Logo Design: Julian Maxwell

Cover Design: DeAnna Stevens

Cover Image: Tomasz Bidermann/Shutterstock.com

Members of the Saber and Scroll Historical Society, the volunteer staff
at the Saber and Scroll Journal publishes quarterly.

saberandscroll.weebly.com

Contents

From the Editorial Team:

Welcome to the fifth issue of the American Public University System (APUS)'s Saber and Scroll Journal. This issue contains a number of exceptional feature articles primarily concentrated on Medieval History, including those with a focus on military history, women's history, social and cultural history as well as two articles on Ancient Greece. The journal team extends a special thanks to the authors of these articles. We would also like to thank our book reviewers and are pleased that this issue contains more book reviews than any previous Saber and Scroll Journal.

The Editorial Team is also pleased to welcome a number of new Saber and Scroll volunteers to the journal team. Our content editors include Anne Midgley, Ben Sorensen, Kathleen Guler, Melanie Thornton and Kay O'Pry-Reynolds. They are joined by our proofreader, Frank Hoeflinger, our technical writer DeAnna Stevens and our webmaster, Danielle Crooks. These individuals have dedicated countless hours to the creation of a rigorously edited quality history journal.

The publication of the Saber and Scroll Journal is a fairly recent endeavor and it has not been without growing pains as we have once again experienced the departure of the acting Editor-In-Chief. However, the individuals who have served in that role have helped our journal progress, and we are grateful for their leadership and on-going support. We continue to seek additional volunteers to help create a superb student-led history journal; if interested, please contact any member of the current journal team.

Please enjoy this issue of the Saber and Scroll Journal!

Journal Staff

Interim Editor in Chief: Anne Midgley
Editor: Kay O'Pry-Reynolds
Editor: Melanie Thornton
Editor: Kathleen Guler
Editor: Benjamin Sorenson
Proofreader: Frank Hoeflinger
Copy Editor: DeAnna Stevens
Web Editor: Danielle Crooks

Eleanor of Aquitane: Not Your Average Medieval Woman

Laura Goodman

Eleanor of Aquitaine is one of the most well-known English queens of the Middle Ages. She has been portrayed as a character in movies and there are many books about her life. She was both a queen of France and of England where she was much more involved than were other medieval queens. Eleanor ruled her own lands without her husband and ruled in her son's place while he was on Crusade. She was not a typical medieval woman, even when compared to other medieval noblewomen and queens.

There are differing views on women during the Middle Ages, but it is generally agreed that their life was not easy. Women were perceived in different ways, depending on the circumstances. In his *English Life in the Middle Ages*, historian L.F. Salzman states "woman is at one moment idealized as a divine being, to gain whose love the world may well be lost, at the next she is figured as a worthless and venomous creature, hardly worthy to have a human soul."[1] The poems of the troubadours frequently portrayed the first kind of woman and the second was often denounced from the pulpits of medieval churches. "The worst slanderers of the female sex were clergy... The common people heard women continually abused from the pulpit."[2] These conflicting views could be seen throughout medieval writings. Women were often portrayed in extremes, especially those who were well known. Eleanor of Aquitaine was viewed in much the same way, in extremes. She did not stay quietly in the background, which drew criticism.

Eleanor did not live the life of a typical medieval woman. As a queen, she did not have to live through the difficulties of day to day life. A typical middle-class woman "would look after the herb garden, help with such work as haymaking, go into the market with butter, cheese, eggs, poultry and so forth, make salt and brew ale, and, presumably, do most of the cooking."[3] Even growing up, Eleanor was a high-ranking noblewoman, and probably would have been spared such mundane duties, as she would have had others to do these chores for her. She was heiress to Aquitaine, Gascony and Poitou, which set her apart from even most noblewomen. However, she probably did learn other duties. "Comparatively rich... though upper-class women may have been, they were not idle. In the administration of households and estates they had a full part to play... some women were literally called upon to defend the hearth and home when their menfolk were away."[4] Eleanor would have been raised to understand the running of a household, which could be extended to the running

of a country. As an heiress to so many lands, she would have learned even more about ruling than most other noblewomen. Eleanor would have been exposed to more than a lower ranking noblewoman. Noblewomen served a different role in society, and Eleanor later took this even farther, ruling in her husband's place. Her early education would have prepared her well for her future positions.

Marriage was an important part of a woman's life during the Middle Ages. Noblewomen were often betrothed at a young age. "In the twelfth century, many an aristocratic girl of thirteen was already married, or betrothed and living in the household of her in-laws-to-be."[5] Royalty and noblewomen were betrothed early, as these betrothals formed key alliances between families and even countries. "Marriages were, indeed, for the most part a matter of arrangements, in which the feelings of the bride were very little considered."[6] Women were often used as pawns for marriage alliances. A woman's dowry was a key portion of any marriage contract as well. "In common English law usage [dower] means that which a free man gives to his wife at the church door at the time of his marriage."[7] This dower was often very important in royal and noble marriages, as it could include important titles as well. Dowry denotes the portion that the woman brought to the marriage. In Eleanor's case, her dowry was key. Entire regions could form a woman's dowry if she was of high enough rank. Eleanor's dowry was much greater than most and was land that belonged to her in her own right rather than to her husband. Her lands remained independent of those of her husband. This dower became more important as her life progressed.

Medieval queens were women set apart from all others. They were an exception to the rule, yet they were still women. They had to find their own way in life, as "nothing like a modern office with... specific duties existed within any royal administration during the central medieval period, and certainly not for the king's wife... and yet, there were ceremonial acts, public obligations, and expectations to be met."[8] Each queen had to find her own place in English society, and some chose to step back, others to stand out. "The first two Matildas were trusted queens of kings who ruled on both sides of the English Channel, and as the king's wife and deputy, they each exercised what amounts to vice-regal authority in their respective realms."[9] These women chose a position of power and control, setting a precedent for Eleanor to follow. Eleanor took this to an extreme, ruling on behalf of her husband and later, on behalf of her two sons. Her long life made much of this possible. "As a woman of incomparable wealth and almost incredible longevity, Eleanor of Aquitaine was 'alone of all her sex' among the twelfth-century queens of England."[10] Eleanor had the time to acquire and consolidate her power.

Eleanor's life as queen began with her marriage to the then future Louis VII of France on 25 July 1137.[11] Eleanor would have been about fifteen at the time she married Louis. She was the heir to immense ducal holdings that Louis VI wanted for his son. The king saw this as

an excellent match. "Louis the Younger's experience... led him to assume that his bride would share his work of ruling over the French kingdom, and Eleanor's background likewise caused her to expect to be her husband's chief counselor."[12]

She was prepared to be a strong force in the ruling of France. She rapidly gained power over the young king, frequently influencing his decisions. By 1144, Eleanor had "succeeded in overcoming all rivals to secure her position as her husband's partner in governing" even over his own mother.[13] This was uncommon, as the mother of the king often maintained power over the queen. This was especially surprising considering her age at the time of marriage. Even at such a young age, Eleanor stood apart.

Eleanor's influence led to some conflict between Louis VII and the French church. This led to Louis' taking the cross and going on Crusade. He had been considering a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but the fall of Edessa to the Turks and the massacre of its Christian inhabitants influenced his decision as well. At Christmas in 1145, Louis declared his intention to go on Crusade, and Eleanor intended to join him.[14] "The presence of women in the crusading armies was not a novelty... Now, though, for the first time, a king was going on crusade and his wife was going with him."[15]

While on Crusade, Eleanor and Louis stopped in Antioch, where she "renewed her acquaintance with her uncle Raymond, on whose elegance, bounty and knightly valor everyone agreed... Uncle and niece had many long private conversations during the stop at the Antioch court."[16] This led to a conflict between Eleanor and Louis. Eleanor supported Raymond's request for help in recovering Edessa, but Louis wanted to continue on to Jerusalem. There were rumors and allegations of an affair between Eleanor and Raymond, but "her actual crime... [was] her refusal to be forced into a constraining mold of wifely submissiveness."[17] Eleanor continued to make her own decisions, regardless of the effect they would have on her husband. Eleanor told Louis that "he could go on to Jerusalem, but she would stay in Antioch and initiate proceedings for the annulment of their marriage."[18] Louis disagreed and forced Eleanor to accompany him to Jerusalem. In this case, Eleanor was forced into being a submissive spouse. In the end, this attempt at asserting her independence was not successful.

Upon their return from the Crusades in 1149, the royal couple stopped just south of Rome to visit the pope. The pope was aware of their troubled marriage and "attempted to mend matters between them: after listening to both sets of grievances, he forbade them to allude henceforth to any kinship which might exist between them and confirmed to them... that their union was entirely valid, even decreeing that no one, on pain of excommunications, should seek to dissolve the marriage for any reason whatsoever."[19] However, this was not enough. In 1153, "the King called a council at Beaugency, at which... several of the King's kinsmen swore under oath that the

spouses were related to each other within the degrees of kinship prohibited by the Church."[20] Their marriage was at an end. In his book *Medieval Lives*, historian Norman Cantor imagined Eleanor saying, "Louis and I stopped sleeping together. The abominable Bernard closed up my womb and then he convinced my silly husband to go on a crusade."[21] It would certainly be possible for Eleanor to have felt this way at this point in her life. She was forced into decisions she did not agree with, and as a woman of strong opinions, this could not have sat well with Eleanor.

Eleanor quickly remarried to the future King Henry II of England. Henry was heir to the English throne through his mother, Matilda. He was already the Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy. "Some historians have been surprised by... Eleanor of Aquitaine because only two months elapsed between her divorce and remarriage... however, political reasons compelled Eleanor's rapid acquisition of a second husband, as did concerns for her personal safety."[22] As a woman who was independently wealthy in her own right, Eleanor was quite a catch. This meant that many men wanted to literally capture her and force her into marriage. Her marriage to Henry was practical, as he was very powerful. She sent him a message notifying him that she was free to marry on 6 April 1152. They were married on 18 May.[23] Gervase of Canterbury described Henry's trip to Poitiers: "The duke indeed allured by the nobility of that woman and by desire for the great honors belonging to her... hastened quickly over the long routes, and in little time obtained the marriage which he had long desired."[24] Eleanor must have been considered quite desirable despite the earlier rumors of her relationship with her uncle. Her wealth would have been quite a draw, regardless of any other factors that may have been involved.

Eleanor's second marriage was also different from that of most women in that she chose her own husband. As previously mentioned, most marriages were arranged without any consideration for the bride.[25] Eleanor, as Duchess of Aquitaine, was able to choose for herself. Both William of Newburgh and Gervase of Canterbury expressed "[surprise at] a woman arranging her own marriage alliance, a rare occurrence in the twelfth century."[26] Eleanor finally had the opportunity to control her own life. Eleanor was also much older than most brides; she was nearly thirty when she married Henry and significantly older than her husband.[27] Eleanor did not submit completely to her husband. This was unique among royal marriages, as the queen usually passed her titles over to her husband. Eleanor chose to remain as the Duchess of Aquitaine and kept control of her own lands. She even went so far as to have a seal created only with the titles that were her own by right, excluding those she had gained through marriage.[28] This demonstrated how, at least initially, she maintained her independent control of her lands. This was very different from the relationships between other marriedcouples at the time. Men typically took control of any

property their wife brought to the relationship.

Eleanor gave birth to many children during her marriage to Henry. Their first son, William, was born in February 1153. This would probably have been a relief as she had never born a son to her first husband, only daughters. Two years later, another son, Henry, was born to the couple. Three daughters and three more sons would be born.[29] Some would go on to be well known, such as Richard the Lion-Hearted and his brother John. Others, such as their first son, did not survive childhood. Their sons would later go on to cause their parents much trouble.

Henry was frequently absent from his English realms, choosing to spend much of his time in Normandy and other areas. This left an opening for Eleanor. Henry reigned for thirty-five years, but only spent thirteen of those in England.[30] Someone had to maintain control of the country while he was away, and this duty fell to Eleanor. Many writs were probably issued in her name, but only nine still remain. There must have been more, as references to her writs are also found in other sources. For example, if a clergyman needed to leave the country, he was required to have a writ from the Queen. Not all of these remain, but they must have existed. It is also implied in one source that a writ from the king in Normandy was not sufficient, an additional writ from the queen was also required.[31] This demonstrates the significant power she wielded within England. This freedom to act gave her much more power than prior English queens.

In 1168, Eleanor returned to her ancestral lands. Some of her nobles were unhappy with the way Henry was ruling over them. "Dissatisfaction mounted to such a level that the Poitevin bishops sought to end the English king's rule over them by challenging the legitimacy of his marriage to their duchess."[32] After much discussion and some fighting, Henry agreed to return the rule of Poitou to Eleanor. She remained in Poitiers until 1174. In 1172, Eleanor had her son, Richard, invested as duke to ensure a continuity of control and that the lands would not go to Henry. This could have been in response to the coronation of his older brother Henry, as the "Young King" of England in 1170, but this is uncertain.[33] Richard spent much of his time in Poitiers with his mother through these years, during which time a dispute arose between Richard, his brothers and their father.

Eleanor's sons were not satisfied with waiting for their father to die to come into their inheritances. They wanted control over their lands while they were young, and they were willing to fight for it. "In 1173, Eleanor of Aquitaine, with the support of three of her young sons, rose in rebellion against her husband, apparently with the intention of regaining the independence of the Duchy of Aquitaine."[34]

Eleanor agreed with her sons, as she had become frustrated with her husband. She felt that "Henry should be forced to cede authority to his sons in the territories assigned to them... she wished to see her husband stripped of power, leaving him to spend his last years...

merely presiding over his sons."[35] This decision did not bode well for the queen. She even received a letter from statesman and theologian Peter of Blois encouraging her to set the dispute aside. He wrote that "before this matter reaches a bad end, you should return with your sons to your husband, whom you have promised to obey and live with."[36] Eleanor disregarded this letter and supported her sons' revolt against their father. Eleanor may have followed in the footsteps of other queens previously, but no other queen before or after supported her sons in such a way. The rebellion failed, and Eleanor was captured. Eleanor was punished for rebelling against her husband, and against the traditional role of a wife.

Eleanor remained in captivity for many years. She was "brought back to England and kept in comfortable but strict confinement until Henry died in 1189."[37] Henry no longer felt he could trust his wife to rule in his place, as he had early in their marriage. "The King hated his wife so much that he kept her under close watch in well-guarded strongholds."[38] The only exception to this captivity came when the King of France attempted to claim back lands that he wanted to give to his sister. Henry "sent his messengers to England to give orders that Eleanor… was to be freed and come into her dower."[39] Henry chose to free Eleanor temporarily in order to prevent handing lands over to the King of France. Eleanor was allowed to travel from palace to palace, but was kept under guard to prevent any future rebellions. Her sons continued their rebellion without her until her eldest son, Henry the Young King, died of dysentery at the age of 27. At this point, the rebellion fell apart. King Henry II took back control of his sons' lands.[40] There were further disputes over the inheritance of King Henry's lands, but they were minor in comparison to the previous revolt. Henry remained in power and kept Eleanor captive until his death in 1189.[41]

Eleanor's son Richard was the first of her sons to reign. The day his father died, Richard sent orders for the release of his mother.[42] Eleanor quickly rose to power during Richard's reign, "[taking] precedence over their wives, enjoying the perquisites of a queen-consort."[43] She issued her own charters, including a charter to confirm the right of Maurice of Berkeley to the Berkeley barony.[44] Richard "laid out plans for governing his lands during his expedition to the Holy Land" that included Eleanor acting as his regent.[45] When Richard was captured upon his return from Crusade, Eleanor raised the money for his ransom and took control of the country, going so far as to issue commands in her own name.[46] Eleanor reigned in her son's name, with nearly complete control of England.

When Richard died in 1199, Eleanor again took control. Richard had named her grandson, Arthur of Brittany as her heir, but Eleanor would have nothing of it. Eleanor felt that her son, John, should rule after his brother. Eleanor "[circulated] about Anjou and Aquitaine to prevent partition of the Angevin 'empire' between John and her

grandson."[47] She went so far as to "[lead] a military campaign on the continent, even though this meant missing her son John's coronation, which she had worked so hard to bring about."[48] Eleanor actively fought for her son's right to the throne, issuing more charters in the first five years of John's reign than in the prior fifteen years after her captivity. Arthur finally gave up the struggle in 1199.[49]

Eleanor did finally relinquish control of England to her son. She retired to the abbey Fontevraud, where she had repeatedly attempted to retire previously. She had made frequent gifts to the abbey throughout her life, and in the last years of her life, she made even larger grants "directed toward the salvation of the souls of her ancestors."[50] She had tombs designed and built for her husband, Henry II, and son, Richard I, as well as her own tomb. Eleanor died at Fontevraud on April 1, 1204 at the age of eighty-three.[51]

During her long life, Eleanor stood out from other medieval women and queens. She was in control of her own life much of the time during a period when many women were under the control of their husbands or their parents. She married two powerful kings, the second by her own choice. Eleanor went on Crusade, as few women could. She was the mother to four sons whom she supported as they revolted against their father. After Henry II died, she became even more powerful as she ruled as regent as her son went on Crusade as well. Eleanor repeatedly maintained control when most medieval women allowed the power to transfer to their husbands or sons. Eleanor of Aquitaine was much more than a typical medieval woman; she was a powerful person in her own right. She used her strengths to maintain control over her life in ways that few women could, even today. Eleanor of Aquitaine was not a typical medieval woman or queen; she was unique in her strength and control over her own fate.

