

And if the guilty party retires to some strong castle, and the merchant or the peers send to him, if he makes amends to the merchant or proves that he did not do him the injury, the commune shall be content in the matter; but if he does neither the one nor the other, justice shall be done to him according to the judgment of the peers if he is captured in the city.

No one except us or our senechal shall have power to send into the city a man who has done injury to any one of the commune without having made amends according to the judgment of the peers. And if the bishop of Beauvais himself shall send by mistake into the city a man who has done injury to some one of the commune, he shall not send him here again after this has been made known to him, unless by the consent of the peers; but for this time he shall have power to recall him, safe and sound.

If the bishop of Beauvais is on the point of going to our three courts[1] or to the army, he shall take each time only three horses, and shall not demand them of strangers in the commune; and if he wishes to send us some fish from time to time, he shall take only one horse for this purpose.

No member of the commune shall give or lend his

1. General assemblies usually held at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.—*Z. et L.*

money to enemies of the commune while it is at war with them, because if he does this, he shall be guilty of perjury, and if someone is convicted of having given or lent anything whatever to them, justice shall be done in the manner according to the judgment of the peers.

And if it comes to pass that the commune marches outside the city against its enemies, no one shall speak with them except by permission of the peers.

The men of the commune shall have a care to place their provisions under a faithful guard within the limits of the city, because if the provisions are seized without the city, the commune cannot reclaim them unless the thief is captured in the city.

Concerning the exposure of cloth for sale: The stakes for suspending it shall be fastened to the ground at equal heights, and if any one makes complaint concerning this subject, justice shall be done according to the judgment of the peers.

Every member of the commune is to be very sure of himself when he lends money to a stranger; because no one can be arrested for this, unless the debtor has bail in the city.

The peers of the commune shall swear to favor no one on account of friendship, and to condemn no one on account of enmity, and to do equal justice in all things according to their best judgment. All others shall swear to observe the decisions of the peers and execute them.

As for us, we grant and confirm the jurisdiction and decisions which the peers shall make, and in order that these things may be fixed in the future, we have permitted them to be put in writing, and have furnished them with the authority of our seals and to corroborate them by writing below our name.

Done publicly at Paris, in the year 1144 of the Incarnation of the Virgin, of our reign the eighteenth, being present in our palace those whose names and seals are inscribed below: Raoul, Count of Vermandois, our Seneschal; Mathieu, Chamberlain; Mathieu, Constable; William, Cup-bearer Done by the hand of Cadurc, Chancellor. (Z. et L., p. 144.)

QUESTIONS

1. How was Beauvais governed? 2. Did the commune include every one living within its limits? 3. Could the commune make war? 4. What are the evidences of a strong *esprit de corps?* 5. Were strangers protected in the city and encouraged to do business there? 6. What were the territorial limits of the criminal jurisdiction of the commune? 7. What provisions are common in the charters of Beauvais and of Soissons? 8. Have both communes made themselves nearly independent of their bishops?

6. LOUIS VII. REPROACHES THE CITIZENS OF REIMS FOR THEIR USURPATIONS. 1139 A.D.

To the mayor and to the commune of Reims, Louis, by the grace of God King of the Franks and Duke of the Aquitanians, grace and favor.

It is very painful to us to see that you do what no other commune has dared to do. You overstep in all points the limitations of the commune of Laon, which has been given to you as model, and have done that which we have expressly prohibited you to do, that is, to incorporate into your commune outside districts or villages. You have done this with audacity and boldness. The customary revenues of the Church, possessed by her since several centuries, you either collect yourselves, or by the authority of your commune have prohibited the subjects to pay. You either destroy entirely or you diminish the liberties, the customs and jurisdictions belonging to the churches of Reins, and especially those of the canons of the church of St. Mary, which is now in our hands and has no other defenders than us. Besides, you have forced the sergeants of the canons, who are under the same privileges as their masters, to pay ransoms. You have imprisoned several of them, and some do not even dare to leave the church from fear of you. In view of these excesses, we have already commanded you and we now command and order you to keep the peace towards them, and to restore what you have taken from them, and to respect in their entirety, the jurisdictions, laws and franchises of the churches and of the canons. Farewell. (Z. et L., p. 142, from *Histor. de France,* t. XVI. p. 5.)

QUESTIONS

1. Of what usurpation were the citizens of Reims accused? 2. Why was it natural for the city to come into conflict with the clergy?

GENERAL EXERCISES

1. Cite as many passages as you can to illustrate the old proverb, "City air makes free."
2. Explain why some lords favored the growth of towns on their domains, while others opposed them bitterly.
3. Make a very careful comparison of the charters of Lorris and Beauvais, showing what they have in common and wherein they differ.

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH. D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 9. MAY, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

THE TRADES OF PARIS.

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Trades of Paris ca. 1260.

Zeller B. Philippe le Hardi. Moeurs et institutions du XIII. siècle. Paris, 1884. In the series l'Histoire de France racontée par les contemporains.

THE *livre des métiers* of Paris owes its origin to Etienne Boileau, whom Louis IX. appointed prévot of Paris in 1258. Ever since the office of prévot had become venal, Paris had suffered so greatly from lawlessness and maladministration that the necessity of some sort of reform was evident. Louis IX. remodelled the jurisdiction of the prevostship to include the police of Paris and the administration of justice, and appointed Etienne Boileau to the post. The choice proved to be a wise one. Etienne Boileau was a prominent burgher of Paris, of the class which had suffered greatly from the recent disorders. In a short time order had been restored.

It was in the course of his efforts to restore order that Etienne Boileau called before him the masters of the various trades of Paris and took their depositions concerning the traditional practices and rules which governed the trades. These depositions were immediately written down by a clerk, and some of them retain the form of an address to the prévot, the form in which a deposition would very naturally be made. They fix the relations of the trade with the king's officers, the amount of services and taxes owing to the king, the priv-

ileges which they have acquired, rules for enforcing honesty and honor among the tradesmen, and other matters. It will be noticed, however, that Etienne Boileau did not invent or promulgate these rules. He merely codified the traditional usages and customs according to which the trades had long been governed.

1. OF THE MASONS, STONE-CUTTERS, PLASTERERS, AND MORTARERS

Any one who desires may be mason in Paris provided he knows the trade and observes its usages and customs, which are as follows:

No one shall have more than one apprentice in his trade, and if he has an apprentice, he shall engage him for not less than six years' service, but of course he may engage him for a longer term of service and for more money, if he can get them. If he engage him for less than six years, he shall be fined twenty sous of Paris, to be paid to the chapel of our lord St. Blaise, except it be his sons, born in lawful wedlock, and these alone.

The mason however may take another apprentice as soon as the first apprentice shall have completed five years, whatever the term may be for which he engaged the first apprentice.