Notes

[1] L.F. Salzman, *English Life in the Middle Ages* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937), 249.

[2] Ibid., 250.

[3] Ibid., 256-7.

[4] Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 165.

[5] Ragena C. Dearagon, "Wife, Widow and Mother," in *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 98.

[6] Salzman, 252.

[7] Robert Palmer, *Women and the Law University of Houston Department of History*. Available from http://vi.uh.edu/pages/bob/elhone/rules.html (accessed 10 June 2011).

[8] Lois L. Huneycutt, "Alliangora Regina Anglorum," in *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 117.

[9] Ibid., 119.

[10] Ibid., 129.

[11] Ralph V. Turner, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen of France, Queen of England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 48.

[12] Ibid., 54.

[13] Ibid., 68.

[14] Ibid., 70-72.

[15] Jean Flori, *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 45.

[16] Ibid., 53.

[17] Turner, 89.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Flori, 54.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Norman F. Cantor, *Medieval Lives: Eight Charismatic Men and Women of the Middle Ages* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994), 117.

[22] Dearagon, 101-102.

[23] Turner, 108.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Salzman, 252.

[26] Turner, 111.

[27] Ibid., 110.

[28] Ibid., 114.

[29] Joseph Dahmus, *Seven Medieval Queens* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1972), 211.

[30] Turner, 150.

[31] Ibid., 155.

[32] Ibid., 183.

[33] Ibid., 187-189.

[34] Cantor, 122.

[35] Turner, 218.

[36] Peter of Blois, "Medieval Sourcebook: Peter of Blois: Letter 154 to Queen Eleanor, 1174." *Medieval Sourcebook*. Available from http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/eleanor.html. (accessed 15 June 2011).

[37] Cantor, 122.

[38] Flori, 118.

[39] Ibid., 127.

[40] Turner, 243-245.

[41] Dahmus, 224.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Turner, 257.

[44] Ralph V. Turner, "The Role of Eleanor in the Government of her Sons," in *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, ed. Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 79.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid., 84.

[47] Ibid., 78.

[48] Flori, 187.

[49] Turner, 285-88.

[50] Ibid., 293.

[51] Dahmus, 240.

Bibliography

Cantor, Norman F. *Medieval Lives: Eight Charismatic Men and Women of the Middle Ages.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994.

Dahmus, Joseph. *Seven Medieval Queens.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1972.

Dearagon, Ragena C. "Wife, Widow and Mother." In *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady*, edited by Bonnie   Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons, 97-113. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Flori, Jean. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen and Rebel.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Honeycutt, Lois L. "Allianora Regina Anglorum." In *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady,* edited by Bonnie   Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons, 115-   132. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Leyser, Henrietta. *Medieval Woman: A Social History of Women in England.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Palmer, Robert. *Women and the Law.* University of Houston Department of History, http://vi.uh.edu/ pages/bob/elhone/rules.html accessed 10 June 2011).

Peter of Blois. "Medieval Sourcebook: Peter of Blois: Letter 154 to Queen Eleanor, 1173." *Medieval Sourcebook.* Available from http://www.fordham.edu/ halsall/ source/eleanor.html (accessed 15 June 2011).

Salzman, L.F. *English Life in the Middle Ages.* London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Turner, Ralph V. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen of France, Queen of England.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. "The Role of Eleanor in the Government of her Sons." In *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Lord and Lady,* edited by Bonnie Wheeler and John Carmi Parsons, 77-95. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Laura Goodman is currently a junior in the history program at American Public University. Her concentration is early European history and she has focused much of her time on British history. Laura currently works as a broadband technical support agent but hopes to one day share her love of history with others as a teacher. She is an avid knitter who also designs patterns in her free time. Laura lives in southwestern Virginia with her husband, Italian greyhound and a few too many cats.

The Impact of the Ancient Greek Slave Trade on Art in the Balkans

Kathleen Guler

While ancient Greece's far-flung overseas slave trade deeply impacted neighboring cultures and displaced thousands of foreign people, it also acted as an unexpected catalyst that shifted the development of the art of southeastern Europe. Evidence suggests that the trade opened new societal elements that had not previously existed in either the Scythian culture of the Eurasian steppes or the Thracian tribes of the Balkans. As a result, the slave trade contributed to a significant change in the Scythians' way of life that in turn introduced eastern artistic designs and techniques, a process known as "orientalizing," that spread into the Balkans. Further, craftsmen of other cultures, such as the Celts who had moved into southeastern Europe from the west, quickly adopted and adapted the new designs. Beginning with the inception of Greek colonization in the seventh century BC, this dynamic, interwoven progression of artistic transmission was driven to a peak in the fourth century and subsequently carried beyond, both in time and distance.

I. The Nature and Extent of Greek Slavery

Exactly when slavery in the ancient Greek world began is unknown,[1] but it was all-pervasive. Compulsory, dependent labor was used in all places under Greek control and was so taken for granted that few, if any, questioned either its existence or its ethics. Even in the face of civil war, revolution or other crises, slavery remained unchallenged because it was so rooted in society.[2]

As the Greek city-states began to establish colonies and trading posts overseas, the slave trade naturally followed. Frequent arguments have revolved around the extent of the trade with skeptics claiming that without records to quantify numbers, the trade must have been sporadic at best. However, in a thorough, quantitative analysis based on recorded slave costs vs. output ratios from silver mines in Thrace, archaeologist Timothy Taylor argues, "a systematic, large-scale and long-lived slave trade had existed in classical times in eastern Europe."[3] He has applied the same extrapolation to other parts of the Greek world.

In a treatise attributed to Aristotle called *Oeconomica*, we are told the life of slaves consisted of three things: "work, punishment and food." However, not all slaves were assigned to pure drudgery. Slaves participated in every part of Greek life except the political process and citizenship. According to noted economic historian M. I. Finley,

"The efficient, skilled, reliable slave could look forward to managerial status. In the cities...he could often achieve a curious sort of independence, living and working on his own, paying a kind of rental to his owner, and accumulating earnings with which, ultimately, to purchase his freedom."[4]

Finley further states, "Skilled slave labor in antiquity was as good as any; that is obvious from fine pottery, metalwork or monumental buildings."[5] In spite of this quasi-independence and having fine skills, the slave or manumitted person was still considered at the lowest level of society. A person's value, in Greek thinking, was in status, not in the type or quality of work performed. Organized slave revolts were rare and if a slave did rebel, it was usually to flee for his homeland. A completely different sense of freedom existed in the ancient Greek world compared with modern conceptions.

II. Who Were the Slaves?

The Greeks almost uniformly equated slaves with foreigners and indeed most slaves were people who had been captured "outside the Greek orbit,"[6] generally in war, piracy or raids for plunder. To a degree, nationalities of slaves can be traced through a few fragmentary lists that have survived. These lists are by far incomplete, but they give a taste of the peoples' origins. One undated fragment lists slaves who were confiscated and sold at a public auction. Of thirty-two, thirteen were Thracians, seven were Carians, and the rest were from a number of other locations including Cappadocia, Colchis, Scythia, Phrygia, Lydia, Syria, Illyria, Macedonia and the Peloponnese. An inscription in Attica dated from around the beginning of the fourth century BC contains the list of a ship's crew that included slaves from Thrace, Dacia, Getae and Triballi (a Thracian tribal name).

According to Finley, slaves were "by definition nameless,"[7] a reflection of the Greek attitude towards the lowest in status. Captured and sold people were given stock generic names derived from either that of the new master, the slave trader, the place where purchased, or from their place of origin. "Thratta," for example, was the feminine version of the Greek word for Thracian; Davos was a Dacian name; and Tibeios stood for a Paphlagonian.[8]

Epigraphic evidence also indicates ethnic diversity in slaves was desirable, as is reflected in the broad mixture of nationalities. This policy supposedly discouraged conspiracies that could have led to uprisings, although as noted earlier, organized slave revolts were rare. On the other hand, as generalized opinions designated which nationality made a better, stronger, more durable slave, those of specific ethnic origins became more valuable. Further, lists of property have included slaves designated as goldsmiths or other kinds of craftsmen, skills that raised value. Laws were put into place that required slave dealers to state a slave's origins and skills—an attempt to prevent falsifications to achieve a higher price. Accuracy,

however, could be sketchy if physical characteristics did not reveal the slave's true background, and often origins were confused or disguised due to language barriers and lack of geographic knowledge.[9]

III. Scythia

In the seventh century BC Greeks from Miletus on the southwest coast of Asia Minor began to ring the shores of the Black Sea with colonies. Olbia, estimated to have been founded at the beginning of the sixth century, was one of several cities built on the northern shore and put the Greeks in contact with the Scythians of the Pontic steppe.

Originating in central Asia, the Scythians first appear in history via Herodotus's *The Histories*.[10] Around 700 BC the Scythians emerged from the vast Asian steppes, their territory in the east running all the way to border China and Mongolia. Pushed by related tribes, they migrated west where they in turn pushed out the Cimmerian people from the Pontic steppe[22] and occupied what is now present-day southern Russia, Ukraine, Moldova and parts of Romania. The Cimmerians dispersed into the Balkans and Asia Minor. If Herodotus is accurate, then the Scythians had settled into their new territory perhaps only a hundred years before Olbia was founded.

In *The Histories*, Herodotus describes the Scythians as having been nomadic when they first arrived, living in wagons and driving enormous herds of horses across the steppe as they followed game and grazing. They used slaves to milk the mares and created a fermented drink called koumiss. Acquired mostly through raids on other indigenous tribes in the area, these slaves were blinded—a method to keep them from running away.

Because of Herodotus's account, we know more about Olbia and its relationship with the Scythians than we know of the other Black Sea cities. By the time the historian visited the colony and encountered the nomads in the mid-fifth century BC, their lifestyle had already changed significantly from the time they first appeared on the Pontic steppe. Herodotus tells us that they had evolved into three sub-groups: a pastoral class that raised and traded cattle, horses, sheep and goats;[12] an agricultural group that settled in the chora, the land around the city of Olbia; and the Royal Scythians, the elite warrior class who ruled over the other two groups and remained semi-nomadic.

Recent studies suggest that many indigenous agricultural tribes occupied the steppe as well and were subject to the Royal Scythians' dominance.[13] Herodotus, though he valiantly attempted to identify each ethnic group he encountered or heard about, was not always correct or sure of those identities. He tended to lump together groups who were similar in appearance and custom under one name.

In the intervening century and a half between the founding of

Olbia and Herodotus's visit, trade developed between the Scythians and Greek Olbians. The Scythians were highly negative towards the Greeks, even enforcing death penalties for any Scythian who took up a Greek lifestyle in the city. The Greeks viewed the Scythians as fierce primitive fighters who were easily drunk and smoked hemp.[14] But trade proved irresistible and the region was critical to the Aegean economy. Though always grudging of each other's customs, they lived in relative peace as neighbors, kept trade flowing, and the Scythians provided a sort of protectorate role over the city.[15]

With the establishment of colonies, the Greeks also introduced their own slave trade to the region. "The practice of selling slaves, in particular from Scythia, to Greece undoubtedly existed as early as the sixth century BC," according to archaeologist Nadežda Gavriljuk.[16] Besides selling livestock and grain (millet and barley) to the Greeks, the Scythians discovered that instead of sacrificing the indigenous people they captured in raids to Ares, the god of war, those captives could be sold to a slave dealer in Olbia in return for luxury goods. Those goods included the wine that the Scythians drank so prodigiously (and undiluted), and most important of all, the stunning gold and silver metalwork for which they are renowned, a large quantity of which has been discovered in their tombs across Eurasia.

Up to the fifth century BC, exports from Scythia to Greece had been tepid at best. But around 475 BC, as Athens, Chios and other parts of the Greek world began to need slaves to fulfill their "energy" demands—i.e., muscular energy that was renewable—the market began to boom. Scythian elites could raid across the hinterland, even as far as the forest steppe to the north, easily round up people and trade them in Olbia or the other colonies in return for wine, olive oil and all kinds of Greek pottery and metalwork, the evidence of which spread throughout Scythian territory. Slaves were far cheaper and easier to transport than other commodities like grain. They were also far more profitable and were not susceptible to seasonality like the availability of crops. Later written sources claim a raid could net anywhere from several hundred to tens of thousands of slaves.[17]

Scythian slaves were considered some of the most valuable for their hardiness. It should be qualified that "Scythians" who turned up in the Greek slave market could have been in truth a member of any one of these indigenous tribes lost to history but were labeled "Scythian" simply for having come from Scythian territory.

The Scythians had produced their own metalwork before the Greeks arrived—mostly weaponry and armor—but they had no sources of gold. They would have had to trade for it from as far away as the Caucasus, modern-day Kazakhstan or the Altai Mountains to the east, or what is now Transylvania in the west.[18] When Greek items in silver and gold were introduced through trade with Olbia, the warrior elites' interest in it soared. This was in the time of Greece's great rise in power in the fifth century BC, a time of swift development from archaic simplicity to fabulously realistic classical

art, monumental architecture, drama, philosophy, wealth and prestige.

By the late fifth century BC, a metallurgical center had been established at Kamianka-Dniprovska, northeast of Olbia on the Dniepr River.[19] By nature, metalworkers were itinerant, and Greek craftsmen were attracted to this and other Pontic cities. Archaeologist Mikhail Treister has identified five masters of jewelry and toreutics, not by physical locations of their workshops, but by technique and workmanship.[20] He believes these masters and others who remain unidentified to have operated mainly in the first half of the fourth century BC and that they were Greek immigrant craftsmen who may have originated from Mysia in Anatolia, southern Italy or Macedon. Archaeologist John Boardman discusses a characteristic ease with which Greek artists adapted decorative fashions,[21] meaning Greek craftsmen catered very well to other cultures' tastes. Treister also suggests the masters could have been inspired by the art of the places from which they originated; however, while the workmanship may suggest this, the iconography does not.

It was in these workshops where the magnificent gold and silver objects were developed for the Scythians' tastes and styles. Their early art was all about motion, a reflection of the nomadic Royal Scythians' daily life moving across the grasslands. Though some motifs were borrowed from the Persians, Chinese, Assyrians and Urartians (Armenians), the subjects chosen were animals with which the Scythians came most into contact—eagles, leopards and deer. The act of one animal attacking another was often portrayed, and over time the figures became transformative, running from one form or animal body part into other forms or body parts. An example of this is seen in the pattern of three birds swirled into a stylized circle, known in some cultures as a *triskele*. Art historians have designated the Scythians' depiction of beasts, both real and legendary, as a dis-tinct "Eurasian Animal-Style."[22]

The fourth century BC was the highpoint of the Scythians' power and wealth, and their animal-style art matured during this time. The elite class wore its gold ornamentation as symbols of self-image. They decorated their beloved horses as well. Plaques and other ob-jects portrayed stags, horses, boars, dogs, leopards and other ani-mals with their legs folded underneath, often with their heads turned back and in pairs that confronted each other. The artisans decorated everything imaginable: bowls, belts, headdresses, war gear, horse trappings, and clothing. In addition, torques, an open neck ring that also originated in Persia, grew highly fashionable for men, women and children. The neck ring's terminals, typically worn in front, often depicted a pair of animal heads facing each other.[23]

Greek influence needs to be mentioned as well. Though rarely portrayed in their own art, male Scythians were almost always shown as realistic figures in a combat scene or a blood oath ritual. The real-ism is indicative of Greek craftsmanship, but the iconography is

Scythian. Females, on the other hand, were usually shown in other-worldly representations of the primary goddess, Tabiti. Further, unlike the Greeks, the Scythians for all their hard-drinking toughness had an aversion to nude human figures.[24]

The fourth century BC was a period of transition. Both the pastoral and agricultural groups began to make permanent settlements. The population grew quickly. The grain trade lessened in importance and the slave trade expanded to fund the massive amounts of expensive gold treasures. While earlier trade with the Greek colonies had been confined to Black Sea coastal areas, now it expanded into the steppes. From Olbia it ran up the Dnieper and Bug rivers, pulling the previously disdained Greek trade items with it.[25] Leadership and society grew much more complex.[26] Intermarriage took place increasingly between local people and Olbian Greeks.[27] Apprentices of mixed blood began to work with metalsmiths. Workers, however, were slaves captured in the hinterland.[28] Some of the goldsmiths mentioned in the slave lists could also have ended up in these workshops.

Though the fourth century brought Scythia its greatest riches, it also brought the onset of its downfall. As Greek influence increased, more Scythians grew sedentary, becoming agriculturalists. The Royal caste gradually settled as well, losing much of its warrior-like and nomadic ways. This shift in lifestyle significantly reduced their vitality, and they became an assemblage of gold-wearing heavy-drinkers. The Sarmatians, a related group of people from central Asia, pressured the Scythians' territory, taking control of more of their lands with each passing year. Fading in power, the Scythians pressed against the Thracians' eastern frontier.