The present king, whom God prosper, has given the guardianship of the masons to master William of St. Patu, so long as it shall please him. The same Master William swore at Paris, in the rooms of the palace above said, that to the extent of his power he would ably and honorably administer the said trade, as well for the poor as for the rich, for the weak as for the strong, so long as it should please the king to entrust him with the administration of the said trade. Then Master William took the oath in the said form in the presence of the prévôt of Paris, at the Châtelet.

The mortarers and the plasterers are of the same condition and have the same laws as the masons in all matters.

The master who administers the trade of masons, mortarers, and plasterers of Paris in the king's name

may have two apprentices, but no more, in the manner aforesaid, but if he shall take more than this number, he shall be fined as provided above.

The masons, the mortarers and the plasterers may have as many workmen and assistants in their trade as they please.

All the masons, all the mortarers, all the plasterers shall swear by the Saints that they will keep and observe truly and honorably every rule of the said trade, and if they know of anyone who is remiss in any matter, who does not observe these usages and customs aforesaid, they shall inform the master of the trade every time that they shall know of it, and upon their oath.

The master of an apprentice who has finished and completed his term shall go before the master of the trade and give notice that the apprentice has completed his term satisfactorily and honorably. Then the master who administers the trade shall administer the oath to the apprentice by the Saints that he will observe the usages and customs of the trade truly and honorably.

No one shall carry on the said trade after the sounding of the nineth hour at Notre Dame during Charnage,[1] and on Saturdays during Lent after the chanting of vespers at Notre Dame, unless it be to finish an arch or a stairway, or to close a door opening on the street. And if any one shall work after the hours aforesaid, except for the purposes mentioned or in case of necessity, he shall pay a fine of four deniers to the master who administers the trade, and on a repetition of the offense, the master may deprive him of the tools of the trade.

The mortarers and plasterers are under the jurisdiction of the master who administers the said trade in the king's name.

QUESTIONS

1. What was necessary in order to become a mason in Paris? 2. Could masons from other cities move to Paris with their trades? 3. What possible motives could the trades have had in limiting the number of apprentices and extending their term of service? 4. During the period of apprenticeship, did the master pay the apprentice for his services, or the apprentice pay the master for his instruction? (*infra*) 5. Were the

1. The time of the year in which the Roman Catholic Church permits the eating of meat.

employers ever limited in the number of workmen they might employ? (*infra*) 6. Was there any restriction upon the hours of labor? 7. In what relation did the trade stand to the king? 8. What powers were exercised by the master who administered the trade? 9. Was this régime likely to be as oppressive as the administration of a royal officer not of the trade? 10. Were a number of allied trades sometimes included in the same organization?

2. OF THE WEAVERS OF WOOL

No one may be weaver of wool in Paris until he has bought the trade from the king; and he who has bought the prerogative of the king, sells the trade in the king's name, to the one dearer, to the other cheaper, according as it seems to him good.

No weaver of wool nor any one else shall or ought have a weaver's shop within the banlieu of Paris, unless he knows how to ply the trade with his own hand, except he be the son of a master.

Every weaver of wool in Paris may have two wide looms and one narrow in his house, but none outside of his house.

Every son of a master-weaver of wool, so long as he is under the guardianship of his father or of his mother, that is to say so long as he has not, and has not had a wife, may have two wide looms and one narrow in the house of his father, if he knows how to ply the trade with his own hands, and he shall not be called upon to pay for the night-watch nor any other tax, nor to buy his trade from the king so long as he is under this guardianship.

Every weaver of wool may have in his house one of his brothers and one of his nephews, and for each of these two wide looms and one narrow, provided that the brother and nephew ply the trade with their own hands; but immediately that he lets them go, he cannot keep the looms. The brother and nephew are not required to buy the trade from the king, nor to serve on the night-watch, nor to pay the taille, so long as they are under the guardianship of their brother and uncle.

No weaver of wool shall, by reason of his minor sons, or by reason of one of his brothers, or one of his nephews, have the looms aforesaid anywhere except in his house.

No weaver shall maintain the looms mentioned above for any one except he be his son of legal spouse, or his brother or nephew born in lawful wedlock.

Every weaver of wool may have in his house one apprentice and no more; but he shall not engage him for less than four years of service, and at the rate of four livres of Paris, or for five years of service and nine sous of Paris, or for six years of service and twenty sous, or for seven years without payment.

The master-weaver may of course contract with his apprentice for a longer service and more money, but he shall not contract with him for less.

The apprentice may buy up the remainder of his term if the master is willing, provided he has [already] served four years; but the master shall not sell nor remit to him the service until he has served four years; nor shall the master take another apprentice, unless the apprentice takes flight, or marries or flees across sea.

The master-weaver of wool shall not engage an apprentice during the four years for which the other apprentice owes him service, unless this apprentice is dead, or has renounced the trade forever; but so soon as he shall have died or shall have renounced the trade, the master may engage another apprentice, but only in the manner set forth above.

If the apprentice plays truant or runs away through his folly or his sloth, he is bound to restore and make good to his master all the costs and losses which he shall have suffered by his fault, before he be allowed to return to his old master or to a new one.

Whoever is a weaver in Paris may dye in his house in all colors except with woad; but he shall not dye with woad except in separate houses; since Queen Blanche, whom God absolve, granted that the trade of weavers might have two houses in which one might ply the trades of dyer and of weaver, and freely without being held to any payment to the dyer, and that the weavers might engage workmen and laborers from the dyers.

QUESTIONS

1. Under what conditions might one become a weaver of wool in Paris? 2. Did the king sometimes grant away the control of single trades? (*infra*) 3. Give the

rules governing apprenticeship. 4. Are they the same as those of the masons? 5. What restrictions were placed upon the extension of a weaver's business? 7. When did a Paris youth escape from parental control? 8. Did the trades of Paris sometimes encroach upon each other? 9. What authority fixed their limits?

3. OF THE CARPENTERS

These are the ordinances of the masters who belong to the carpentry of the banlieu of Paris, as Master Fouques of the Temple and his predecessors have exercised and maintained them in times past; that is to say, carpenters, door-makers, coopers, wheel-wrights, roofers, and all manner of workers in wood with edge-tools.

First, Master Fouque of the Temple says that when the offices and the administration of the said trade was given him, he had all the masters swear that they would not ply their trade from Saturday at the sounding of the nineth hour by the great bell of Notre Dame.

No one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for less than eight years, nor accept wages for the work of their apprentice during the first year, except six deniers for his expenses during the day; nor may one have more than one apprentice; nor may one take another apprentice until the said first apprentice shall be in his last year, unless it be his son or nephew, or those of his wife, born in lawful wedlock.

The carpenters, chest-makers or door-makers shall not work at night, except for the king, or for the queen, or for their children, or for the bishop of Paris.

If the aforesaid Master Fouques finds carpenters, chest-makers or door-makers working on Saturday after the sounding of the ninth hour by the great bell of Notre Dame, he shall have authority to fine them twelve deniers, or confiscate their tools.