The entire region grew unstable in the second half of the fourth century BC. Greece was in turmoil, its power, already greatly weakened in the Peloponnesian War (431- 404 BC), was further disintegrating. Philip II of Macedon, ruling from c.359 BC, planted a firm foothold in both Thrace and northern Greece and threatened to cut off the Greeks' grain trade with Scythia. Ateas, an ageing Scythian king, made the bold move to attack Thrace in 339 BC, possibly thinking the Thracians were preoccupied and vulnerable in the face of Philip's aggression. Ateas misjudged and the Scythians faced the powerful Macedonian army instead. At 90-years old, or possibly even older, the king was killed in the battle. Reportedly, 20,000 Scythian women and children were enslaved as a result of Philip's decisive victory.[29]

From that point on the severely weakened Scythians faced expulsion from the Pontic steppe or conquest by the Sarmatians.[30] Those that survived and were able to migrate west-ward were absorbed into the mixture of Balkan cultures. As a distinct group, the Scythians completely disappeared from history by 300 BC.

IV. Thrace

Thrace enters history in the seventh century BC, once again via the Greeks through a brief description from Herodotus. This period coincides with the advent of the Iron Age in eastern Europe, about three hundred years later than it did in Greece itself.[31] Instability, frequent migrations and conquests caused much confusion for Herodotus—as with the Scythians, he attempted to distinguish among the Thracian tribes, but he did not always understand the differences. Thrace consisted of several tribes loosely related by culture and occupied roughly what is now present-day Bulgaria and parts of Romania, Macedonia and European Turkey. In the west some tribes were more closely related to the Illyrians. A group of Celts, known as the Scordisci, settled and partially assimilated into a neighboring tribe called the Triballi. Borders were territorial and highly fluid, and each time a new tribal king took control, the frontiers shifted.[32]

Originally it was thought that the Thracians and Scythians were closely related because of many similarities in their artwork, religion and social structure and because the steppes of the Scythians ran to the grasslands of the Thracians along the western Black Sea coastline. Earlier scholarship also suggested the Thracians had no artwork of their own and that any they had was either Greek or Scythian in origin. However, since the collapse of the Soviet bloc, new artifacts have come to light, dramatically changing this thinking. Archaeologists and historians have realized the two were distinct cultures.

As in Scythia, the Greeks introduced their slave trade into Thrace on the inception of Greek colonization in the seventh century BC. Abdera, the first colony on the Aegean coast, was established in 654 BC. Other colonies followed, the chronology of which is uncertain. This time the Greeks were looking for natural resources—timber and silver—rather than trade when they initially took lands in this area. The Thracians beat them off at first, but the Greeks persisted, returning to settle and paying tribute for "protection," which allowed them to stay.

Evidence suggests that unlike the Scythians, the Thracians had no form of slavery prior to this time.[33] Once established, the Greek slave trade in Thrace sold captives mainly for the silver mines that were developed along the Aegean coast. The largest proportion of these slaves came from Thrace itself, Asia Minor and Scythia. A slave owner could also buy slaves cheaply and lease them to the mines for a high profit. In addition, overpopulation in Thrace was handled by selling off captives, undesirables and even, in Herodotus's words, their children.

In return, imported Greek goods spread throughout Thrace, wealth increased, and fabulous gold and silver artwork was crafted, all in a similar manner as in Scythia. Thrace, however, seems to have been more resilient to outside pressures. Chieftains had been hereditary controllers of tin supplies in the late Bronze Age. "…bronze-

smiths probably operated via ties of clientage," says Taylor.[34] But as ironworking became more established, society detribalized. "Control was lost by the old order, artisans became less tied to particular tribal groups or lineages, and status became something that was more often achieved than ascribed."[35] This indicates a more flexible social structure that could absorb new elements.

The Danube River corridor became the principal route of communication and trade between east and west. Instability in the Pontic steppe, Europe and elsewhere caused peoples to migrate into or through the region. As a result other cultures certainly influenced the artisans of the Balkans as well and must be taken into account. First, the remnants of the Cimmerian people from the Eurasian steppe, mentioned earlier, had already been absorbed. Their art showed Persian elements that had been passed on to Scythian art. In addition, Herodotus tells how the Persians launched a campaign against the Scythians in 513-12 BC from Thracian lands. Defeated through a clever ploy, the Grand Persian Army retreated into Thrace and maintained a presence there until the Greeks finally ran them out in 479 BC. The army's elite kept an entourage of working artists during this hiatus, also possibly influencing Thracian art.[36]

In an effort to bring some stability to the region at the end of Greece's Persian Wars, the Scythians and Thracians executed a peace treaty c.480 BC.[37] In spite of this, throughout the fifth and fourth centuries BC the Scythians continued to pressure Thrace's borders. Further, by the fourth century BC, large amounts of Celtic people had migrated eastward from Gaul and established many communities in the Middle Danube and Transylvanian regions.[38] Known for their constant raiding, groups of Celts continued east, creating the Scordisci tribal region as well as spreading more communities as far as present-day Moldova. In Thrace, they "undoubtedly played an active role in the disruption of Thracian tribal regimes."[39] This disruption likely explains why hoards of silver and gold from the mid-fourth century were buried in the region of modern-day North Bulgaria—for safekeeping.

V. The Orientalizing of Art in the Balkans

The Greek slave trade's profound influence on the Scythians' lifestyle created a sort of chain reaction that is most readily seen through the art of the Balkans. Art historians, beginning with Paul Jacobsthal, coined the term "orientalizing"[40]—from the now not so politically correct label "oriental"—to describe the transmission of eastern characteristics to European art.

In the Balkans of the fourth century BC, Thracian art decidedly began to show specific traits strikingly similar to certain details in Scythian art. Some eastern influence had already appeared in the fifth century BC, most likely descendant from the Cimmerians and the Grand Persian Army's presence, but by the fourth century BC, the

influence is much more pronounced. This could be due partly to Greek craftsmen working in the colonies along the Aegean coast making goods for Thracian elites and who could have adopted motifs and styles from the influx of Scythians. There is also the likelihood that craftsmen fled the workshops in the Pontic steppe upon the invasion of Sarmatian conquerors and went to work for Thracian elites. Greek art picked up some of the animal-style motifs as well.

Archaeologist Ivan Marazov points out how "local Greek and Thracian artists developed a taste for Iranian (i.e., Persian/Scythian) models."[41] He also notes that Thracians and Scythians "influenced each other for centuries,"[42] having had a similar social base and drawing from the same eastern sources. He does not mention the Cimmerians, a portion of whom were absorbed into the Thracians. Perhaps in this case he is equating the Cimmerians with the Scythians.

The animal-style art is one of two key motifs or styles that orientalized Thracian art. It is not only that recently discovered Thracian pieces portray the same animals—deer, eagles, lions, gryphons, serpents, among others—but the way they are portrayed: around a "tree of life," which is a symbol from Persia; as well as one beast attacking another and the sense of movement, both traits from Scythia. Shapes of horse trappings are nearly identical, including the triple spiral motif. Of personal adornment, the torque—though simpler than those the Scythians produced—appeared in both personal collections and were depicted on objects with human faces. All these elements originated in Persian art and were subsequently passed to Scythian art. Like the Scythians, individual masters and workshops in Thrace can be identified as well, and from the slave lists mentioned earlier, it is possible some enslaved Scythian goldsmiths toiled in these workshops.

A torque made of silver-plated iron, found in modern-day Rodenbach, Germany, with facing bulls' heads and each bull wearing its own torque, is most likely Thracian. The famed Gundestrup Cauldron (found in Jutland and of a later period than explored here) has Celtic pictorials, including an antlered god wearing a torque and holding a second torque. Its construction and use of silver and gilding, however, are suspected to be Thracian.[43]

How did these artifacts get so far away from their origins? The cauldron could have been a gift from an elite in Thrace to a king of another culture in northern Europe. Equally possible, they could have been plunder that was carried off. Intriguingly, many more objects in the same vein have been discovered across a far-flung region.

VI. A Further Legacy

The Celtic people who migrated into the Balkans in the fourth century BC were a combination of settlers, raiders and mercenaries. They belonged to the Early La Tène phase of Celtic culture and art.

Their chieftains moved about with entourages that included expert craftsmen. Because every decoration on every object had meaning and every symbol was a form of communication, the artisan had to have a deep knowledge of Celtic mythology. Their craftsmen were not simply makers of pottery, shields and helmets. Rather, they were treated with great respect, something akin to a shaman.[44] "They were the repository and the perpetrators of ancient skills and beliefs, and as such they themselves would surely have been regarded as being above normal men,"[45] according to archaeologist Barry Cunliffe. This respect was completely the opposite of the way the Greeks, Thracians, Scythians, Persians and most other cultures treated their craftsmen—like slaves even if they were not or had actually bought them as slaves.

The fourth century BC Early La Tène art of the Celts in the Balkans shows a continuance of
the same animal-style motifs taken from Scythian inspiration. This could have come either directly from Scythian crafts or indirectly through Thracian or Greek-made pieces. Either way, Celtic craftsmen were by tradition amazingly quick to adopt new styles and techniques.

They were also by tradition highly mobile. Cunliffe's analysis of the movements of Celtic people demonstrates not only did they swiftly migrate, settle, uproot and move on from west to east, but back again throughout the vast lands believed dominated by the Celts—from the Atlantic to the Black Sea—before, during and after the period studied here. Their craftsmen, held in high esteem, would certainly have accompanied their chieftains. They would not have been considered expendable and left behind as other cultures' artisans might have been. They would have carried their knowledge, skills and the new designs with them throughout Europe, traveling with their chieftains.

Archaeological finds appear to bear this out—many Celtic gold and silver decorative items which display Scythian influence have been discovered. Some show an even more dramatic influence than Thracian art does. A prime example is a hoard that included arm rings and neck rings with confronted rams' heads that are turned back and the legs folded under—very reminiscent of Scythian gold work of the sixth and fifth centuries BC.[46] That they came from a grave in modern-day Rodenbach, Germany in the Rhine basin attests to the high degree of the Celts' mobility. Pieces found with the vegetal style, including the tree of life motif, have been found over vast distances, also supporting the suggestion that the Celtic warrior society was highly mobile.[47] And the triple spiral motif, of which Scythian art was often worked in birds,[48] are found in the Celtic *triskele*.

Interestingly, no evidence suggests that Celts moving through southeastern Europe and farther east were forced into slavery. Possibly some Celtic tribes, like the Boii, who originated in Gaul and had some sort of slave system of their own, brought that system with

them on their distant travels. However, the Celts in the Balkans appear to have had a profound sense of maintaining freedom, reflected in their lifestyle, art and mythology. Taylor makes an intriguing observation: "…that the elite neck torques of the La Tène Celts… inspired in part by those of Persia, are a reflex of the existence of slave chains. Torques in some way symbolize enslavement, not to a superior human but to a superior power. To wear a gold or silver neckpiece signaled enslavement to deity and, by that very token, freedom on earth."[49]

VII. Conclusion

Both Marazov and Cunliffe believe the finds discovered so far are only a tiny bit of what actually was moving around Europe and Asia, much more of which has yet to be found, analyzed and interpreted. Indeed, as Boardman illustrates so well in his work, goods carrying art were imported, exported, gifted and transported all over the known world. Moreover, numerous additional opportunities existed for the transmission of artistic traits. The import and export of goods, war and mercenaries transporting plunder, itinerant metalsmiths travelling from workshop to workshop, and migrations and settlement all could have contributed in some degree to the orientalizing of art in the Balkans. But the impact of Greek slavery certainly had a profound effect on the north Pontic steppe people in ways they never imagined when they first encountered the Greeks. In following the trail of the Scythians' decline and dispersal, the Greek slave trade appears to have been a prime catalyst in transmitting artistic influence from eastern cultures to western art in the Balkans of the fourth century BC.

Notes
[1] Yvon Garlan, *Slavery in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), 25.
[2] M.I. Finley, *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 97.
[3] Timothy Taylor, "Believing the Ancients: Quantitative and Qualitative Dimensions of Slavery and the Slave Trade in Later Prehistoric Eurasia," *World Archaeology* 33 (2001): 29.
[4] Finley, *Economy and Society*, 110.
[5] Ibid., 192-93.
[6] Ibid., 103.
[7] Ibid., 171.
[8] Ibid., 169.
[9] David Braund and G.R.Tsetskhladze, "The Export of Slaves from Colchis," *The Classical Quarterly* 39 (1989):119.
[10] *Herodotus, The Histories*, trans. Aubrey de Selincourt (London: Penguin Classics, 2003), 240-88.
[11] Lazlo Torday, *Mounted Archers: The Beginnings of Central Asian History* (Edinburgh: Durham Academic Press, 1997), 242-80.
[12] Lada Onyshkevych, "Scythia and the Scythians," in *Scythian Gold*, ed. Ellen D Reeder (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999), 30.

[13] Ibid., 33.

[14] *Herodotus, The Histories*, 264.

[15] Ibid., 33-34.

[16] Nadežda A Gavriljuk, "The Graeco-Scythian Slave-trade in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC," in *The Cauldron of Ariantas, Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Studies* 1, ed. Guldager Bilde, Jakob Munk Højte and Vladimire F. Stolba (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2003), 77.

[17] Ibid., 81-82.

[18] Onyshkevych, "Scythia and the Scythians," 33.

[19] Ibid., 32.

[20] David Braund, *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (Sixth Century BC – First Century AD)*, (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2005), 56-63.

[21] John Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 54-55.

[22] Paul Jacobsthal, *Early Celtic Art*, Vol. 1 (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), 163.

[23] Ellen D Reeder, "Scythian Art," in *Scythian Gold*, ed. Ellen D Reeder (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999), 45-6.

[24] Ibid., 43-55.

[25] Onyshkevych, "Scythia and the Scythians," 33.

[26] David Braund, *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World*, ed. David Braund and S.D. Kryzhitskiy (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Proceedings of the British Academy 142, 2007), 142.

[27] Reeder, "Scythian Art," 50.

[28] Gavriljuk, "Graeco-Scythian Slave-trade," 83.

[29] Ibid., 78.

[30] E.V. Cernenko, *The Scythians: 700-300BC* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1983), 32.

[31] Timothy Taylor, "Thracians, Scythians and Dacians," in *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe*, ed. Barry Cunliffe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 377.

[32] Fanula Papazoglu, *Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times: Triballi, Autaratae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1978), 346.

[33] Ivan Marazov, *Ancient Gold: The Wealth of the Thracians* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998), 13.

[34] Taylor, "Thracians," 378.

[35] Ibid., 378.

[36] Barry Cunliffe, *The Ancient Celts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 168.

[37] Braund, *Classical Olbia*, 151.

[38] Cunliffe, *Ancient Celts*, 168.

[39] Taylor, "Flying Stags: icons and power in Thracian Art," in The *Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*, ed. Ian Hodder (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 131.

[40] Paul Jacobsthal, *Early Celtic Art*, 156.

[41] Alexander Fol and Ivan Marazov, *Thrace and the Thracians*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), 80.

[42] Ibid., 89.

[43] Ruth and Vincent Megaw, *Celtic Art: From its Beginnings to the Book of Kells* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1989), 176.

[44] Cunliffe, Ancient Celts, 112-13.

[45] Ibid., 112-13.

[46] Ibid., 117.

[47] Ibid., 121.

[48] Reeder, "Scythian Art,"46.

[49] Taylor, "Believing the Ancients," 39.

Bibliography

Boardman, John. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.

Braund, David. *Classical Olbia and the Scythian World*. Edited by David Braund and S. D. Kryzhitskiy, 37-77. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Proceedings of the British Academy 142, 2007.

Braund, David. *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (Sixth Century BC – First Century AD)* Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2005.

Braund, David and Tsetskhladze, G.R. "The Export of Slaves from Colchis." *The Classical Quarterly* 39 (1989):114-25.

Cunliffe, Barry. *The Ancient Celts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Finley, M.I. *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. New York: Penguin Books, 1983.

Fol, Alexander and Marazov, Ivan. *Thrace and the Thracians*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

Garlan, Yvon. *Slavery in Ancient Greece*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Gavriljuk, Nadežda A. "The Graeco-Scythian Slavetrade in the 6th and 5th Centuries BC." in *The Cauldron of Ariantas, Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Studies* 1. Edited by Guldager Bilde, Jakob Munk Højte and Vladimire F. Stolba. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press (2003): 75-85.

Herodotus. The Histories. Translated by Aubrey de Selincourt. London: Penguin Classics, 2003.

Jacobsthal, Paul. *Early Celtic Art*. Vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.

Marazov, Ivan. *Ancient Gold: The Wealth of the Thracians*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1998.

Megaw, Ruth and Vincent. *Celtic Art: From its Beginnings to the Book of Kells*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1989.

Onyshkevych, Lada. "Scythia and the Scythians." in *Scythian Gold*. Edited by Ellen D. Reeder, 23-35. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999.

Papazoglu, Fanula. *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times: Triballi, Autaratae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1978.

Reeder, Ellen D. "Scythian Art." in *Scythian Gold*. Edited by Ellen D. Reeder, 36-57. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1999.

Taylor, Timothy. "Believing the Ancients: Quantitative and Qualitative Dimensions of Slavery and the Slave Trade in Later Prehistoric Eurasia." *World Archaeology* 33 (2001): 34-43. http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy1.apus.edu/ stable/827887 (accessed April 15, 2011).