Moreover, the said Master Fouques shall cause the wheel-wrights to take oath that they will put no axle-trees in carts which are not so strong that they would be willing to have them put in their carts if they were drivers.

At the time of the said Master Fouques and of his predecessors, all kinds of workers with edge-tools, that is to say, coopers, coachmakers, boat-builders, turners, panel-makers, roofers and all other workers who be-

long to the carpentry, shall govern themselves, and it was so established that if one of the laborers of the trades aforesaid should be summoned before the said Master Fouques and shall fail to come, that he shall pay four deniers five a day; and that the said Master Fouques might establish one man in each trade, whomever he chose, to administer said trade.

QUESTIONS

1. What was the origin of the rules governing the carpentry? 2. Wherein do the rules concerning apprenticeship differ from those governing the other trades? 3. What restrictions were placed upon the hours of labor? 4. Were there many allied trades included in this organization? 5. How was the carpentry organized and how was it governed?

4. OF THE SMITHS[1]

No one shall be blacksmith in Paris, that is to say, farrier, lock smith, edge-tool maker, who has not bought the trade of the king; and the king's master-farrier sells it in the king's name, to the one dearer, to the other cheaper, according to his pleasure, as high as five sols, which five sols shall not be exceeded.

The king has granted to his master-farrier this trade and the jurisdiction over it, so long as it is the king's pleasure.

Whoever is of the said trade, shall pay to the king each year six deniers at the workshop of the royal farriery, to be paid at Pentecost, which has been granted to the master-farrier during the king's pleasure, and for this the master-farrier of the king is bound to shoe the king's saddle-horses, and these alone, and no other horses.

Whoever is of the trade aforesaid, and has bought the trade in the manner set forth above, is excused from serving on the night-watch for a year and a day, but no longer.

No one who has bought the said trade shall ply the trade until he has paid the purchase price, anywhere up to five sols, and has taken oath to follow the trade truly and honestly according to the usages and customs which his predecessors have observed before him.

1. Fevres, workers in iron.

The master of the trade shall receive this oath in the presence of the prud'hommes of the trade.

Whoever prefers to ply his trade at his house may do so by paying three sols a year to the hauban of the king.

Whoever desires to work at his trade away from his house it is necessary that he have permission of the surveyor of roads in Paris, and he shall pay six sols to the hauban of the king if he follows his trade away from his house.

Whoever is of the said trade may engage as many workmen and apprentices as he pleases.

Blacksmiths, farriers, edge-tool makers, and greiffers may work at night if they please, and all of the trade aforesaid, except locksmiths and cutters.

The master-farrier shall summon his watch and shall choose each year six prud'hommes, which six men are required to summon the watch, and are free from their service on the watch: and the six men and the masters shall have no other profit from this.

No one who has been of the said trade for nine years shall be required to serve on the watch, nor any one during the period that his wife lies with child.

The master-farrier exercises jurisdiction over all the masters of the said trades, over the workmen and over the offenses connected with their trades, blacksmiths and others, and over all accusations which they bring against one another.

QUESTIONS

1. In what relation did the trade stand to the king? 2. Was it a source of revenue to the king? 3. How was it governed? 4. What restrictions were placed upon the exercise of the trade? 5. What privileges had the members not found in the previous extracts?

5. OF THE BREWERS

Anyone who wishes may be brewer in Paris with the king's permission provided he will carry on the trade according to the usages and customs of the trade which the prud'hommes of the trade have established and ordained for honesty and honor, which usages and customs are as follows:

Whom the king grants permission to brew at Paris

shall have as many apprentices and sergeants[1] as he pleases, and may carry on his trade by day and by night provided the shop belongs to him.

No brewer either shall or ought make beer except from water and grain, that is to say, of barley, of barley and wheat mixed, and of malt, and if he adds anything to strengthen it, as juniper (?), pimento, or pea-grapes, he shall pay a fine to the king of twenty sous of Paris for each offense, and the entire brew which is made of these things shall be dedicated to charity. The prud'hommes of the trade say that not all things are good and proper to put into beer, since they are unwholesome and injurious for the head and for the body, for the strong and for the sick.

No one shall or ought sell beer except in the brewery itself; for the beer sold by the hawkers is not so good and pure as that sold in the breweries, but sour and stale, since they do not understand how to keep it fresh. And those who do not brew themselves, but who send it to sell in two or three different parts of Paris, do not sell it themselves, nor their wives, but send their little daughters, even into the foreign quarters where rude and fallen company gathers. For these reasons, the prud'hommes of the trade have agreed to these rules, if it please the king; and whoever shall act contrary thereto shall pay to the king twenty sols of Paris, for every offense; and the beer which is found in such other places shall be dedicated to charity.

The prud'hommes of the trade of brewers of Paris request, if it please the king, that the said trade may have two prud'hommes sworn in the king's name, which prud'hommes shall take oath by the Saints in the presence of the prévôt of Paris, that they will administer truly and honestly the trade aforesaid, and that they will make known to the prévôt or to his officers at the earliest possible moment any violations of the rules which they shall discover.

The brewers of Paris shall serve on the night-watch and shall owe the taille, and the other dues and services which the other burghers of Paris owe to the king.

1. Workmen who have served their apprenticeship, but have not yet become masters.

The brewers of Paris of nine years standing, those who are ill, those who have been bled, provided they were not summoned before the blood-letting, those who are out of the city, if they were not summoned before leaving, or if they did not know of the summons, those whose wives are with child, are excused from the night-watch, provided that they give notice to those who superintend the night-watch in the king's name.

QUESTIONS

1. How was Paris policed? 2. Under what conditions was the trade open to new-comers? 3. Was it usual for the trades to allow an unlimited number of apprentices? 4. Was it usual to leave the hours of labor unfixed? 5. Were the restrictions upon the manner of brewing intended for the protection of the producer or consumer? 6. How were the rules of the trade enforced?

6. OF THE MARKET-DUES ON CLOTHS

Whoever sells scarlet cloth at Paris in the market-place or at his house, shall pay two sous market-dues for the sale of each piece, and the purchaser two sous, if he is not buying it for his own use; but if he is buying it for his own use, he shall pay nothing.

For cloth of Beauvais, the seller shall pay four deniers market-dues and the buyer four deniers, unless they are of the fraternity of drapers; but if they are of the fraternity of drapers, they shall pay for each piece three deniers market-duties.

The weavers who sell cloths at their houses shall pa for each piece which they sell at their houses, provided they have weaved it themselves, two deniers market-dues, and the buyer two deniers market-dues to the lord under whom he lives, and if they sell it in market, they shall pay six deniers market-dues, and the buyer six deniers.

The drapers of Paris shall pay nine deniers for a stall at the fair of Saint Ladre; for each colored cloth, whether striped or not, sold outside the fair of Saint Ladre, twelve deniers market-dues shall be paid, that is to say, six by the seller and six by the buyer.