Taylor, Timothy. "Flying Stags: icons and power in Thracian Art." In *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings*, edited by Ian Hodder, 117-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Taylor, Timothy. "Thracians, Scythians and Dacians" in *The Oxford Illustrated Prehistory of Europe*, edited by Barry Cunliffe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Torday, Laszlo. *Mounted Archers: The Beginnings of Central Asian History*. Edinburgh: Durham Academic Press. 1997.

Kathleen Guler is the author of the Macsen's Treasure Series of novels set in fifth century Britain. She draws from her Welsh and Scottish heritage as well as a long background in history and literature to research her books. The author has also published numerous articles, essays, reviews and poems, is a member of the Historical Novel Society and the International Arthurian Society and participates in various writing and academic groups focused on history. Her novel A Land Beyond Ravens won the 2010 Colorado Book Award for Historical Fiction. She is currently a graduate student at American Military University, studying Ancient and Classical History.

Defenders of the Empire: The Byzantine State Intelligence Communications, Agent, and Intelligence Management Apparatus

Scott D. Hibbard

Abstract

The Eastern Roman, or Byzantine, Empire endured almost a thousand years longer than its Western Roman counterpart. Central to the longevity of the Byzantine Empire was its state intelligence gathering capabilities; but what were those capabilities and how were they organized? Answering these questions will require discussion of the challenges conducting Byzantine studies using secondary sources, literature review of English-language intelligence sources and qualitative analysis to summarize the structure and function of the Byzantine state intelligence apparatus. The Empire endured as long as it did due to a decentralized intelligence apparatus that could nevertheless be undermined by corruption and treason.

Introduction

The Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire endured almost a thousand years longer than its Western Roman counterpart. Understanding its intelligence gathering capabilities requires evaluation of the most relevant literature, an understanding of its communications system, and an exploration of its system of agents and intelligence administration as the Latin tradition was slowly subsumed by Greek. Corruption was a recurring weakness of the Byzantine intelligence apparatus; however, its capabilities appear to have largely met the needs of Empire throughout its existence.

Literature Review

A variety of challenges exist for researchers conducting Byzantine studies. Attribution of sources must be carefully considered by scholars due to anonymous authorship of primary sources or attribution to an important official as opposed to the original author. Some important intelligence-related sources exist as do a variety of military, government and private texts from the Byzantine era. Intelligence-specific material presents challenges in extracting appropriate case study examples from secondary sources in addition to the relative dearth of intelligence-specific materials in the Byzantine Studies field. Byzantine-specific intelligence literature can be obtained two ways: a) Information and insights derived from related non-specific sources such as political and military histories, and b) specialized

literature. Specialist literature on Byzantine intelligence studies is relatively rare with only three titles addressing one or more aspects directly.

Three sources particularly contribute to Byzantine intelligence studies: *Origins of Intelligence Services* by Francis Dvornik, S.J. (Dvornik), *Espionage in the Ancient World: An Annotated Bibliography* by Dr. Rose Mary (R.M.) Sheldon (Sheldon), and *The Master of Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* by Arthur Edward Romilly Boak (Boak). Dvornik's and Sheldon's books span a variety of ancient and medieval cultures but they contain important chapters on Byzantine intelligence studies. Boak's book is a specialized title that summarizes important details about the Master of Offices and the importance of the functionary to Imperial intelligence gathering.

Dvornik's work provides rich details about the different offices and major features of Byzantine intelligence organization. It is worth noting that Dvornik's inspiration for writing *Origins of Intelligence Services* comes from General William O. Donovan, the late Director of the U.S. Office of Strategic Services of World War II era fame and precursor organization to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Dvornik's close association with the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection further solidifies his scholarship. *Origins of Intelligence Services* certainly provides a compelling read for historians and intelligence professionals alike; however, the book is not without its problems with attendant consequences for intelligence scholars.

First, Dvornik does not footnote or endnote but instead only offers a bibliography following each chapter in the book. This may force scholars to research Dvornik's facts against his bibliography in order to further scholarly research. Second, Dvornik is the only secondary source that surveys Byzantine intelligence organization and capabilities. All other secondary sources tend to specialize in one related facet of the topic. The implication is that Dvornik will likely form the substantial basis of any summarization of Byzantine intelligence capabilities and organization as is the case with this study.

Sheldon's bibliography of ancient espionage sources is a survey of Western language sources. Some sources are uncommon and published in other languages like French, German or Greek but tantalizing nevertheless. An example is an article written by August Audollent in 1889 entitled 'Les Veredarii emissaries imperiaux sou le Bas Empire' in a journal named *Melanges d'archaeologie et d'historie*.[1] The description provided by Sheldon indicates that Audollent's article describes the importance of the *veredarii* couriers of the Western Empire and their continued use in the Eastern Empire and to the *agentes in rebus* of the Eastern Empire.[2] Sheldon's footnoting and bibliography provides useful sources for scholars to investigate and perhaps incorporate into their own work.

Boak's contribution to understanding the importance of the Master of Offices, one of the most senior and important offices in the *Consistory* – the Imperial Court – cannot be overstated for two

reasons. First, similar to Dvornik, Boak's work is the only book dedicated to the topic. Second, although published in 1919, Boak's work provides scholarly understanding complimentary to Dvornik's work of how Byzantine state intelligence was coordinated between the Emperor and his most senior functionaries. The Master of Offices held a variety of responsibilities later subsumed by the Logothete of the Post but for the purposes of this study only the Master's and Logothete's responsibilities for intelligence will be explored.

The Cursus Publicus

Intelligence collection and dissemination rely almost entirely on an effective communications system. The *cursus publicus* or Imperial Post provided an essential communications function that supported Imperial intelligence collection and dissemination activities. Communication in the ancient and medieval world was courier-based. In the case of official messages an appointed low-level civil service functionary, the *veredarius* (pl., *veredarii*), filled the courier role. Couriers, in their role as messengers, were in a perfect position to collect intelligence on behalf of the Empire because they had access to messages and because they traveled in the provinces and could report on occurrences far from Constantinople.

The *cursus* was created early in Imperial Roman history. Augustus (r. 23 BCE – 14 CE) created the *cursus* to further his Imperial ambitions.[3] Augustus's innovation in Imperial communications was a dramatic improvement over the experiences of his immediate predecessor, Julius Caesar, who reported that he frequently arrived before advance messengers sent to announce his arrival.[4] The *cursus* was necessarily a complex system that permitted the transportation of messages and cargo while allowing for the care of horses, pack and draft animals, their riders and passengers.

The *cursus* was initially setup by Augustus as a relay system where a courier would hand-off messages to another courier in a chain of couriers. According to historian Adam J. Silverstein the couriers would make their exchanges at relay-stations (Latin: *mutationes*) and rest at rest stations (Latin: *mansiones*).[5] The relay and way stations would also have staffs of attendants, grooms, carpenters, veterinarians, and other people necessary for system operation.[6] The average speed of the *cursus* was considerable. Silverstein, citing the Roman historian Suetonius, writes that a courier could travel approximately 75 kilometers daily.[7] Silverstein, citing A.W. Ramsey, writes that in time of emergency, distances of 300 kilometers could be travelled daily depending on prevailing circumstances.[8] Daily average and emergency speeds convert to approximately 46 miles and 186 miles respectively.[9]

The *cursus* also evolved over the span of Roman history. Augustus's courier relay system was replaced by a system where mounts would be exchanged and the courier would proceed to his final

destination.[10] This new system had two effects: first, a single courier required layover time for food and rest at appropriate intervals, and second, the speed of the *cursus* was necessarily limited to what one courier could manage unless a relay system was implemented for the sake of urgency. A second modification of the *cursus* in the third century CE was the creation of a two-tiered system of what Silverstein refers to as "ordinary and swift branches."[11]

The *Cursus Clabularis*, *Cursus Velox* and Expense

The ordinary branch, the *cursus clabularis*, was reserved for messages or cargoes that did not have to be expedited. Because the *cursus clabularis* relied on wagons and oxen for hauling freight its use necessitated travel by paved roads.[12] The swift branch, the *cursus velox*, was intended for messages or lightweight cargoes that could be carried by a single horse and rider who could travel off of paved roads if necessary.[13] According to Silverstein, the *cursus clabularis* should be considered the standard reference relative to the term 'Imperial Post' throughout later Western Roman and Byzantine history whereas the *cursus velox* was not fully implemented throughout the Empire.[14] The *cursus velox* could be discarded or revived as Imperial fortunes or necessity waxed and waned.

The expense of the Imperial Post was considerable and ripe for official abuse. Use of the *cursus publicus* was notionally limited to holders of *evectiones* which entitled the bearer to have messages transported on the Imperial Post, or *tractiones* which entitled the bearer to full services from the Imperial Post. Constantine the Great (r. 306 CE – 337 CE) and Constantius (r. 337 CE – 361 CE) extended the privilege of using the *cursus publicus* to dignitaries and bishops traveling to synods the volume and frequency of which deepened Imperial expenses.[16]

Various attempts to control the expenses of the *cursus publicus* and its official abuse were made after Constantius. Julian the Apostate (r. 361 CE – 363 CE) stopped most of the official abuse of the *cursus publicus* and its expenses however such concerns did not stop him from using the *cursus publicus* to transport St. Basil I, his tutor, to Constantinople.[17] Theodosius I (r. 379 CE – 395 CE) further regulated the *cursus*. Theodosius's laws were published in the Codex Theodosianus by Theodosius II (r. 408 CE – 450 CE) in 429.[18] The *cursus* was limited to conveyance of Imperial messages and cargoes only. Personal messages were not permitted use of the *cursus*. Regardless of the restrictions, historian Francis Dvornik writes, "The use of the *cursus* was available also to people acquainted with the emperor or other high level functionaries at court."[19] The right of issuing *evectio* or *tractionae* in the Eastern Empire would be limited by Justinian to only the Emperor, the Praetorian Prefect, and the Master of Offices.[20] An important final measure to detect and reduce if not eliminate abuse of the *cursus* was inspection of *cursus* facilities and accounts

by Imperial agents – the *agentes in rebus*, the *curiosi* in particular.

Couriers and Agents – The *Frumentarii*, *Agentes in Rebus*, the *Curiosi* and the *Notarii*

The Byzantine intelligence system utilized several classes of agents because of the variety of sources available: the *frumentarii*, *agentes in rebus*, the *curiosi* and the *notarii*. The *frumentarii*, and the *agentes in rebus* could be prototypical couriers but their vested authority and proximity to the Imperial Court and the Emperor made them atypical. The title of official couriers varied through the span of Roman history. Until the late third century CE official couriers were called *frumentarii* (sing. *frumentarius*, 'grain-provider').[21] Boak writes that "The *frumentarii* were originally soldiers sent into the provinces to supervise the transportation of grain for the provisioning of the army...but had developed into secret agents of the imperial administration".[22] The *frumentarii* were never numerous – there are estimated to never have been more than 200 *frumentarii* throughout the Empire.[23] Into the early centuries CE *frumentarii* were increasingly associated with official corruption for personal gain such that their information gathering capabilities became compromised. Diocletian (r. 284 CE - 305 CE) reorganized the *frumentarii* into a new office called *agentes in rebus* ('those active in affairs').[24]

Agentes were typically assigned to provinces and they were responsible for affairs in their assigned province and for reporting acquired information to higher authorities. The *agentes* were civil servants but they were organized as a *schola*, or regiment, of the Imperial Guard.[25] Their numbers varied widely from less than two dozen under Julian the Apostate to 1,248 during the reign of Leo I (r. 457 CE – 474 CE).[26]

The *curiosi* were somewhat more specialized because they were tasked with oversight of the *cursus publicus*. Also known as *curagendarii*, the *curiosi* were *agentes* appointed from the *agentes schola* by the Master of Offices with a preference toward higher-ranking or senior *agentes*.[27] The appointment to *curiosi* was for one year only and appointments were made on the Emperor's birthday.[28] The *'curiosi'* appellation came from one of their duties which was inspection and proper use of *evectiones* and *tractiones* in their assigned province. The *curiosi* were never numerous. In 357 two *curiosi* were dispatched to every province; however, in 395 one *curiosi* per province.[29] In 412 the limitation was lifted.[30] The reaction according to historian Rose Mary Shelton, citing Marcellinus Ammnanus, was that the ambitions of the *agentes* and *curiosi* peaked and their affiliation with corrupt and treasonable practices increased.[31]

Between the sixth and eighth centuries CE the position of *notarii* ('secretary') gained more importance in Imperial administration and for intelligence collection due to the proximity of secretaries to their superiors in the bureaucracy and to the Imperial Court. Through this

period the role of the *agentes* started to be redefined in favor of secretarial roles while the *notarii* assumed more 'field' responsibilities traditionally held by the *agentes* and *curiosi*.[32] The *agentes* and *curiosi* remained a feature of the Byzantine intelligence collections capability until the government reorganization in 700 CE.[33] In the Late Empire the intelligence collection capabilities shifted more fully to the *notarii* due to their proximity to Imperial officials, the Imperial Court and the Emperor and to official and unofficial secrets.

Intelligence Administration –The *Praefectus Praetorio*, *Magister Officiorum* and Logothete of the Drome

Intelligence administration similarly evolved through the course of Roman history. The *frumentarii*, as military officers, were employed by and acted under the orders of the *Praefectus Praetorio* or praetorian prefect.[34] The *agentes in rebus*, as civil servants, answered to the *Magister Officiorum* or Master of Offices until the eighth century CE. From the eighth century CE forward the Magister title was subsumed by the Logothete of the Drome.[35]

The praetorian prefect was a multifaceted role that included command of the Imperial Guard and administration of justice. The position was created as part of the Augustinian reforms and remained in use through at least the seventh century CE although the importance of the praetorian prefect position waxed and waned during the period. During the rule of Constantine the Great the praetorian prefect acted as a first minister second only to Constantine. At other times the praetorian prefect's military duties in a bodyguard role were emphasized.

The *Magister Officiorum* was also a multifaceted role. According to Boak the title magister appears in the 1st century CE although it is uncertain why the title 'Master' was used other than possibly for its adaptability to administrative offices.[36] Boak also writes of the creation, domination, and decline of the Magister that the office was created, incrementally acquired a broad portfolio of powers and responsibilities only to lose those powers and responsibilities over time. In the Late Byzantine era the title was an honorific shortened to the diminutive 'Master'.[37]

The Logothete of the Drome, or Logothete of the Post, represented a turn away from the Latin Roman tradition towards the Greek tradition of the East but as a continuation of the Roman Empire. Dvornik writes that "[Constantinople's] inhabitants, and the population of the eastern provinces, continued to think of themselves as Romans, or '*Romaioi*'(Ρωμαίοι) in their native Greek language."[38] In about the middle of the eighth century CE, as Greek began to replace Latin in official terminology and offices, the *cursus publicus* that the Logothete of the Drome was responsible for becomes known as the '*demosios dromos*'.[39]

Other Avenues of Inquiry

Multiple avenues of additional inquiry remain although it is possible that these may be limited by the availability of scholarly translations. The relationship between the intelligence administration and the provinces remain ill-defined other than evidence of the provincial collection orientation of the *agentes* and *notarii*. The relationship between intelligence agents and local law enforcement may also be worth investigation. Byzantine intelligence in the late Empire, particularly in the last century of the Empire's existence with its diminished territory and resources, would also be an intriguing line of inquiry to pursue. The role of Byzantine intelligence capabilities in episodic expansions of Byzantine power under notably successful Emperors like Nikephoros II Phokas (r. 963 CE – 969 CE), John Tzimisces (969 CE – 976 CE) or Alexios Komnenos (r. 1081 CE – 1181 CE) would also be a useful line of inquiry.[40] Further research into Byzantine 'technical methods' beyond Greek Fire to include possible ciphers and secret writing would also be worthwhile to research. The importance of military intelligence including naval capabilities should also be explored further.

Conclusions

The Byzantine intelligence structure was decentralized in the sense that agents operated with some degree of freedom in the provinces with the direction of higher administration from Constantinople. The degree of freedom agents enjoyed was also a two-edged sword for the Empire as official abuses and corruption forced intelligence reorganizations. The slow evolution of the Eastern Empire toward the Greek East resulted in a continuation of Roman intelligence capabilities under Greek names and titles. Byzantine intelligence institutions remained remarkably consistent in terms of functionality for almost a full thousand years after the fall of the Western Empire and contributed greatly to the continuance of the Eastern Empire.

Notes

[1] R. M. Sheldon. *Espionage in the Ancient World: An Annotated Bibliography*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2003.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 30.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., 31.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] No Author, *Metric Conversions Kilometer to Miles*. 2013. http://www.metric-conversions.org/length/kilometers-to-miles.htm (accessed 3 May 2013).

[10] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 31.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Francis Dvornik, S.J. *Origins of Intelligence Services: The Ancient Near East, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, the Arab Muslim Empires, the Mongol Empire, China, Muscovy* (Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1974), 123.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid. 124.

[21] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 36.

[22] Arthur E. R. Boak, *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* (London: Kessinger, 1919), 68.

[23] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 37.

[24] Ibid., 32.

[25] Arthur E. R. Boak, *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* (London: Kessinger, 1919), 68.