Cloths of Chartres shall pay six deniers market-dues for each piece, that is to say, three deniers from the seller and three deniers from the buyer. Each cape

sold shall pay four deniers market-dues, that is to say, two deniers from him who sells and two deniers from him who buys, provided he does not buy for his own use. Tiertaines, galebrun,[1] and all other warped cloth shall be subject to the same dues. All cloths which measure nineteen ell and one-half, if they are of full width, shall be subject to the same dues.

The drapers of Paris hold their market three times a year; that is to say, at St. John, at St. Ladre and at Christmas, and may use as much of the market-place as they need; and are square for it on paying to the king four sous rent for each ell of stall, to be paid at St. Remi and at mid-lent; except that in the fair they shall pay for their chests. If a draper comes to Paris to the fair of St. Ladre, he shall not pay for his chest, provided he has not more than six pieces of cloth.

QUESTIONS

1. Was there a sharp distinction between manufacturers and merchants? 2. Could any sales be made without paying a duty? 3. Why were the dues greater at the markets? 4. Was the consumer taxed directly on making his purchases?

7. OF THE OLD CLOTHES MEN

No one shall be old clothes man in the banlieu of Paris, that is to say buyer or seller of clothing, old linen or woolens, or of leather of any sort, old or new, unless he buys his trade from the king; and the master chamberlain of the king, to whom the king has granted this prerogative, sells it in the king's name; and the chamberlain sells it, to the one dearer, to the other cheaper, for such price as seems to to him good.

The chamberlain ought not and shall not sell the said trade to any man who is not honest and trustworthy, and of whose honesty and trustworthiness he has not good and sufficient testimony.

No one shall be old clothes man in the banlieu of Paris until he swears by the Saints in the presence of the master and two prud'hommes of the trade that he will follow the trade honestly and honorably according to the usages and customs of the trade; that is to say, that he will not knowingly buy of a thief, if he does not know where the things come from, nor anything

1. Certain kinds of coarse cloth.

moist or bloody, unless he knows what the moisture or blood comes from, nor of lepers in the banlieu of Paris; nor any religious vestment, unless it has been worn out by legitimate use; and if anyone violates any one of these rules, he shall forfeit his trade for each and every offense, and neither ought nor shall undertake the said trade either to sell or to buy anything until he has purchased the said trade all over again, and taken the oath in the manner provided above.

No old clothes man ought or shall full cloths, nor buy or sell fulled clothes nor cloths of false dye.

The things aforesaid may be seized by him who administers the trade in the name of the master chamberlain of the king in whatever place he finds them, and caused to be burned in full market in the presence and by the consent of the prud'hommes of the trade.

QUESTIONS

1. In what relation did this trade stand to the king? 2. How was it governed? 3. What was the purpose of these prohibitions?

8. OF THE PEACOCK-HATTERS

Whoever desires to make hats ornamented with peacock feathers in Paris may do so without payment, and may have as many workmen and apprentices as he pleases, and may work at night if the shop belongs to him.

No peacock-hatter shall pay any fee for anything which he sells or buys pertaining to his trade, nor pay any toll on leaving Paris for any fairs or markets; for their occupation pays no market-dues, tolls or other dues in the city of Paris.

If any peacock-hatter puts gilded pewter on a hat, which pewter has not first been silver-plated before being gilded, the work is false and should be burnt.

No peacock-hatter shall owe service on the night-watch unless he follows another trade or calling by which he owes this service; for his trade frees him from it since the trade only concerns the churches, the cavaliers, and the chief men.

QUESTIONS

1. What unusual privileges were allowed to this trade? 2. Why were they granted?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What was the relation between the Paris trades and the royal authority. Was Paris a commune or a *ville de bourgeoisie?* In how far was a man's political status affected by his employment?

2. Make an exact statement of the conditions and purposes of apprenticeship in Paris.

3. Were the interests of the employer as carefully guarded as those of the employers? Was there the same distinction then as now between the employer and the unemployed? What separated the employer and the employed in those days?

4. What was the main purpose of the police regulations concerning the conduct of the trades? Was it to maintain the honor and efficiency of the trade against its own careless or unscrupulous workmen?

5. What are some of the most striking points of similarity and differences between medieval and modern trades-unions?

European History Studies

F. M. FLING, PH. D., EDITOR.

Vol. II. No. 10. JUNE, 1899

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS

SELECTIONS MADE

BY

GUERNSEY JONES, PH. D.,

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

J. H. MILLER, Publisher,

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

Yearly Subscription, 40 cents Single Copy, 5 cents

Ten or more subscriptions to one address, 30 cents

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, Lincoln, Nebraska U. S. A.

CIVILIZATION DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.

Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis

Giraldus Cambrensis, The Historical Works of. Containing the Topography of Ireland, and the History of the Conquest of Ireland, translated by Thomas Forester, Esq., M.A. The Itinerary through Wales, and The Description of Wales, translated by Sir Richard Colt Hoare, Bart. Revised and edited, with additional notes, by Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., etc. Bohn's Library. London, 1881.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS was born in Pembrokeshire about the year 1147. He was of illustrious birth, being descended on his mother's side from Rhys ap Theodor, Prince of South Wales. He was early destined for the Church and was sent to Paris, then famous as an educational center, where he greatly distinguished himself for his learning and his lectures. From 1184 to 1192 he was connected with the English court, and during this time filled important positions in various parts of the king's dominions. In 1198 he was elected for the second time Bishop of St. David's in Wales, but since it was the settled policy of the English to place only Norman bishops over Welsh dioceses, the confirmation of the election was twice refused. Giraldus appealed to Rome and made three journeys thither to further his claim. The dispute was very bitter and lasted some years, but in the end Giraldus lost his case. His later years until his death, the date of which is uncertain (1220 ?), were passed in retirement. (Hardy.)

The following extracts illustrating certain mediaeval points of view with reference to the external world of nature are taken from Giraldus's Topography of Ireland. The work was the result of two journeys to Ireland in 1183 and 1185–6 in company with Prince John, and was produced in 1188. It is the product of a keenly intelligent man who had studied deeply and had seen much of the world. The student's first impression on reading the Topography, especially the second part which deals with the prodigies of nature, will probably be that these stories are ridiculous to the last degree, but are without special meaning. But a moment's consideration will convince him that our feeling of utter absurdity is itself a striking illustration of the wide gulf which separates the mediaeval and modern mind in the field of natural science. Giraldus not only found nothing absurd in the story of the bear of St. Firmin or the blackbird of St. Keiwin, but he thought them of enough importance to be incorporated into an expensive manuscript volume. From this point of view, the Topography of Ireland is something more than a collection of idle and silly tales.

1. GIRALDUS'S CLASSICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL KNOWLEDGE

Thule, which is said to be the furthest of the Western islands, is very remarkable for having been well known among the Orientals both in name and position, although entirely unknown to the people of the West. Virgil * says to Augustus:—

"And furthest Thule own thy rule."

And Solinus mentions Thule as the furthest among the islands which surround Britain. He says that at

* It is impossible to give an adequate conception in these extracts of Giraldus's very frequent references to classical writers.

the summer solstice there is no night there, and at the winter solistice no day; and both Solinus and Isidore relate that beyond Thule lies the thick and frozen ocean.

Solinus places Thule, the most remote island in the ocean, between the Northern and Western regions beyond Britain and says it derives its name from the sun because the sun causes the summer solstice there, and beyond it there is no day. But this island is so unknown to the people of the West, that it appears that no one of the western or northern islands have the same name or character. We find, however, that in the furthest parts of the Arctic regions, the sun in summer is seen by the inhabitants revolving constantly for several nights about the edge of the earth, but above the horizon; and when it returns from the constellation of Capricorn, as though under the dark confines of the Antartic pole, the cheerful beams of that luminary vanish during the same space of days. Either, therefore, Thule is an island as fabulous as it is famous, or it must be looked for in the most remote and distant recesses of the northern ocean, far off under the Arctic pole. Hence Orosius, speaking with more certainty than others respecting doubtful points, says that Thule, which is separated on all sides by boundless space from the rest of the world, and faces towards the south in the midst of the ocean, is known but to few persons, and to them imperfectly. Augustine, however, in his twenty-first book, *De Civitate Dei*, says that Thule, an island in India, is to be preferred to other lands, because there the trees which it produces, keep their leaves all the whole year round. So that it appears to be situated in India. But he was led astray by a doubtful meaning, which is more apparent than real; for Tylis is the name of the one, Tyle (Thule) of the other. Hence Isidore also says, Tylis is an island of India, where the leaves are always green. And, again, Solinus says, Tylis is an island in India, which bears palms, produces oil, and abounds in vines, and it excels all lands in the miracle that every tree which grows there is clothed with perpetual verdure. (p. 77.)

When the moon is at half her growth, as her light returns, the Western seas, from some unknown natural cause, begin to be rough and agitated, and, till she is

in her full, swell more and more from day to day, overflowing the shore far beyond their usual bounds. But when the moon wanes, and her light failing, she, as it were, turns away her face, the swelling of the waters gradually declines, and when the moon's face is no longer seen, the sea returns into its proper channels, its overflow subsiding. Indeed, the moon is the entire source and cause of motion in liquids, so that it not only regulates the waters of the ocean, but, in animal life, influences the marrow in the bones, the brains in the head, and the juices of trees and plants, in proportion to its increase or decrease. Hence, when the moon ceases to be luminous you will find all animate nature shrink, but when she is again round and shining at the full, the marrow fills the bones, the brains the head, the juices of vegetables swell. Hence it is, that those are called lunatics, who suffer every month by the excessive action of the brain, as the moon increases; and the word *mensis* (a month) is derived from *mene*, which signifies decrease, because it decreases with the moon, and with her increase fills and completes its course. (p. 60.)

What wealth then can Eastern lands boast which is comparable to these advantages [of Ireland]? They possess, indeed, these silken fabrics, the produce of a little worm, which glow with colors of various dyes. They have the precious metals, and sparkling gems, and odoriferous trees. But what are these, procured at the cost of life and health? Are they not attended with the presence of a familiar enemy,—the air the Orientals breathe, and which constantly surrounds them?

In those countries all the elements, though created for the use of man, threaten wretched mortals with death, undermine health, and bring life to an end. Plant your naked foot on the earth, death is at hand; incautiously seat yourself on a rock, death is at hand; drink pure water unmixed, or smell it when it is putrid, death is at hand. Expose your head uncovered to the free air, if it be cold it pierces you through, if it be hot you languish; death is at hand. The heavens terrify you with their thunders, and flash their lightnings in your eyes. The blazing sun allows you no

rest. If you eat too much, death is at the gate; if you drink wine undiluted with water, death is at the gate. Besides this, poison threatens on all hands: the mother-in-law gives it to her step-son, the exasperated wife to her husband, the corrupt cook to his master. You may expect poison not only in the dish and in the cup, but in your clothes, your seats, your saddles. It insidiously creeps into your veins of itself; you are subject to its insidious attacks from venomous animals; man, of all noxious creatures the most noxious, insidiously gives it to man.

Besides all the more common annoyances which abound in these regions, the safety of man is threatened and and endangered by swift panthers of various kinds; by rhinoceroses, allured by love of virgins, crocodiles, fearful by their breath; hippopotami frequenting the rivers. * * * The country is infested by asps and vipers, by dragons, and by the basilisk; whose very glance is fatal. * * *

It happened, within my own memory, that a man having gone on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, as is the custom, from Britain, one morning, as he happened to be sifting with his hand the corn for his horses, he had his finger bitten by a little reptile which was lurking in the corn. Immediately his whole body, flesh and bone, was converted into a shapeless mass like pitch. * * * (p. 52).

The nearer, indeed, we go to the regions of the East, and warmer climates, the greater is the fertility of the soil, and the more plentifully does the earth pour forth her fruits. There also are found in abundance the precious metals and gems, with silk and cotton wools; and wealth of all kinds is overflowing. The people also, thanks to a brighter atmosphere, although slender in person, are of a more subtle intellect. Hence, they have recourse to poison rather than to violence for success in their schemes, and gain their purposes more by their arts than by their arms. But when we come to the Western parts of the world, we find the soil more sterile. the air more salubrious, and the people less acute, but more robust; for where the atmosphere is heavy, the fields are less fertile than the wits. (p. 54.)

QUESTIONS

1. Do you judge that Giraldus knew at first hand the authors mentioned? 2. Did he accept their statements without question? 3. Does he show critical skill in reconciling their contradictions? 4. Has Giraldus stated accurately the influence of the moon upon the tides? 5. Are his other ideas concerning the influence of the moon upon the earth and its inhabitants entirely obsolete at the present day? 6. In what manner did the western world evidently obtain its information of the Orient? 7. Did Giraldus have a correct impression in the main of the eastern countries? 8. In how far was his information at fault? 9. In how far did he acknowledge the superiority of the Orientals? 10. Was this impression correct? 11. Was Giraldus's mental horizon as limited as you had expected of a man of this period?

2. SOME ANTIQUARIAN RESEARCHES

According to the most ancient histories of the Irish, Cæsara, a granddaughter of Noah, hearing that the flood was near at hand, resolved to escape by sailing with her companions to the farthest islands of the west, as yet uninhabited by any human being, hoping that, where sin had never been committed, the flood, its avenger, would not come. The ships in company with her having been lost by shipwreck, that in which she herself sailed with three men and fifty women, was saved, and thrown by chance on the coast of Ireland in the year before the flood. But although, with ingenuity laudable in a woman, she had planned to escape the destined visitation, it was not in her power by any means to avoid the common and almost universal fate. The shore where the ship first came to land was called the bay of small ships, and the mound of earth in which she was buried is called the tomb of Cæsara to this day. But it appears to be matter of doubt how, if nearly all perished in the flood, the memory of these events, and of their arrival could have been preserved. However, those who first committed to writing these accounts must be answerable for them. For myself, I compile history: it is not my business to impugn it. Perhaps some record of these events was found, inscribed on a stone or a tile, as we read was the case with the art of music before the flood. (p. 113.)