[26] Ibid., 69.

[27] Arthur E. R. Boak, *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* (London: Kessinger, 1919), 74-75.

[28] Arthur E. R. Boak, *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* (London: Kessinger, 1919), 75.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Sheldon, "Ancient Rome" 262.

[31] Ibid., 263.

[32] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 37.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Ibid., 36.

[35] Ibid., 37.

[36] Ibid., 15.

[37] Arthur E. R. Boak, *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires* (London: Kessinger, 1919), 1.

[38] Francis Dvornik, S.J. *Origins of Intelligence Services: The Ancient Near East, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, the Arab Muslim Empires, the Mongol Empire, China, Muscovy* (Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1974), 122.

[39] Adam J. Silverstein, *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 40.

[40] A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire, Vol. Two* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1952), 730.

Bibliography

Bartusis, Mark C. The *Late Byzantine Army, Arms and Society, 1204-1453.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Boak, Arthur Edward Romilly. *The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires.* Kessinger Publishing's Legacy Reprint. London: McMillan, 1919.

Constantine XI Porphyrogenitus. *De Administrando Imperio.* Translated by Gyula Moravcsik (Greek) and R.J.H. Jenkins (English). Dumbarton Oaks Texts. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2002.

Contamine, Philippe. *War in the Middle Ages.* Translated by Michael Jones. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Dvornik S.J., Francis. *Origins of Intelligence Services: The Ancient near East, Persia, Greece, Rome, Byzantium, the Arab Muslim Empires, the Mongol Empire, China, Muscovy.* Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1974.

Haldon, John. *The Byzantine Wars: Battles and Campaigns of the Byzantine Era*. Charleston, SC: Tempus, 2001.

Leo VI. *The Taktika of Leo VI*. Translated by George T. Dennis S.J. Vol. Twelve Dumbarton Oaks Text. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Re   search Library and Collection, 2010.

Maurice. *Maurice's Strategikon*. Translated by George T. Dennis S.J. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

McGeer, Eric. *Sowing the Dragon's Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century*. Vol. XXXIII Oaks Studies: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995.

No Author. "Metric Converter: Kilometers to Miles." 2012. http://www.metricconversions.org/length/kilometers-to-miles.htm (accessed 3 May 2013).

Sheldon, R.M. *Espionage in the Ancient World: An Annotated Bibliography*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2003.

Sheldon, Rose Mary. *Intelligence Activities in Ancient Rome: Trust in the Gods, but Verify*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2005.

Silverstein, Adam J. *Postal Systems in the Pre Modern Islamic World*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Treadgold, Warren. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Treadgold, Warren. *Byzantium and Its Army 284-1081*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1995.

Vasiliev, A.A. *History of the Byzantine Empire. Vol. One*. Two vols. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press,   1980.

Vasiliev, A.A. *History of the Byzantine Empire. Vol. Two*. Two vols. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press,   1980.

Various Authors. *Three Byzantine Military Treatises*. Translated by S.J. George T. Dennis. Vol. IX Dumbarton Oaks Texts. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2008.

Various Authors, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, Volume One*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Various Authors. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, Volume Two*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Various Authors, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantiim, Volume Three*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Scott Hibbard is currently attending American Military University for a B.A. in Intelligence Studies with an emphasis in Intelligence Analysis. He is new to the APUS Saber and Scroll Journal. He has two A.S. in Computer Information Systems and in Business from Gillette College and undergraduate technology certificates from Colorado Technical University. He is also a U.S. Army Veteran. Scott has 17 years experience in information technology in data analysis and application support in telecommunications, wireless and healthcare industries and is currently serving as a Data Analyst for Behavioral Health Services of Campbell County Memorial Hospital in Gillette, WY.

Men and Women as Represented in Medieval Literature and Society

Anita Kay O'Pry-Reynolds

Men and women in medieval epic literature are portrayed in a way that is contrary to the modern day ideals of male/female stereotypes. There are few examples of gender equality in medieval literature, or for that fact in medieval historical records. In the traditional epic, the 'classical' hero is masculine, violent, and aggressive; men exuded heroic knightly personalities while the classical females are portrayed as vessels of chastity, purity, and goodness. During the period of the Middle Ages and in its literature there are highly idealized views on manners, society, and morality.

Contrary to popular stereotypes and Victorian romance novels, women in the Medieval period were not all damsels in distress waiting for the knight to come save them. Nor for that fact were all men of the era heroic saints on white chargers. Historian Jeffrey Cohen states:

> the problem is one of cultural imposition and anachronism... the heroic code demands that its adherents live up to its ideals or perish striving. Chivalry established a rule-based method of living that, when adhered to, regulates the body in a way that is beneficial to the smoother functioning of the social body; this fiction is disseminated through the gesta of the hero.[1]

The damsel in distress, the chaste maid, good wife, and lady of the manor provide a reason for the hero to be heroic. There is a dependency on one another in the epics as well as the romances of Medieval literature. The male hero is defined by who he is, his quests and his victories; as the damsel is defined by the roles ascribed to her by society.

The works examined are fictional epics in which women do not play main characters but are predominately given supporting roles. These roles are important to the story and in some instances provide a catalyst for the plots within the story. The characters also serve as a guide or example of the proper behavior that is expected in Medieval society.

From the very beginning of the story of *Lancelot, The Knight of the Cart*, women play an important role. Chrétien De Troyes tells the audience in the introduction that the work is at the wish of his patroness, the Countess of Champagne. Chrétien implies that this tale is the idea of the countess, his patron, who provided the information that was the catalyst for the tale. There were very few female writers,

and those that did write were mostly involved in the Church; women's roles in literature and society were very restricted in the early part the Middle Ages. "Roles were never stable, but repeatedly re-situated between the poles of constraint and freedom, submission and authority, passivity and agency."[2] They were symbols of purity, motherhood, beauty, kindness, love, conquest and sexual desire. Objects to be worshipped yet at the same time many considered them the downfall of man. Women are central to the action in the *Knight of the Cart* from Guinevere, the Queen, to the beautiful damsel that Lancelot encounters along his quest. Women could not resist the handsome Lancelot.

Men and women of the Medieval period and Medieval literature were confined by the norms of society. The characters often reflected the standards of Medieval morality in real life. In order to understand their place in epic literature one must first understand their places in Medieval society and culture; being careful not to romanticize the lives of men and women of this time. It is imperative to go beyond the definitions of the masculine and the feminine and explore the way that men and women saw themselves, and each other. This is quite difficult given the lack of historical documentation of the lives of women but there are significant examples of women's thoughts and deeds as well as the reflections of their men on the women.

Women were viewed as daughters of the Eve's sin. In Medieval Europe they were responsible for the temptation of men, "source of the original sin and an instrument of the devil."[3] Medieval feudal society placed more emphasis on men than on women:

> [in] vassalage and feudal relations is noticeable for the absence of a role for women. However, women were essential to the functioning of feudal society not only as brides and mothers...[they] were often at least the de facto administrators of the land and household...women were often the witnesses for charters.[4]

Men are represented as the heroic warrior archetype looking for a battle to fight if not in their own village then in other lands. The men would seek out a fight or join in another village's fight often as the repayment of a debt of honor. In the case of Beowulf and Hrothgar, it is the repayment for Hrothgar coming to the aid of Beowulf's father during a feud years earlier. Because of the rigid feudalism, this was a strict warrior culture; feuds and friendships were generational as were debts. There is a sense of civilization but it is still a violent culture. The people of this story respect bravery and revile cowardice. Men swear an oath of allegiance and would gladly die for and with their leader.

There is a sense of reverence for the some of the women in this tale. Women are somewhat central to the story. They are portrayed as

hostesses, wives, and in the case of Grendel's mother a warrior/monster. Wealtheow, the wife of Hrothgar is one of the few women mentioned in the epic but she is treated with honor and held up as an example of queenly duties. She is described in positive terms and her personality is characterized as one of adherence to the standards of Medieval womanhood. She is "observing the courtesies, queenly and dignified" and "welcoming," she influences the hall and the members of her husband's court.[5] Wealtheow is still an extension of her husband and his role in the tale.

Women played an important role because there had to be someone to recognize the brave and heroic deeds of the men; and there had to be someone to mourn the dead, the men would not be wailing and grieving. Michael Murphy theorizes that the men or knights would repay young women for entertaining them by "a queer mix of chivalry, savagery, and gaucherie…vow[ing] to send her the results of their conquests swords, shields, knight's heads and so forth romantically."[6] The women also fulfilled the roles as hostess and wait staff for the men as well as a social distraction. Since they served the mead and other drinks to the men, in some degree, they controlled the drunkenness and abilities of the men at a feast or celebration. "Nevertheless, we can see traces of such female influence even in a poem as unfeminine as *Beowulf*. Queen Wealtheow plays a small if very dignified part in his epic, but she seems to achieve a significant amount in her brief appearances."[7]

A different example of female characterization is Grendel's mother in the tale of *Beowulf*. A descendent of Cain, therefore, a child of sin, and the avenging warrior over the death of her son. Grendel's mother as a reflection of a child of sin shows the attitude of the Medieval Church toward women, many of the contemporary clergy lectured and sermonized on the sinful daughters of Eve, and that there was no wickedness as bad as a woman's wickedness.

Grendel's mother is described as evil and devious, she is human but still portrayed as a monster. Since she is an outcast as a descendent of Cain, she is not expected to live up to the same strict moral and social code as the other women in the tale, thereby, making her warrior-like status acceptable. She does demonstrate an awareness and acceptance of a code of honor when she seeks revenge for the death of her son. "In the European Middle Ages, as in virtually all periods of human history, warfare is see as a masculine activity;"[8] she is warlike but she also shows the weakness of a woman by fleeing for her life from Heorot. It was a normal and expected activity for men but it was considered astonishingly abnormal for a woman to participate in war.[9]

Modthryth is also portrayed outside of the social normal; she acts in a more masculine manner than the rest of the women in the tale. Modthryth had people chained and tortured for an infraction as small as looking her in the face.[10] She was not the shining example of queenly virtue that is described in Wealtheow. However, she is tamed

by her marriage to Offa "she could grace the throne and grow famous for her good deeds and conduct of life."[11] Both she and Grendel do not use their marriage or words to influence the men but they use the masculine traits of strength and swords, they are content to use strife and violence rather than feminine wiles to settle disputes.

The works composed in the 1170s at the mid-point of the Middle Ages reflect a time when roles and attitudes toward women were beginning to slowly change. Literature was one of the first places that these changes were notable. Europe was experiencing a cultural renaissance or revival. Relationships were changing between men and women, there was a new respect and the flourishing of courtly love. Still women were expected to be the

> ...perfect lady, whose deportment and manners do credit to her breeding; the perfect wife, whose submission to her husband is only equaled by her skill in ministering to his ease; the perfect mistress whose servants love her and run her house like clock work.[12]

And, of course, she was expected to be the perfect hostess who put the needs of her guests above her own.

A question that must be asked is literature influencing society or is society influencing literature. There is no definite answer for this question, historical documentation is slim for this event, but it seems that literature could have possibly been unfolding at the same time or slightly earlier. It is widely thought by scholars that there was a "women's revival" about this time.

Men and women in the epic *Beowulf* were assigned the roles that were traditionally theirs in reality. There is very little difference in the actions of the male and female characters than one would find in any medieval court or village. There was a traditional hierarchy and it held fast in much of Europe. In literature and reality there are recognized gender roles; McLaughlin writes, "exploration of the complex relationship between the myths of masculinity and feminity and the reality of human behavior has revealed a profound ambiguity of gender and the tension inherent in any system of gender roles."[13] Women and men knew their places and most stayed in that spot; "those who did undertake a role not usually assigned to their gender group often elicit strong reactions from the rest of society."[14] Grendel's mother was beneath her son in the social hierarchy of *Beowulf* and did not rise up and take the place of a warrior until her son dies. The monstrous woman flees when she is put in a position to fight for her life or flee, proving that beneath all the evil that she was still a weak-minded woman and unable to bear the rigors of being a warrior.

The role of a warrior was the dominion of men and it was through warfare that manhood was proven and displayed. Warfare is documented in many medieval texts and they are "peppered with references to gender, references which equated fighting with virility... [a]

man who failed in warfare was considered almost by definition "effeminate" and became subject to ridicule."[15] Beowulf, Hrothgar and the rest of the Danes and the Geats, as well as Grendel have proven their worth and their manhood in many battles. There were no shrinking violets in Beowulf's company. Unferth is the only courtier that seems afraid to face the monster and join Beowulf on the mission. This clearly renders him unworthy in the eyes of the others. Unferth has failed in his assigned role as a man.

Women's literature and history in the Medieval period is still a young field academically, while men have been well documented and researched. As the studies have matured somewhat there are many references now being written about in scholarly works showing that women played a more important role that once thought. By the late eleventh century there were women warriors; McLaughlin discusses this stating "chroniclers generally noted the activities of women warriors with little comment."[16] The latter part of the Middle Ages sees a newfound respect and confidence in women.

The men and women in the tale of *Beowulf* are constrained by their gender roles. They are forced to play their parts the way that the author and society viewed them. Even when one can see the changes begin in medieval literature, there is still a decided gender bias that dominates both secular and religious works. Men and women had their place and it was not considered normal for them to step outside of the bounds of the gender roles assigned to them. Women might not have been the helpless damsels in distress waiting to be saved by the chivalrous knight in shining armor as they were portrayed as in romantic literature but they filled the roles that their cultures assigned them.

The images of most of the women that Lancelot encounters in the *Knight of the Cart* are façades; they start out showing him an image of innocence, helpfulness and vulnerability. However, there is an agenda beneath their beauty and courtly manners. One of the first women that he encounters is a damsel who offers him shelter in her home; her conditions is that Lancelot lie with her.[17] The only reason that he even considers lying with the woman is that he needs to rest and replenish his energy to continue on his quest to rescue the queen. Lancelot refuses her at first because of the great love that he has for the queen. The lady in this instance is providing the audience with a way to see that Lancelot is loyal and faithful to his queen and is only going to bed this woman out of obligation; and then only after he rescues her from her faux attackers.

In *Sir Gawain and The Green Knight*, the Lady Bertilak is the temptation of Gawain; both of these women are examples of how the men are tempted to act dishonorable. Both the Lady Bertilak and the damsel are unconfined or uninhibited by showing their forwardness in seeking sex with Gawain and Lancelot, while Guinevere is seen as the model of queenly actions. The damsel can see that this troubles Lancelot greatly and in the end, she decides not to have sex with

him. Here the damsel is a symbol of temptation as mentioned in Richards' book trying to lead Lancelot into sin and dishonor.[18] She is also a test of Lancelot's love for Guinevere and his personal honor.

The damsel that Lancelot has spent the night with at her home cares greatly for him so much so that she does not wish him to be hurt when he swoons at the sight of Guinevere's comb and hair. She throws herself off the horse and rushes to him pretending to want the comb. She does this because she does not want him to be ashamed for his weakness.[19] Here she is representing kindness and love and possibly for Lancelot a courtly love since he would not sleep with the lady in question. Perhaps, the lady feels remorse for tricking Lancelot and forcing him into a position where he would have had to dishonor his true love for his queen. She has remorse for her actions and this proves that women are not evil and bent on the destruction of man.

At one point Lancelot must be willing to fight for the damsel who is under his protection; another knight desires her and will take her by force if necessary. Julia Dietrich states, "women, even in the most privileged class, could be bereft of security and control of their own person."[20] Here the damsel is property, to be fought over by the men. She is the spoils of the fights. A woman alone could be captured by any man; he could do what he wished with her but he often would be forced to marry her, but if he took her from another knight in a battle then she was his by right of victory. The victor could do what he wished with the woman without fear of reprisal. Lancelot must prove that he is brave and loyal to the woman under his care. In this instance, she is proof of his loyalty, his honor and his ability to protect the weaker under his charge.

The women in this story cannot resist the handsome Lancelot, he is the epitome of the chivalrous knight. Men believed that women were in constant danger of "being seduced...because of their natural frivolity and sensuality."[21] At the same time, they thought that they, women, were the seducers of men, the evil sinful daughters of Eve. The female character that Lancelot encounters have to show interest in him physically as well as emotionally. They need to be rescued so that Lancelot has a challenge in his quest, someone to fight and temptation to defeat. Lancelot is "made to look foolish several times for love, but he is willing to risk his reputation for his lady's pleasure" this makes the tales more interesting.[22] What would he do and how far would the women go to achieve their own agenda? Tales about happy housewives and devoted daughters would not have kept the interests of the Medieval audiences. The "authors' purposes, audiences' interests... [were] set on a landscape of violence."[23]

Guinevere's role is that of an unattainable goal, Lancelot knows that she can never be his, he must love her from a distance but still he can participate in the courtly love of the medieval society and literature. It is treason for these two star crossed lovers to consummate their feelings for one another physically. In a way, she is Lancelot's

Holy Grail. He risks all to save her from her capturers. Sandra Prior writes, "Lancelot's outstanding act of chivalry...the freeing of the queen, receives less than its due" because of the act of adultery.[24] Chretien, however, develops a story of chivalry, courtly love and a passionate love of a knight for his lady fair. He stops short in addressing the complex issues of the relationship between Guinevere, Lancelot and King Arthur, after the lovers have given in to temptation. It seems indirectly that he lays the blame at Guinevere's feet because Lancelot has not given in to this point and is able to resist all the other instances of temptation. Guinevere is his downfall, his Achilles' heel, the one temptation that he is unable to continue to resist.