In the three-hundredth year after the flood, Barthol

anus, the son of Terah, a descendant from Japhet, the son of Noah, with his three sons and their wives, is reported to have landed on the coast of Ireland, either by chance or design; having either erred in their course, or, as the better opinion is, mistaken the country. * * * However, Bartholanus and his sons and grandsons were no less fortunate in their affairs than in having a numerous posterity; for in three hundred years after their arrival, his descendants are said to have already increased to the number of nine thousand men. At length, having gained the victory in a great battle he fought with the Giants, since human prosperity is never durable, * * * Bartholanus, with nearly all his people, was carried off by a sudden pestilence, which probably was produced by the air being corrupted by the putrifying carcases of the slain giants. Ruanus alone is said to have escaped the mortality and to have lived, as ancient chronicles inform us, for a vast number of years (more indeed that it is easy to believe), surviving till the time of St. Patrick, by whom he was baptized. It is reported that he gave a faithful account of the history of Ireland, having related to St. Patrick all the national events, the memory of which had faded, from their great antiquity. * * * As far as can be collected from Irish annals, Ruanus is stated to have had his life prolonged for many years beyond the utmost longevity of the ancient patriarchs, although this account may appear very incredible and open to objection. (p. 114.)

In ancient times there was in Ireland a remarkable pile of stones, called the Giants' Dance, because the giants brought it from the furthest parts of Africa into Ireland, and set it up, partly by main strength, partly by artificial contrivances, in an extraordinary way, on the plains of Kildare, near Naas. Hence, certain stones exactly resembling the rest, and erected in the same manner, are seen there to the present day. It is wonderful how these stones, in such numbers and of such vast size, could ever be collected together on one spot, and raised upright, as well as by what mechanical contrivance others, not inferior in dimensions, were placed as lintels on top of the other massive and lofty piles, so that they appear suspended, and, as it were, hanging

in the air, rather by some artificial contrivance than resting on the columns supporting them. According to the British History, Aurelius Ambrosius, King of Britain, caused these stones to be transported from Ireland to Britain by the divine aid of Merlin, and in order to leave some memorial of so great a deed, they were erected on the spot where, before that time, the flower of the youth of Britain died by the concealed knives of the Saxons, who fell upon them and slew them, under the guise of peace, with their treacherous weapons. (p. 78.)

QUESTIONS

1. How much credence do you think should be given to these accounts of early Irish history? What evidence does Giraldus offer in support of them? 2. What do you think of his explanation of the origin of the Giants' Dance? (The student should read a good modern account of these prehistoric remains.) 3. Being nearer the time of their origin, was Giraldus therefore in a better position to explain their origin? 4. How do you account for Giraldus's skepticism in these passages and his boundless credulity in the extracts which follow? 5. Is it not remarkable that while expressing doubts of the story of Cæsara he should swallow the story of the giants and of Merlin's magic? 6. Where else in ancient literature have you met with accounts of giants? 7. Why should Giraldus accept the accounts of the longevity of the ancient patriarchs and question the reputed age of Ruanus?

3. SERMONS IN STONES

Cranes assemble in such numbers, that a hundred, or about that number, are often seen in one flock. By a natural instinct they keep watch in turns at night for their common safety, perched on one foot, and holding a stone in the other featherless claw, that if they should fall asleep, the fall of the stone may rouse them to renew their watch.

These birds are emblems of the bishops of the church, whose office it is to keep watch over their flock, not knowing at what hour the thief will come. And any sacred duty should employ the mind, and be like the stone, ready to drop. It should utterly shake off all sloth, and allow nothing to be thought of but itself. And if by any chance it should sometimes fail, the mind, being inured to its habitual occupation, resumes it like one awakened out of sleep.

This bird also gives notice of danger by its cries. In like manner the pastors of the church drive the wolves from the fold by sounding the alarm from the holy oracles, and with unwearied diligence lift up their voice like a trumpet. The liver of this bird is also of such a fiery heat, that when by any chance it swallows iron, its stomach digests it. So bowels inflamed with the fire of charity subdue and soften iron hearts which were before indurate, and reduce them to soft concord in brotherly love. (p. 34.)

Eagles are as numerous here as kites are in other countries. These birds eye with fixed gaze the full effulgence of the solar rays; and it is reported that they teach their young to do the same, though unwillingly. Hence, eagles (*aquilae*) are so called from their piercing eyes (*acumine*). Thus, contemplative men strive to fix the whole powers of their mind without distractions on the very essence of the Divine majesty, and on the true sun of righteousness, and, putting their hands to the plough of the heavenly paradise, do not look backward. The fathers of the church also, in order to accustom their sons in tender age to that which is good, teach them to turn the eyes of the soul to the intuition and the desire of the light divine.

Eagles also live for so many ages, that, enjoying renewed youth, they seem to contend with eternity itself. So also the saints, renewed with the innocence of childhood, having put off the old man, and put on the new man, obtain the blessed fruit of everlasting life. Again, eagles often soar so high in their flight, that their wings are scorched with the fiery rays of the sun. So those who in the Holy Scriptures strive to unravel the deep and hidden secrets of the heavenly mysteries, beyond what is allowed, and those limits which it is not permitted us to pass, returning to themselves halt below as if the wings of the presumptuous imagination on which they were borne were scorched in their flight. (p. 30.)

QUESTIONS

1. What conception of nature, so prevalent during the Middle Ages, is illustrated here? 2. How many of these statements of natural phenomena are false? 3. How did Giraldus make these mistakes? Did he think it necessary to substantiate his statements by personal

observation? 4. Is this fable of eagles renewing their youth to be found in classical literature? 5. Is Giraldus's derivation of *aquila* correct?

4. MIRACLES AND WONDERS

I come now to those facts which, being contrary to the course of nature, call forth our wonder and amazement. * * * I know, however, and am persuaded, that I shall have to write some accounts which will seem to the reader either utterly impossible, or quite ridiculous. But, with the help of God, I will insert nothing in my book the truth of which I have not elicited with the greatest diligence either from my own firm belief or the authentic testimony of most trustworthy men, who have lived in the districts of which I write. Let me not, however, be involved in a cloud of malicious slander. What I have witnessed with my own eyes, that I assert firmly and without hesitation. But what has only reached my ears through others, which I am slower to believe, that I do not affirm but only relate. To all those of which I received authentic accounts from many persons who were eye-witnesses of them, I give full credence; and I accept those given by others, whose truth and assertions I find no reason to doubt. * * *

Some countries, islands especially, and parts remote from the centre of the earth, are remarkable for prodigies which are peculiarly their own. For nature always, and purposely as it were, interlards her works with some new ones, that she may thus plainly teach and declare, that although her usual operations may be comprehended by the human understanding, her mighty power cannot be understood. Let the careful reader also remark that history must not be sparing of the truth, and that it rather chooses what is certain than what is probable. If, therefore, anything should escape me which is new and unheard of, let it not be condemned and struck out even by the malicious, but sometimes pardoning, sometimes approving, let my task proceed. (p. 57.)

When the body of St. Firmin, bishop of Auch, and a native of Narbonne, was carried through some parts of the province to Auch, the oxen which drew the vehicle being unyoked and turned out to graze, one of them

was suddenly devoured by a bear. On discovering this, St. Ferreolus, who was a nephew of St. Firmin, and the conductor of the noble procession, as well as St. Firmin's immediate successor in his episcopal see, instantly calling on the name of God, summoned the bear before him, who, making his appearance, forthwith submitted his neck to the yoke, and devoutly took the place of the ox he had slain as his successor in drawing the load. The body of St. Firmin having been thus miraculously drawn from that spot for several miles to the city of Auch, and his obsequies celebrated there with great pomp, the bear, having obtained, as it were, the permission of St. Firmin, returned unhurt to his mountain lair. Moreover, every year afterwards, as long as he lived, he regularly came to the church on the festival of St. Firmin, and, laying aside for the time all the ferocity of a beast of prey, he shewed himself to the people as a tame animal, allowing them to touch and stroke him; as if he were ready to undergo the punishment merited by his atrocious act, and the offense he had committed. Wherefore, his skin, carefully preserved in the church of St. Firmin to the present day, is held in great veneration, and is shewn to travellers and pilgrims as a memorial of this great miracle. * * *

St. Keiwin, then, upon some occasion, when, during the season of Lent, he had fled, as he was wont, from converse with men, retired to a little cabin in the wilderness, where, sheltered only from the sun and rain, he gave himself up to contemplation, and spent all his time in reading and prayer. One morning, having raised his hand to heaven, as was his custom, through the window, it chanced that a blackbird pitched upon it and laid her eggs in his palm, treating it as her nest. The saint, taking pity on the bird, showed so much gentleness and patience that he neither drew in nor closed his hand, but kept it extended and adapted it to the purpose of a nest, without wearying, until the young brood was entirely hatched. In perpetual memory of this wonderful occurrence, all the images of St. Keiwin throughout Ireland represent him with a blackbird in his extended hand. (p. 91.)

At Ossory is the mill of St. Lucherinus, the abbot,

which does not work on Sundays, and never grinds any corn which has been obtained by thieving or pillage. (p. 108.)

In Leinster, in the land of Mactalewi, there is a bell, which unless it is adjured by its keeper every night with an exorcism composed for the purpose, and fastened by some cord, however slight, is found next morning at Clunarech, in Meath, in the church of St. Finnan, from which it had come. It is certain that this occurred on several occasions. (p. 96.)

There is in the province of Leinster a district called Fernigenan (Ferns), which is only separated from Wexford by the river Slaney. From this district the larger species of mice, commonly called rats, were so entirely expelled by the curse of St. Yvorus, the bishop, whose books they had probably gnawed, that none were afterwards bred there, or could exist if they were introduced. (p. 96.)

There is a lake in the northern parts of Munster, containing two islands, one large, the other small. * * * No woman, nor any animal of the female sex, could ever enter the larger island without instant death. This has been often proved by dogs and cats, and other animals, of the female sex, which, having having been carried over for the sake of the experiment, immediately expired. * * * In the smaller island no one ever dies, was ever known to die, or could die a natural death. It is consequently called the Isle of the Living. Notwithstanding, its inhabitants are sometimes severely afflicted with mortal diseases, and languish in misery until life is nearly exhausted. But when no hope remains, all expectation of the powers of life being restored becomes extinct, and they are reduced by their increasing malady to such a degree of suffering that they would rather die than live a life of death, the natives cause themselves to be ferried over in a boat to the larger island, where they breathe their last as soon as they touch the land. (p. 61.)

There is an island called Aren, situated in the western part of Connaught, and consecrated, as it is said, to St. Brendan, where human corpses are neither buried nor decay, but, deposited in the open air, remain

uncorrupted. Here men can behold, and recognize with wonder, grandfathers, great-grandfathers, and great-great-grandfathers, and the long series of their ancestors to a remote period of past time. (p. 64.)

There is a fountain in Armorican Britain of a somewhat similar nature; for if you draw its water in the horn of an ox, and happen to spill it on the nearest road, however serene the sky may be and contrary to rain, you will not avoid its immediately falling. In Sicily there is a most wonderful fountain. If any one approaches it dressed in a red garment, its waters, bubbling up, suddenly rise to the height of the man's stature, although other colors produce no agitation of the surface. On the man's departure, the waters, sinking to their usual level, return into their former channels.

"'Tis blest to learn the principles of nature,
And scan the source of good."

But since bounds are set to the powers of the human mind, and everything mortal is far from perfection, the causes of such occurences

"Ye Muses tell; we cannot master all."

Envious nature has locked up the causes of these and other unusual occurrences among her own mysterious wonders. There is on the sea-shore of Connaught a rocky point of considerable size, which, when the tide is out, appears to rise above the strand no higher than it does above the returning waves which cover all larger objects when the tide is full. There is also in Connaught a walled place, having the appearance of a large castle, consecrated, they say, by St. Patrick. Into this enclosure they never drive so many cattle (although the booty of the whole province is very often shut up in this place of refuge), but that it would contain many more, until by chance it is reported that it is full, or supposed to be full. (p. 69.)

QUESTIONS

1. Had not Giraldus an evident delight in relating these wonders? (One third of his Topography of Ireland is devoted to them.) 2. What was Giraldus's conception of nature? Did he have any conception of natural laws? 3. What did he conceive to be the purpose of miracles and wonders? 4. What was his idea

of proving anything? 5. What is the difference between Giraldus and Munchausen? 6. Were the anathemas of the Church fearful to men only? 7. Is the fact that these miracles and wonders were found for the most part in remote parts of the earth of significance? Why were islands the special seat of prodigies?

5. NO SNAKES IN IRELAND

Of all sorts of reptiles, Ireland possesses those only which are harmless, and does not produce any that are venomous. There are neither snakes nor adders, toads nor frogs, tortoises nor scorpions, nor dragons. It produces, however, spiders, leeches, and lizards; but they are quite harmless. Hence it may be said, or even written, pleasantly, as well as with historical truth:— "In France and Italy the frogs fill the air with their croakings; in Britain they are mute: in Ireland there are none." Some indeed conjecture, with what seems a flattering fiction, that St. Patrick and the other saints of that country cleared the island of all pestiferous animals; but history asserts, with more probability, that from the earliest ages, and long before it was favored with the light of revealed truth, this was one of the things which never existed here, from some natural deficiency in the produce in the island.