The role of women in Medieval life and literature is a complicated one. Historical documents reflect little activity on the part of women unless they were somehow involved in religion, but literature is full of well-rounded female characters. Cook and Herzman argue, "the frequency with which women appear in such legal documents [charters and wills] suggests that women's activities in feudal society were more complex and public than often imagined."[25] In the stories of King Arthur, Lancelot and other notable romances of the time there is a shift in the roles of women; some of them are moving out of the shadows and becoming important parts of the story. In the early part of the Medieval period women's roles were that of a supporting cast, as the Middle Ages reached its high point women began expressing their opinions and a more active and equal role in society. Some literature presented the women who were becoming more active in a less than positive light seeing them as troublesome and not knowing their place; but over all there is a positive reaction in the romance of the period.

The women of *Lancelot, Knight of the Cart* reflect the changes that were beginning; they are not seen as simple-minded victims and support characters but people with emerging strength and wills of their own. Most men of the time knew that their wives and female relations were not simpletons, and were quite capable of managing their own affairs. The ideal of the weak and victimized damsel in distress is a view of women that came centuries after Lancelot. It was written likely as a product of the overly romantic Victorian era. There is however, an underlying emphasis of the power that women have over men, this brings the Medieval audiences minds back to the thoughts of the Medieval church on the view of women's sexuality and their disposition to lead men into sin. Lancelot and Guinevere are the leading couple in the world of Arthurian romance. Their story has been told over the centuries embellished by each person that picks up their tale but timeless in their love for one another.

Notes
[1] Jeffrey J. Cohen, *Medieval Masculinities: Heroism, Sanctity, and Gender.* Georgetown University. www.8.georgetown.edu/departments/medieval/labyrinth/e-center/interscripta/mm/html. June 29, 2012.

[2] Julia Dietrich, " Review of For Her Good Estate: The Life of Elizabeth de Burgh; Medieval Gentlewoman: Life in a Gentry Household in the Late Middle Ages; Constructions of Widowhood and Virginity in the Middle Ages; Young Medieval Woman" *NWSA Journal*, 13:2. Summer 2001. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University 2001), 1.

[3] Jeffery Richards, *Sex, Dissidence and Damnation: Minority Groups in the Middle Ages* (London/New York: Routledge, 1990), 25.

[4] William Cook and Ronald Herzman, *The Medieval World View 2nd Edition* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004.),167.

[5] Seamus Heany, *Beowulf* (New York: Farr, Straus, and Giroux, 2000) Verses 613-624.

[6] Michael Murphy, "Vows, Boasts, and Taunts, and the Role of Women in Some Medieval Literature" *English Studies* 66.2-1985 P. 105-112.

[7] Ibid., 111.

[8] Meagan McLaughlin " The Woman Warrior: Gender, Warfare, and Society in Medieval Europe" *Women's Studies* 17. 3-4 -1990, 194.

[9] Ibid., 196.

[10] *Beowulf* Verses 1933-1940.

[11] Ibid verses 1952-1953.

[12] Eileen Power, *Medieval People (Cambridge: Cambridge University*, 1924, 1963. Kindle Edition, 2011), 81.

[13] McLaughlin, 193.

[14] Ibid., 193.

[15] Ibid., 194.

[16] Ibid., 194.

[17] Chretien De Troyes. *Lancelot: Knight of the Cart*. (Cambridge: Charles Rivers Editors. 2011). Kindle Edition E-book. Verses 539-982.

[18] Richards, 25.

[19] Chretien De Troyes, Verses 1369-1552.

[20] Dietrich, 2.

[21] Richards, 128.

[22] Robert and Laura Lambdin, " Lancelot, The Knight of the Cart" *Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature*. (Westport/London: Greenwood Press. 2000), 344.

[23] Lisa M. Bitel, *Women in Early Medieval Europe 400-1000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002), 275.

[24] Sandra P. Prior, "The Love That Dares Not Speak Its Name: Displacing and Silencing the Shame of Adultery in Le Chevalier de la Charrete" *Romantic Review* 97.2: March 2006, 1.

[25] Cook and Herzman,167.

Bibliography

Bitel, Lisa M. *Women in Early Medieval Europe 400-1100*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002. Print.

Cohen, Jeffery J. *Medieval Masculinities: Heroism, Sanctity, and Gender*. Georgetown University. www.8.georgetown.edu/departments/medieval/labyrinth/e-center/interscripta/mm/html. Retrieved: Proquest Research Library. Accessed: June 29, 2012.

Cook, William and Herzman, Ronald. *The Medieval Worldview 2nd Edition*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2004. Print.

De Troyes, Chretien. *Lancelot: Knight of the Cart*. Cambridge: Charles Rivers Editors. 2011. Kindle Edition. Ebook.

Dietrich, Julia. "Review of For Her Good Estate: The Life of Elizabeth de Burgh; Medieval Gentlewoman: Life in a Gentry Household in the Late Middle Ages; Constructions of Widowhood and Virginity in the Middle Ages; Young Medieval Women" *NWSA Journal*, 13:2. Summer 2001. Baltimore: John Hopkins University. Proquest Research Library. Accessed: July 16, 2012.

Heany, Seamus. *Beowulf*. Translated by Seamus Heany. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 2000. Kindle E-book.

Lambdin Richard and Lambdin Laura "Lancelot The Knight of the Cart" *Encyclopedia of Medieval Literature*. Ed. Robert and Laura Lambdin. Westport/London: Greenwood Press. 2000. Print.

McLaughlin, Meagan. "The Woman Warrior: Gender, Warfare and Society in Medieval Europe". *Women's Studies* 17.3/4 – 1990: 193-209. Academic Search Premier. Web. Accessed: June 30, 2012.

Murphy, Michael. "Vows, Boasts and Taunts, and the Role of Women in Some Medieval Literature" *English Studies* 66.2 -1985: 105-112. Academic Search Premier. Web. Accessed: June 29, 2012.

Power, Eileen. *Medieval People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University. 1924: 1963. Kindle Edition 2011. Ebook.

Prior, Sandra P. "The Love That Dares Not Speak Its Name: Displacing and Silencing the Shame of Adultery in Le Chevalier de la Charrete" *Romantic Review*: 97, 2: March 2006. New York. ProQuest Research Library. Accessed: July 17, 2012.

Richards, Jeffery. *Sex, Dissidence and Damnation: Minority Groups in the Middle Ages*. London/New York: Routledge. 1990. Print.

Anita Kay O'Pry-Reynolds, prefers Kay, married and the mother of three girls (two biological one step) and one son, and is the obnoxiously proud grandmother of five of the most intelligent children on the planet. A History major with a minor in English/ Literature, her college education started in 1981 at the Angelina College in Texas, with a stint at the University of Texas, and Dallas Baptist University, holds a degree in Business/Accounting. After working in the accounting field for over twenty years, she decided in 2011 to pursue a second degree in one of her favorite subjects, history, at American Public University. Kay will be attending Arcadia University in the fall of 2013 for her Master's in Humanities with a double concentration in History and Literature. Then possibly Drexel or Temple (or APUS if they are offering one by Spring 2015) for a PhD. Kay is a member of Pi Gamma Mu, NSCS, Alpha Beta Gamma, a founding member of Saber and Scroll Historical Society and the current secretary.

William Wallace: The Man Behind the Legend

DeAnna Stevens

"The Uprising"
Albannach

I wonder what you felt inside, as they dragged you through foreign streets
The townsfolk spat venom at you, as churchmen took their seats
And did you think of your Motherland, as you stood there centre stage
Or did you feel suppression, Dear Sir, like an animal in a cage?

I wonder what you felt inside, as they hung you by your throat
Through tear-welled eyes you looked out, as the crowd began to gloat.
And when they cut you down, so that your body slammed the ground
Did you pray to God for strength, Dear Sir, to fight another round?

I wonder what you felt inside, when you burned with ropes pulled tight
Did you see the glee upon their faces, as they watched you lose the fight?
And when every inch of your body cried out, with a burning, searing pain,
Did it ever cross your mind, Dear Sir, "was it all in vain"?

I wonder what you felt inside, when you met the butcher's blade
Did you see their blank expressions, as they watched your life-force fade?
Or did your soul break free from the pain and the hurt, to a pine covered glen
And will you ever know, Dear Sir, what a hero you became?

Aye, will you ever know, Dear Sir, what a hero you became?

(shouted)
Don't fear their cannons or their muskets!
Charge with me!
We fight for what we love, we fight for our country!
Scotsmen, charge, for Scotland!

Legends grow up in every country throughout the world. They sometimes create national heroes and provoke a sense of pride and patriotism. Though usually inaccurate and based on myth, every so often a legend is born out of historical events and based on real people. This is the case with the Scottish hero William Wallace. Wallace was a flesh and blood man who had no idea that he would one day become a national hero of Scotland and an international legend; however, in the right time and in the right circumstances, normal becomes exceptional and exceptional becomes legendary.

The first historical account of William Wallace is that of Henry the Minstrel, otherwise known as Blind Harry. Blind Harry wrote *The history of the life, adventures, and heroic actions of the celebrated Sir William Wallace* in the fifteenth century, approximately one hundred and fifty years after the execution of Wallace. Once thought of as a

historically accurate rendition of Wallace's life, it is known to be filled with inaccuracies and romantic embellishments. However, Blind Harry's account is still referenced in biographies and comparisons between reality and legend.

Details of William Wallace's birth are lost. Blind Harry wrote that Wallace was born in Ellerslie to Malcolm Wallace and a daughter of Sir Ronald Crawford.[1] Some historians claim that Wallace was born around 1270 and was the second son of Sir Malcolm Wallace.[2] Others state that Wallace was born anywhere between the years 1260 and 1278 and that he was born either at Ellerslie, Elderslie, or Renfrewshire, that his father was Malcolm, Andrew, or William, and that his mother was Jean, Joan, Margaret, or an unnamed woman.[3] Speculation also is rampant on the number and gender of Wallace's siblings, whether he was born into a minor or major noble family, or if he was a commoner with no claim to any noble heritage.[4] Historian Fiona Watson states that the "lack of verifiable evidence, or even relatively certain supposition, for the life and deeds of the man is both a blessing and a curse."[5] The blessing of no clear evidence means that the mystery and legendary status of Wallace will continue to increase. However, for historians who try to provide the reality behind the legend, the lack of evidence is a curse.

One of the foremost and well-known biographers of Wallace is Andrew Fisher. In studying the few writings by Wallace that still exist, Fisher believes that Wallace was the son of Alan Wallace, evidenced in a letter Wallace wrote after the Battle of Stirling Bridge in 1297. The inscription on the seal states "[*Wilelm]vs Filius Alani Walais*," which translates to "William, son of Alan Wallace."[6] By his own seal, Wallace declares his father as Alan Wallace. Fisher has traced the lineage of Alan Wallace and has been able to reconstruct some background information on the family. Alan Wallace had sworn allegiance to King Edward I of England, as had so many other Scottish nobles in order to gain wealth and protection from the English crown. Fisher also found evidence that William Wallace had two brothers, Malcolm and John. William supported the Baliol family, whose authority as rulers of Scotland was increasingly undermined by Edward I. Malcolm supported Robert the Bruce, a rival for the Scottish throne. John Wallace also supported Robert the Bruce, an action for which he paid in 1304 when he was executed for treason against the crown of England. Fisher also states that if Alan Wallace was the father of William, then William's birthplace would probably have been in Ayrshire rather than the commonly believed Elderslie.[7]

It is not clear what caused William Wallace to turn so violently against the English in May 1297. However, it is true that Wallace killed William Heselrig, sheriff of Lanark. Legend records that Wallace was avenging the murder of his beloved wife, Marion Braidfute, whom he had married in secret. Blind Harry's poetically written account follows:

Ev'n then she shakes at Hesilrig's fierce hate,
And her soul shrinks, as previous to her fate.
Now fierce with rage the cruel foe draws near,
Oh! does not Heaven make innocence its care?
Where fled thy guardian angel in that hour,
And left his charge to the fell tyrant's power?
Shall his fierce steel be redden'd with thy gore,
And streaming blood distain thy beauties o'er?
But now awaken'd with the dreadful sound,
The trembling matron threw her eyes around,
In vain, alas! were all the tears she shed,
When fierce he wave the faulchion o'er her head,
All ties of honour by the rogue abjur'd,
Relentless deep he plung'd the ruthless sword;
Swift o'er her limbs does creeping coldness rise,
And death's pale hand seal'd up her fainting eyes.

The description of Wallace's reaction by Blind Harry, is detailed and full of vengeance:

Then let those tears to war's rough toils give way,
And the fierce sword perform what words would say.
Hear me, brave Graham, companion of my arms,
Whose soul alike is fir'd with glory's charms.
To thee I swear, this sword I'll never sheath,
Till I revenge my dearest dearest's death.
Heavens! what new toils of death and war remain?
Rivers of floating blood, and hills of slain!
But steel'd with rage, to slaughter let us fly,
And for her sake there shall ten thousand die.

The murder of Marion Braidfute may have enraged Wallace enough to kill Heselrig. Or Heselrig may have instigated a murder or attack on someone else close to Wallace. Alternatively, Fisher states that evidence presented at Wallace's trial in 1305 indicates Heselrig was killed on the day he held court in Lanark. Fisher offers two possible explanations. The first is that Heselrig entered a judgment against Wallace and was murdered in retaliation. Of the second explanation, Fisher believes it to be most plausible. The murder of Heselrig may have been a crime of opportunity in which Wallace saw a way to strike a blow against a representative of the English crown while dispensing judgment on the Scottish people.[8] Whatever his motives were, there is no question that Wallace murdered Heselrig. The act could not have occurred at a more opportune time to catapult Wallace to the forefront of the Scottish rebellion. His band of supporters grew enormously in response to the death of Heselrig. Wallace was seen as unafraid to act and willing to dispose of Englishmen, even if he aroused the anger of the powerful king of England, Edward I.

When the English army advanced on Stirling Bridge in September 1297 in retaliation for the continuous Scottish rebellions and raids into England, William Wallace and the nobleman Andrew de Moray led the Scottish forces. When the English arrived, James Stewart, the High Steward of Scotland, and Malcolm, Earl of Lennox, a Scot whose forces had previously fought with the English, approached the Scots in an effort to negotiate a peaceful settlement. Wallace and Moray rejected the offerings of their fellow Scotsmen. The English forces, led by the Earl of Surrey, settled in for the night and prepared for battle.

The English must have confused the Scots the next morning. The bridge was barely wide enough for two mounted soldiers to ride abreast, forcing the vanguard to take a long time to cross. Then, once they had crossed, they were called back across the bridge because the Earl of Surrey was still in bed. The vanguard began crossing the bridge a second time after the Earl had risen only to be called back again upon the return of James Stewart and the Earl of Lennox. Upon learning that Wallace and Moray had declined a peace settlement, the Earl of Surrey sent two Dominican Friars to the Scots' leaders in one last attempt to settle the matter without bloodshed. According to the account of Walter Hemingborough of Guisborough Priory, the friars returned with a message from Wallace: "Take back this reply, that we are not here to make peace but to do battle to defend ourselves and liberate our kingdom. Let them come on and we shall prove this in their very beards."[9]

The Scots, after seeing the two previous crossings, decided to take the offensive and attack the English at the most opportune time. The third time the English crossed Stirling Bridge, the Scots waited until the cavalry and infantry vanguard of 2,000 arrived.[10] The movie Braveheart took liberties with this battle and showed the two armies advancing towardseach other on a large meadow. Mel Gibson, as William Wallace, spoke with eloquence and roused the troops into an uproar. He ended his speech, declaring "they may take our lives but they will never take our freedom."[11] While no record of any such speech survives from the real battle, some sort of encouraging talk probably was given prior to the attack. In the real battle, horns would have blared, weapons pounded against shields, and war cries screamed as the Scots ran towards the English soldiers. Fearsome to the English already across the bridge, the sight was a death sentence. Pinned between the oncoming Scots and the river behind, and with troops still on the bridge, the English had no choice but to fight the advancing enemy. The Scots lowered their long spears, met the cavalry, and pushed the entire English force back into the river.[12] The English on the south side of the bridge, defeated by a commoner, a noble warrior, a savage outlaw, or a natural born leader, depending on the sources, retreated. Wallace had managed to overcome the advantage of the much larger, well organized English army.