Nor does it appear to me much to be wondered at that the country does not naturally produce these reptiles, no more than some kinds of fishes, birds, and wild animals which are not found there. But it does appear very wonderful that, when anything venomous is brought there from other lands, it never could exist in Ireland. For we read in the ancient books of the saints of that country, that sometimes, for the sake of experiment, serpents have been shipped over in brazen vessels, but were found lifeless and dead as soon as the middle of the Irish sea was crossed. Poison also similarly conveyed was found to lose its venom, when midway on the waters, disinfected by a purer air. Bede, in speaking of Ireland, writes on this subject as follows:—"No reptile is found there; no serpent can live there; for, though often carried thither out of Britain, as soon as the ship draws near the land, and the scent of the air from off the shore reaches them, they die. On the contrary, almost all things produced in the island have

virtues against poison." * * * Nay more, according to Bede's statement, almost all things produced in the island have virtues against poison. He gives an instance which he witnessed himself. Some persons having been bitten by serpents, water in which the scrapings of the leaves of books brought from Ireland had been mixed was given them to drink, and it extracted all the venom of the spreading poison, reduced the swelling of their bodies, and assuaged the tumor. * * *

Indeed the soil of Ireland is so hostile to poison, that, if gardens or any other spots in foreign countries are sprinkled with its dust, all venomous reptiles are immediately driven far away. (p. 47.)

There is an island, not the least of the smaller islands, which is now called Man, but had in old times the name of Ewania, and lies, they say, in the midchannel between the northern shores of Ireland and Britain. Which country it rightly belonged to was a matter of great doubt among the ancients; but the controversy was settled in this way. Since the island allowed venomous reptiles, brought over for the sake of experiment, to exist in it, it was agreed by common consent that it belonged to Britain. (p. 76.)

QUESTIONS

1 Did the Giraldus understand the function of experiments in natural science? (also *supra*) 2. What was the matter with his experiments? 3. Is there not a slight discrepancy between the statement of Bede and the statement from the ancient book of the saints? 4. Does the discrepancy apparently escape Giraldus?

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What is the extent of Giraldus's mental horizon?
2. What was his conception of nature? Did he have any idea of natural laws?
3. What was his idea of proving anything? Did he appreciate the necessity of experiments in natural science?
4. What is the difference between Giraldus and Munchausen?
5. Cite as many examples as you can to show the surprising persistence of certain fables and superstitions.

J H. Miller's Publications.

PARTIAL LIST.

HISTORY.

SOURCE MATERIAL.

I. A Survey of American History, Caldwell. Source extracts. (New edition) Price, 75c.

II. Some Great American Legislators, Caldwell. Source extracts, treating of ten American Statesmen, from Gallatin to Blaine. (New edition). Price, 75c.

III. Territorial Development, Caldwell. Source extracts treating of Colonial Boundaries, Northwest Territory, Louisiana Purchase, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, etc. Valuable for class or library. Price, 75c.

IV. American History, Caldwell. For high school use. Composed of Vol. I. and Vol. III. Price, $1.25.

V. Greek and Roman Civilization, Fling. A collection of source material in ten chapters, touching upon salient topics of Grecian and Roman history. Price, 60c.

VI. Civilization in the Middle Ages, Guernsey Jones, Ph. D. Source extracts Price, 60c.

VII. A Survey of English History, Mary Tremain. Covers whole period of English history. Extracts from public documents. Invaluable for collateral study. Price, 75c.

METHOD.

Studies in European and American History. F. M. Fling and H. W. Caldwell. A manual setting forth the principles and plans of the "Source Study" method. $1.00.

Outline of Historical Method. F. M. Fling. A series of papers on Criticism of Sources, Synthetic Operations, etc. Prof. Edw. Bourne (Yale) says: "I shall use 'Historical Method' in one or more of my courses." Price, 60c.

ENGLISH.

Studies in Literature and Composition. W. H. Skinner. A text for first year of high school. Also a valuable manual for any teacher of English. Price, 90c.

High School Exercises in Literature. L. A. Sherman, Ph. D. This will consist of a series of practical exercises that may be given to a class in any preparatory school. It will contain about 150 pages. (Ready August 15.)

Questions on the Art of Shakespeare. L. A. Sherman, Ph. D. Hamlet, Julius Cæsar, each, 15c.; The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, Othello, Antony and Cleopatra, each, 10c. Sample pages free.

Inductive Studies in Browning. H. C. Peterson, Ph. D. This edition for school and college use contains 21 of the most artistic of Browning's poems, with notes and several hundred analytic questions. Price, 80c.

.....ADDRESS.....

AINSWORTH & COMPANY,

378-388 Wabash Avenue, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.

American History Studies.

H. W. CALDWELL, A. M.

Professor of American History, University of Nebraska.

Extracts from the sources of American History, Early Laws, Treaties, State Papers, Letters, Speeches, etc.—Single copy, 5c.; 10 or more copies of one number, 4c. each. These are used in all grades of schools, from the rural school to the University.

Vol. I. A Survey of American History.

1897-1898—No. I. Founding of the Colonies. No. II. Development of Union among the Colonies. No. III. Causes of the Revolution. No. IV. Formation of the Constitution. No. V. Growth of Nationality. No. VI. Slavery (1). No. VII. Slavery (2). No. VIII. Civil War and Reconstruction. No. IX. Foreign Relations. No. X. Industrial Developments. **Bound Volume, 75c**
[Extra. Early Colonial Laws, 5c.]

Vol. II. Some Great Legislators.

1898-1899—No. I. Gallatin. No. II. J. Q. Adams. No. III. Clay. No. IV. Webster. No. V. Calhoun. No. VI. Sumner. No. VII. Douglas. No. VIII. Seward. No. IX. Chase. No. X. Blaine. **Bound Volume, 75c**

Vol. III. Territorial Development. Expansion.

1899-1900—No. I. Territorial Boundaries. No. II. First National Boundaries. No. III. The Northwest Territory. No. IV. Acquisition of Louisiana. No. V. Purchase of Florida. No. VI. Annexation of Texas. No. VII. Annexation of California and New Mexico. No. VIII. Annexation of California and Oregon. No. IX. Alaska and Hawaii. No. X. West Indies and the Philippines. **Bound Volume, 75c.**

European Leaflets.

Single copy, 5c.; ten or more of one number at 4c. each.

1. Greek and Roman Civilization,
   10 Nos.—Bound Volume, 60 cents.
2. Civilization of the Middle Ages,
   10 Nos.—Bound Volume, 60 cents.
3. A Survey of English History,
   10 Nos.—Bound Volume, 75 cents.

.....ADDRESS.....

AINSWORTH & COMPANY,

378-388 Wabash Avenue, - - - CHICAGO, ILL.