The Battle of Stirling Bridge sparked the beginning of the legend

of William Wallace. The debates about where he came from do not change the simple fact that Wallace defeated the overwhelming English with a smaller force. The tactics used at Stirling Bridge took intelligence, courage, and a steady heart to implement. Wallace proved that he had the necessary composition to lead men into battle. In reward, he was knighted and conferred with the title of Guardian of Scotland by March 29, 1298.[13]

In the absence of a king, a man of lower birth had risen to the highest power in Scotland at that time. In fighting to protect his country, William Wallace was already beginning to take on legendary status before his death. In Braveheart, commoners talk of William Wallace and his achievements after the Battle of Stirling Bridge, bragging about how many men he had killed, the story changing from fifty men to one hundred men. The Scots found a sense of pride in being Scottish and rallied behind Wallace. The English, on the other hand, spread fear about Wallace in an effort to have him captured. Propaganda described Wallace as "an ogre of unspeakable depravity who skinned his prisoners alive, burned babies and forced the nuns to dance naked for him."[14]

In a turn of events, the Battle of Falkirk brought about the defeat of William Wallace and the end of his major role in Scotland. In a pitched battle Wallace met the English, employing the same type of tactics used at Stirling Bridge. At first, it seemed as if the strategy and the ground itself would work in his favor. However, the English broke through the Scots' line of spearmen. Wallace retreated to the North.[15] No clear evidence exists that Scottish nobles betrayed Wallace that day, as has been suggested. However, legend indicates that John III Comyn, another rival for the Scottish throne, and his cavalry abandoned Wallace on the battlefield. Possibly, Comyn may have been chasing his own cavalry in order to turn them around and join the fight. Stories also report that Robert the Bruce took the field that day on the side of Edward I. Robert, though, was rumored to be fifty miles away in Ayr Castle.[16] *Braveheart* drew on these stories of betrayals, giving them extended life in the theatrical portrayal of the Battle of Falkirk. In the movie, Wallace calls on the cavalry of the nobles to join the battle, but they turn and ride away, abandoning Wallace. Robert the Bruce protects Edward I from Wallace's attack,[17] but he also saved Wallace's life before Edward's men reached him as he lay injured.

William Wallace resigned as Guardian of Scotland after his defeat at Falkirk. As fast as he rose in prominence, he returned to outlaw status. Relentless, Edward I never forgot Wallace and the trouble he had caused. The English king engaged Scottish nobleman Sir John de Mentieth to carry out the arrest of Wallace. No evidence explains why Mentieth betrayed Wallace in spite of the fact that Mentieth had at one time been a close friend of Wallace's.[18] After his capture on August 23, 1305, William Wallace was transported to Westminster to stand trial for treason.

The trial was nothing more than a reading of William Wallace's crimes against the King of England. The judges accused him of killing English priests and nuns, stealing relics from churches, murder, treason, and numerous other charges. His only reply was that he had never sworn allegiance to Edward I. Sentenced to death, Wallace faced his accusers in silence.

The method of execution for a man like William Wallace guaranteed his place in history. Hanged, drawn, disemboweled, quartered and beheaded, Wallace's head was placed on London Bridge. The quarters of his body were publicly displayed, one each in Newcastle, Perth, Berwick, and, most likely, Aberdeen at Stirling. The display of Wallace's body parts was meant to stifle any further thought of rebellion. Nine years passed before Robert the Bruce led the Scots at Bannockburn in 1314 and won independence for Scotland.[19]

More than seven centuries after his execution, William Wallace is still an integral part of Scotland's history. No matter whose declarations are the loudest, the truth is that there is simply not enough evidence to provide a clear history of his life. However, Scotland, and the world know the most important fact about him. Wallace fought for Scotland's independence, not because he wanted to be a hero, but because he simply wanted his country to be free.

Notes

[1] Henry, the Minstrel, *The history of the life, adventures, and heroic actions of the celebrated Sir William Wallace.* Revised by William Hamilton. William W. Crawford: New York, 1820. http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/scd0001.00137182762. Accessed January 15, 2013.

[2] Graeme Morton, *William Wallace: Man and Myth*, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 2004.

[3] James Mackay, *William Wallace*, Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Company (Edinburgh) Ltd., 1995. Kindle edition.

[4] Graeme Morton, *William Wallace: Man and Myth*.

[5] Edward Cowan, ed., *The Wallace Book*, Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited, 2012. Kindle edition.

[6] Andrew Fisher, *William Wallace.* Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited, 2012. Kindle edition. Location 217 of 4288.

[7] Andrew Fisher, *William Wallace*, Location 217 of 4288.

[8] Andrew Fisher, *William Wallace.*

[9] Peter Armstrong, *Stirling Bridge and Falkirk 1267-98: William Wallace's Rebellion*, Long Island City: Osprey Publishing Ltd., 2003, Kindle edition, Location 676-827 of 1555.

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Braveheart*, Video, directed by Mel Gibson, (1995: Los Angeles, CA: Amazon Instant Video, 2013).

[12] Peter Armstrong, *Stirling Bridge and Falkirk 1267-98: William Wallace's Rebellion.*

[13] Andrew Fisher, *William Wallace*, Location 1685-1784 of 4288.

[14] James Mackay, *William Wallace*, Location 2940 of 4593.

[15] James Mackay, *William Wallace*, Location 2956-3143 of 4593.

[16] Ibid.

[17] *Braveheart.*

[18] James Mackay, *William Wallace*, Location 4056-4103 of 4593.

[19] Andrew Fisher, *William Wallace.*

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Henry, the Minstrel. *The history of the life, adventures, and heroic actions of the cele-brated Sir William Wallace*. Revised by William Hamilton. William W. Crawford: New York, 1820. http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/scd0001.00137182762. Accessed January 15, 2013.

Secondary Sources

Albannach. "The Uprising." *Eye of the Storm*, Mix Records, 2007. www.albannachmusic.com/music/lyrics.html. Accessed February 24, 2013.

Armstrong, Peter. *Stirling Bridge and Falkirk 1297-98: William Wallace's Rebellion*. Long Island City: Osprey Publishing Ltd., 2003. Kindle edition.

Braveheart, Video, directed by Mel Gibson, 1995: Los Angeles, CA: Amazon Instant Video, 2013.

Caldwell, David H. "Scottish Spearmen, 1298–1314: An Answer to Cavalry." *War In History* 19, no. 3 (July 2012): 267-289. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

Clater-Roszak, Christine. "Sir William Wallace ignited a flame.." *Military History* 14, no. 4 (October 1997): 12. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

Cowan, Edward, ed. *The Wallace Book*. Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited, 2012. Kindle edition.

Donaldson, Peter. *The life of Sir William Wallace, the governor general of Scotland*. Hartford: Andrus and Judd, 1833. http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/scd0001.00137182762. Accessed January 15, 2013.

Fisher, Andrew. "THE HUNT FOR WILLIAM WALLACE." *History Today* 55, no. 9 (September 2005): 31-36. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

———. "Wallace & Bruce: Scotland's uneasy heroes." *History Today* 39, no. 2 (February 1989): 18-23. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

———. *William Wallace*. Edinburgh: Birlinn Limited, 2012. Kindle edition.

Fraser, James E. "William Wallace: The True Story of Braveheart." *Innes Review* 57, no. 2 (September 2006): 224-227. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

Gray, D. J. *William Wallace: The King's Enemy*. London: Robert Hale, 1991.

Mackay, James A. *William Wallace*. Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing Company (Edinburgh) Ltd., 1995. Kindle edition.

Morton, Graeme. "The Most Efficacious Patriot: The Heritage of William Wallace in Nineteenth-Century Scotland." *Scottish Historical Review* 77, 2, no. 204 (October 1998): 224. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

———. *William Wallace: Man and Myth*. Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 2004.

Ohlgren, Thomas H., ed. *Medieval Outlaws: Twelve Tales in Modern English Translation*. West Lafayette: Parlor Press, 2005.

Paterson, James. *Wallace: The Hero of Scotland.* London: William P. Nimmo, 1877. Kindle edition.

Reese, Peter. *Wallace: A Biography*. Edinburgh: Canongate Books Ltd., 2012. Kindle edition.

Ross, Andrew. "Wallace's Monument and the Resumption of Scotland." *Social Text* 18, no. 4 (Winter2000 2000): 83. Academic Search Prem- ier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

Taylor, James G. "SPRINGING A TRAP STIRLING BRIDGE." *Military History* 24, no. 4 (June 2007): 58-61. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

"William Wallace's adventure through time." *British Heritage* 18, no. 6 (October 1996): 42. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 15, 2013).

Young, Alan and Michael J. Stead. *In the Footsteps of William Wallace: In Scotland and Northern England.* Gloucestershire: The History Press, 2011.

DeAnna Stevens is currently enrolled in her last two undergraduate classes at American Public University. She will graduate in August 2013 and move immediately into the Master of Arts in History program at Univeristy of Nebraska – Kearney. Besides working full time and attending school, DeAnna is also a single mom to two. In her spare time, DeAnna enjoys crocheting, reading, playing with the family dog, playing the XBox 360 with her son and reading to her daughter.

The Frankish War-Machine of Charles Martel

Patrick S. Baker

In 715, Charles Martel had been passed over to inherit his father's position as Mayor of the Palace and Prince (leader) of the Franks in favor of his infant nephews and had also been imprisoned by his stepmother, Plectrude (Plectrudis).[1] However, some time in 716 Charles managed to escape.[2] By then Charles' Austrasian (Eastern Franks) Carolingian clan, whose homeland included what is now Northern France to the Somme and most of the Benelux countries, was facing a two front war. To the west were the rival Neustrian (New or Western) Franks, whose lands ran from the River Loire through the Seine Valley to the River Somme, under the leadership of their Mayor of the Palace, Ragamfred; to the north, allied with Ragamfred were the pagan Frisians.[3] The two allies managed a coordinated assault on the Carolingians. Charles moved to stop the Frisian invasion, but was soundly defeated by the pagans: ". . . he suffered a great loss of followers, but, taking to flight, he escaped."[4] This was the first battle Charles is said to have fought in and his only recorded defeat.

While Charles appeared to be down, he was certainly not out. The Frisians and Neustrians met at the Rhine River and marched on the city of Cologne, where they forced Plectrude to hand over the family treasure. While the Neustrians were returning west, Charles organized an ambush at Ambleve near Malmedy in present day Belgium and inflicted a serious defeat on them, recapturing at least some of the treasure.[5]

From the victory at Ambleve, Charles went on to defeat Ragamfred again the next year at Vinchy (or Vincy).[6] He also settled affairs with his father's widow, including seizing from her the remainder of his father's treasure.[7] Then in 718 Charles chased an army of Aquitainians, allied to Ragamfred, back over the River Loire.[8] Later that same year he marched east of the River Weser and defeated the West Saxons.[9]

By 717 Charles was the acknowledged leader of all the Franks and hailed as Mayor of the Palace.[10] The position of Mayor of the Palace was unique. Originally merely the administrator of the royal landed estates, the office began to accrue more and more responsibilities and thus power.[11] By the time Charles' father, Pippin, held the office, the Mayor was responsible for hearing cases in the law court and "the governance of the whole kingdom, the royal treasure, and command of all the army."[12]

Charles campaigned incessantly and widely, from 716 until his death in 741.[13] In 718, 724, 725, 728, and 738 Charles fought against

the West Saxons east of the Rhine.[14] In 725 and 728, he campaigned along the Danube against the Bavarians.[15] In 734, he fought the Frisians again; this effort included a naval invasion of the Frisian home islands in the North Sea.[16] In 731, he raided Aquitaine twice.[17] In 732, he defeated a major Al-Andalusian (Spanish) Muslim Moorish attack on Aquitaine at the Battle of Tours-Poitiers.[18] In 736-737 Charles led his army south and took control of the Rhone River Valley all the way to Marseilles on the Mediterranean Sea and again defeated the Moors, this time at the Battle of the River Berre.[19]

Based on just this brief sketch of Frankish military activity during the reign of the Duke Charles, plainly the Franks had a war-machine that was a highly effective and mobile. It fought from the North Sea in the north to the Mediterranean Sea in the south and from Aquitaine in the west to Bavaria in the east. The Franks also fought and won against enemies as diverse as the pagan seafaring Frisians to the heavy cavalry of the Muslim Moors of Al-Andalus.

Antecedents

The Frankish military of the early eighth century was at least as much a product of the late Roman Empire as it was of the so-called barbarian war-bands that crossed the Rhine and settled in what is now France.[20] Originally invited into Roman Gaul as auxiliaries for the Roman Army, a contingent of Franks had fought against the Huns at the Battle of the Catalaunian Plains or Chalons in 451.[21] Part of the continuity between the late Roman Imperial military traditions and the Frankish military of Charles Martel were the two available military handbooks. The most popular, if the number of surviving manuscripts is an indicator, was Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus' *De Re Militari* (Concerning Military Matters).[22] Sextus Julius Frontinus' *Strategemata* (Strategies) was also available in some numbers, although fewer manuscripts of it survived.[23] Of course, how much or how little these handbooks were used by any given military leader is impossible to know. But logic dictates that a general such as Charles Martel, who was said to be "uncommonly well educated and effective in battle" and "the shrewdest of commanders," would have made use of all available military information.[24]

Branches

The Frankish land military may be seen as having three broad, yet distinct, combat "branches" or "arms". These included: first, the infantry that moved and fought on foot,[25] and second, the cavalry who moved on and at least sometimes fought from horseback.[26] Lastly, the "combat engineers" defined as soldiers that designed and supervised the building of defensive positions and the construction and operation of siege equipment, such as catapults and battering rams.[27] However, there seems to have been a great deal of crossover among

these three "branches". For example, horsemen frequently dismounted and fought on foot and regular infantry helped build and then operated the siege equipment under the supervision of the skilled engineers.[28]

Infantry

For the Franks the decisive combat arm was the infantry. Infantry could fight on the tactical offense or defense and were used as assault troops when taking fortifications.[29] Of course, as stated previously, infantry could also have been dismounted horsemen. The percentage of fighting men that moved and fought exclusively on foot was about eighty percent of the total forces available.[30]

The average Frankish infantryman was minimally equipped with a shield and spear.[31] Perhaps he had an iron helmet, maybe body armor and perhaps a sword, if he could afford them, or had taken them as loot.[32] The round shield, or *scutum rotundum*, favored by the Franks after 700 was slightly conical in shape and approximately 80 to 90 centimeters, or 31 to 35 inches, wide; about a centimeter thick made of wood joined to an onion-shaped central metal boss.[33] The spear was the primary infantry weapon.[34] It was between six and eight feet long with an iron head, held in one hand and used as a thrusting weapon.[35] The swords used were likely some variation of the *semispatha*, about 40 centimeters (15 inches) long, designed for stabbing, not cutting, or the longer *sax* or *scaramsax* swords, that were up to 85 centimeters (33 inches) long.[36] Selection of sword length, balance and weight were highly individual choices based on weapon availability, an individual's strength and dexterity, and personal preferences. A spear and shield cost the same as two cows, or two *solidi*.[37] A sword without a scabbard was three *solidi* and one with a scabbard was seven *solidi*.[38]

The helmets were conical in shape and most likely some variation of the spangenhelm; six bands of iron were joined to a headband and at the apex of the helmet with the intervening spaces filled with iron plates or horn.[39] A good helmet cost six *solidi*, enough for two good mares.[40] The average infantryman was unlikely to have much purchased body armor. A good piece of armor cost twelve *solidi*, or as much as twelve good cows, twice as much as a good helmet.[41] The body armor that was available was likely similar to the Roman cuirass, or perhaps just a simple chainmail shirt.[42]

As recommended by Vegetius, some infantry were selected to act as archers.[43] However, there seems to have been a chronic shortage of bowmen.[44] The Frankish-European self-bow had a range of about 175 meters (190 yards).[45] The bow's impact could be significant, through the technique of mass shooting. The "hail of arrows" would kill and injure a few enemies, but more importantly it could break up the enemy's formations and affect his morale.[46] Although no mention of archers is made in the accounts of the battles during the eighth

century it is impossible to merely dismiss their presence.

The most important aspects of Frankish infantry were their high levels of courage and discipline. Maurice's *The Strategikon*, written about 600, clearly states: The Franks "are bold and undaunted in battle. They consider any timidity . . . a disgrace. They calmly despise death as they fight violently in hand-to-hand combat. . ."[47] Even the Muslims remarked on their bravery; Musa, the conqueror of Spain, is reported to have said: "These Franks . . . are full of might: brave and impetuous. . ."[48] Further *The Chronicle of 754* in an account of the Battle of Tours describes the Franks as ". . . immobile like a wall, holding together like a glacier . . ."[49] The high level of discipline needed to maintain a tight infantry formation in the face of repeated attacks by the Moors was remarkable. This obedience is even more noteworthy given that just a little more than a century before the 732 Battle of Tours, the Franks were described as "disobedient to their leaders" and thought to despise "good order."[50]

Cavalry

The cavalry, or more properly, horsemen, were approximately twenty percent of the total of Frankish soldiers and were not heavily armored knights organized and equipped for mounted shock combat.[51] Rather they acted in other military and paramilitary roles. First they fought against other horsemen; also they operated as scouts, and in an anti-scouting role, they conducted anti-bandit operations, acted as raiders, defended against raids and were also messengers.[52] Traditional, Frankish horsemen were trained to dismount quickly and fight on foot when required.[53]

Frankish horsemen were usually the armed followers of a great landed magnate or part of the royal bodyguard. For example Dodo, who was a *domesticus*, or court official, for Pippin, Charles' father, armed and equipped his followers with chain-mail coats, helmets, shields, lances, swords, bows and arrows.[54] This list of equipment indicates that the *satellites* were expected to fight from both horseback and on foot. Of course, equipping any number of fighting men was a very expensive proposition, with the basic equipment listed above and a horse costing about forty *solidi*, or enough to buy about forty cows or twenty oxen.[55] The *antrustiones*, equipped like the *satellites*, were the technically sworn armed followers of the kings, but actually loyal to the Mayors of the Palace, and were armed and supported directly from the royal *fisc*, or royal lands, controlled by the Mayors.[56] These two groups represented the primary sources of mounted warriors for the Franks during the war.

Combat Engineers

The Franks were able to effectively conducted sieges directed against fortified cities. Charles unsuccessfully besieged Angers in

718.[57] He successfully besieged Avignon twice, once in 737 and again in 738, he also unsuccessfully besieged Narbonne in 737.[58] During the course of the sieges, the Franks either brought with them or built on the spot various types of throwing machines of different sizes and battering rams.[59] They also built earthworks that surrounded the cities which featured emplacements and camps at regular "intervals."[60] All of this kind of work, the building of siege equipment and artillery as well as the construction of breastworks and the sighting of artillery were highly specialized skills with no civilian equivalent.[61] While the actual labor was done by ordinary soldiers, a small number of expert artisans, or "combat engineers," had to plan and supervise the various building projects.[62]

Navy

The Franks were capable of organizing and deploying large naval forces on northern rivers and on the North Sea.[63] However, despite controlling Marseilles from at least 736 onward, they never seemed to develop the same capacity on the Mediterranean, or at least could not deploy enough ships to close off Narbonne from seaborne resupply as they besieged it.[64] The Frankish naval forces were probably commandeered merchant or transport vessels, and possibly a special obligation rested on men that worked on the water, or on shipowners, to provide naval forces when called to service.[65] While the Franks did not totally ignore naval operations, and in fact paid close attention to riverine operations, the development of sea-going naval power was not a high priority.[66]

Mobilizing and Resourcing

Regardless of the type of service rendered, the obligation to either campaign in person or provide resources to supply others on campaign was a function of landholding or annual income. Local defense was the responsibility of all able-bodied men, but going on offensive military operations, or *expeditiones*, was related to wealth.[67] A freeman with sufficient income measured by *mansi* (income producing land areas worked by peasants) would have technically been required to serve in the selected levy and go on offensive operations.[68] Often a group men who were too poor to go on campaign themselves would come together to support one man going.[69] The wealthier the man was, the greater his obligation to equip himself and to go on campaign. For example in Charlemagne's time, a landowner with twelve *mansi* would have campaigned on horseback and worn body-armor.[70] In some cases a son would go on *expeditio* in place of his father, but supported by his father's holdings.[71]

Of course, the great landholding magnates, regardless if they were clerics or laymen, would arm and lead some number of fighting men based on their landholdings.[72] The great magnates' personal

military followings variously called *pueri*, *socii*, *sodales* and *satellites*, all words meaning armed retainers, followers, or supporters were one of the main sources for mounted Frankish military manpower.[73]

The other source of mounted Frankish military power at this time was the royal or mayoral military household, the *trustis*.[74] Individual members of the *trustis* were called *antrustione*.[75] Originally recruited and organized with the job of protecting the kings, the bodyguard's responsibility was shifted to performing the same functions for the Mayors of the Palace as they became the *defacto* rulers of *Francia*.[76] Although it is impossible to determine the exact size of this force, it is clear that the late Merovingian kings and the Mayors imposed significant taxes; between forty and fifty percent on Church lands.[77] These taxes were specifically to support a group of professional soldiers, whose primary loyalty was to the realm's leader.[78]

Further, Charles also used *precaria*, a sort of lease of Church land, to reward and support his military followers.[79] This appears to be a regular way of supporting soldiers by giving them tenancy of Church land that the Church still owned.[80] On the death of the tenant, the land would revert to the Church for disposition.[81] But if the realm still needed the land to support a soldier, another *precaria* would be issued and recorded.[82]

Men not reporting for duty remained a serious and long lasting issue. Merovingian kings fined men for not complying with summons to military service.[83] A heavy fine, the *heribannus*, would be levied on a freeman for not reporting or for not sending a substitute to fight.[84] The fine was assessed on the offending freeman's personal assets and could be as high as 60 *solidi* and was paid in either coin or various goods.[85] Arming a man with sword and scabbard, spear and helmet cost only 21 *solidi*.[86] Economically, it made much more sense to buy the weapons and report, or support a substitute, than to pay the *heribannus*.

Also of note were the resources obtained by capturing enemy equipment, looting and raiding. A poorly armed or armored Frankish soldier could easily equip himself with captured enemy gear by taking it from a dead enemy, or from prisoners of war, or by obtaining a helmet or some piece of body armor through a formal division of loot.[87] Raiding and looting of an enemy provided two benefits. It weakened the enemy by depriving them of resources and also provided resources to the attacker to support his army. Seemingly, the Franks engaged in these kinds of "smash and grab" raids as part of regular military operations. For example, Charles Martel raided Aquitaine twice in 732 with no apparent attempt to seize territory but seemingly with the goal of taking "rich booty" to punish the Duke of Aquitaine.[88] A defeated enemy's camp was also an important source of riches and captured equipment.[89] However, while the spoils of war could and did provide valuable resources to the Franks, it was not a primary motivation for fighting.[90]

Tactics

Around 600 Maurice described how the Franks fought in a dense formation with an even front.[91] The entry for the year 612 from the *Chronicle of Fredegar* describes an infantry formation so closely packed that the dead could not fall.[92] This statement is no doubt hyperbole, but does point out that the Franks traditionally fought in a tight infantry formation. In battle the Franks would deploy in a formation very like the one described in Vegetius, with the warriors standing nearly shoulder to shoulder, leaving just enough room to hold a shield and a spear and to stab without interfering with the next soldier in the line.[93] This formation would have been several ranks deep, depending on its total length and the total number of Frankish soldiers fighting.

This traditional infantry line was tactically flexible, used both defensively, such as the Battle of Tours and offensively, as at the Battle of the River Berre. As mentioned above, at Tours the Franks stood: ". . . immobile like a wall, holding together like a glacier . . ." fighting almost completely on the defensive.[94] At the River Berre, the Franks stopped another Moorish army then drove the survivors into the sea.[95] In this battle, it is likely the Frankish infantry line moved forward slowly, step by step, just as they would do at later battle, again maintaining "unit cohesion" and good order.[96]

In siege operations the Franks used multiple points of attack when directly assaulting an enemy fortification. For example, at Avignon in 737 they used a combination of "battering rams and rope ladders" to assault the city.[97] The battering rams were heavy logs with iron heads attached that were hung from a frame so it could be swung back and forth to smash the gates or walls.[98] This arrangement was mounted on wheels and over the whole device was a protective cover of "woven branches, and planks" or layers of leather, wool and sand to ward off stones and incendiary devices.[99] The rope ladders were likely just knotted ropes with grappling hooks of some kind. The nature of rope ladders makes their use in the attack on Avignon most likely a commando-type or sneak attack.[100] Further, the use of rope ladders indicates that the defending force was relatively small. The attack scenario was probably something like this: The battering rams were wheeled into position against the city's gates under the covering fire of archers, while the defenders rushed to fend off this attack, other Franks using rope ladders climbed over the now undefended parts of the wall.

Summary

The small landowners as infantry, the mounted *satellites* and the *antrustiones* and the very small number of highly skilled craftsmen that acted as "combat engineers" were the primary sources of Frankish military power throughout the eighth century. Charles' army was

highly mobile, campaigning throughout what is now France, Germany and the Low Countries. The army was also highly effective, winning all but one major set piece battle and failing to capture Angers in 718 and Narbonne in 737. Despite all of this efficiency, there should be no confusion between the army of Charles Martel and the Roman legions, or between Charles' army and the army of his grandson, Charlemagne. Besides the *antrustiones* and *satellites*, Charles' soldiers were decidedly part-time, being called out for campaigns and then demobilized to return to civilian life.[101] However, it is likely that the same men served year after year on *expeditio*, making them if not professional, then highly experienced.[102] The Frankish armies of Charles Martel played an important role in the development of Europe in the early middle ages. The reverberations of their iron discipline and raw courage carry through to even today's military forces.

Notes

[1] *Liber Historiae Francorum* (The Book of the History of the Franks: The Last Eleven Chapters) in *Late Merovingian France: History and Hagiography, 640-720*, trans and ed. Paul Fouracre and Richard A. Gerberding (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), chap. 51, 94.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., chap. 52, 95.

[5] Ibid.

[6] *Continuations of the Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar*, ed. and trans. J. M. Wallace-Hardill (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, LTD., 1960), chap. 10, 88.

[7] *Liber Historiae Francorum*, chap. 53, 95.

[8] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 10, 89.

[9] *Annales Mettenses Priores*, ed. B. De Simson (Hannoverae et Lipsiae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1905), s. a. 718, 26.

[10] Ibid., s.a. 717, 26.

[11] Charles William Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 161.

[12] *Annales Mettenses Priores*, s.a. 686, 7.

[13] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 24, 97.

[14] Paul Fouracre, *The Age of Charles Martel* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, Limited, 2000), 199.

[15] Ibid.

[16] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 17, 92.

[17] Ibid., chap. 13, 90.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., chap. 20, 93 -95.

[20] *Bernard S. Bachrach, Merovingian Military Organization, 481-751* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1972), 128.

[21] Jordanes, *The Gothic History of Jordanes*, trans. Charles Mierow (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915), chap. 191, 105.

[22] Christopher Allmand, "De Re Militari of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance" in *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare*, ed. Corinne J. Saunders, Francoise Hazel Marie Le Saux, Neil Thomas (Woodbridge, UK: D. S. Brewer, 2004), 16.

[23] Ibid.

[24] *Liber Historiae Francorum*, chap. 49, 93 and *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 18, 93.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Bernard S. Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare: Prelude to Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 131.

[27] Ibid., 119.

[28] Maurice, *Strategikon: Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy*, trans. George T. Dennis (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1984), Book XI, Part 3, 119 and Bachrach, *Early Carlingian Warfare*, 119.

[29] Bernard S. Bachrach, "Charles Martel, Mounted Shock Combat, the Stirrup, and Feudalism," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, Vol. 7 (1970), 75.

[30] Ibid., 63.

[31] Simon Coupland "Carolingian Arms and Armor in the Ninth Century," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 21 (1990), 50.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Philippe Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, trans. Michael Jones (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1986), 178 and Coupland, "Carolingian Arms," 36.

[34] Ibid., 44.

[35] Ibid., 45.

[36] Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, 77-78.

[37] *Lex Ribuaria et Lex Francorum Chamavorum: ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis recusae*, ed. Rudolf Sohm (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1883), Indices XXXVIII, art. 11, 67.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Coupland, "Carolingian Arms," 33.

[40] *Lex Ribuaria*, Indices XXXVIII, art. 11, 67.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Coupland, "Carolingian Arms," 39-41.

[43] Flavius Vegetius Renatus, *De Re Militari*, trans. John Clarke, Book I, chap. 15. http://www.pvv.ntnu.no/~madsb/home/war/vegetius/dere03.php (accessed April 11, 2013) and Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 100.

[44] Ibid., 45.

[45] Bachrach, Early Carolingian Warfare, 173.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Maurice, *Strategikon*, Book XI, Part 3, 119.

[48] "Arabian Chronicler," in *Readings in Ancient History: Illustrative Extracts from the Sources, Rome and the West*, Vol 2., ed. William Stearns Davis and Willis Mason West (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1913), 362.

[49] *The Chronicle of 754*, in *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, trans. and ed. Kenneth Baxter Wolf (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1990), chap. 80, 144.

[50] Maurice, *Strategikon*, Book XI, Part 3, 119.

[51] Bachrach, "Charles Martel," 63 and 75.

[52] Bernard S. Bachrach, "Animals and Warfare in Early Medieval Europe," in *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di sull'alto medioevo* 31 (1985), 713-714.

[53] Maurice, *Strategikon*, Book XI, Part 3, 119.

[54] *Vita Landiberti Episcopi Traiectensis Vetustissima* in *Monumentis Germaniae Historicis: Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum,* Vol. 6, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii,1913), chap. 11, 365 and chap.13, 367

[55] *Lex Ribuaria,* Indices XXXVIII, art. 11, 67-68.

[56] *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi: Legum sectio 5: Formulae*, ed. Karl Zeumer, (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1886), *Marculfi Formularum Liber I*, no. 18: *De Regis Antrustione,* 55.

[57] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 11, 89.

[58] Ibid*.,* chaps. 20-21, 94-95 and *Annales Mettenses Priores*, s.a. 752.

[59] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 108.

[60] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 20, 94.

[61] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 118.

[62] Ibid.,119.

[63] *Continuations of Fredegar*, chap. 17, 92 and chap. 32, 102.

[64] Ibid., chap. 18, 93 and Bachrach, "Charles Martel," 55, note 21.

[65] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 253.

[66] Ibid., 257.

[67] Ibid., 53-55.

[68] Walter Goffart, "Frankish Military Duty and the Fate of Roman Taxation," in *Early Medieval Europe,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (2008), 171.

[69] *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi: Legum sectio 5: Formulae*, Formulae Turonenses, no. 1, 135-136.

[70] *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ed. Alfred Boret (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1883), Ch. 44, No. 6, 123.

[71] *Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi*, Formulae Andecavenses, no. 37, 16.

[72] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 56.

[73] Bachrach, *Merovingian Military Organization,* 99 and Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare,* 64.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid., 68.

[77] Ibid., 61.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Fouracre, *Charles Martel*, 139.

[80] "Capitulary of Lestinnes: Appropriation of Church Property for Military Purposes, 743," http://www.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/743Lestines.asp (accessed 12 April, 2013).

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Gregory of Tours, *A History of the Franks*, trans. Earnest Brehaut, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1916) Book II, chap. 26 and. 37 and Book VII, chap. 42 http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ basis/gregory-hist.asp (accessed April 12, 2013).

[84] *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ed. Alfred Boret (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1883), chap. 44, No. 19, 125.

[85] Ibid.

[86] *Lex Ribuaria,* Indices XXXVIII, art. 11, 67-68.

[87] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 55.

[88] *Continuations of Fredegar,* chap. 13, 90.

[89] Ibid., chap. 13, 91 and chap. 30, 95.

[90] Guy Halsall, *Warfare and Society in the Barbarian West, 450-900* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 74.

[91] Maurice, *Strategikon*, Book XI, Part 3, 119.

[92] *Chronicle of Fredegar,* chap. 38, 31.

[93] Vegetius, *De Re Militari*, Book III, chap. 12.

[94] *Chronicle of 754*, chap. 80, 144.

[95] *Continuations of Fredegar,* chap. 20, 95.

[96] *Annalium Fuldensium Continuatio Ratisbonensis* in *Annales Fuldenses sive Annales regni Francorum Orientalis*, ed. G.H. Pertz (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1891), s. a. 891, 120.

[97] *Continuations of Fredegar,* chap. 20, 94.

[98] *Mappae Clavicula*, quoted in Bernard S. Bachrach's "On Roman Ramparts 300-1300," in *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Warfare: the Triumph of the West*, ed. Geoffrey Parker (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 73.

[99] Gregory, *History of the Franks*, Book II, chap. 37.

[100] Bachrach, *Early Carolingian Warfare*, 106.

[101] Halsall, *Warfare and Society*, 74.

[102] David Nicolle, *Poitiers AD 732: Charles Martel Turns the Islamic Tide* (New York: Osprey Publishing, 2008), 25.

Bibliography

Allmand, Christopher. "De Re Militari of Vegetius in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance." In *Writing War: Medieval Literary Responses to Warfare,* 15-28. Edited by Corinne J. Saunders, Francoise Hazel Marie Le Saux and Neil Thomas. Woodbridge, UK: D. S. Brewer, 2004.

Annales Mettenses Priores. Edited by B. De Simson. Hannoverae et Lipsiae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1905.

Annalium Fuldensium Continuatio Ratisbonensis in *Annales Fuldenses sive Annales regni Francorum Orientalis.* 107-131. Edited by G.H. Pertz. Hanoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1891.

"Arabian Chronicler" in *Readings in Ancient History: Illustrative Extracts from the Sources, Rome and the West:* Volume 2, 362. Edited by William Stearns Davis and Willis Mason West. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1913.

Bachrach, Bernard S. "Charles Martel, Mounted Shock Combat, the Stirrup, and Feudal ism" *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, Vol. 7, (1970): 49-75.

_____. *Merovingian Military Organization, 481- 751.* Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press, 1972.

_____. "Animals and Warfare in Early Medieval Europe", *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di sull'alto, Medioevo 31.* (1985), 707-751.

_____. *Early Carlingian Warfare: Prelude to Empire.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Capitularia Regum Francorum. Edited by Alfred Boret. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1883.

Capitulary of Lestinnes: *Appropriation of Church Property for Military Purposes*, (743). http://www.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/743Lestines.asp.

Chronicle of 754, *The.* in *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain*, 111-158. Translated and edited by Kenneth Baxter Wolf. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1990.

Continuations of the Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar in *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar with its Continuations,* 80-121. Translated and edited by J. M. Wallace-Hardill. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, LTD., 1960.

Contamine, Philippe, *War in the Middle Ages.* Translated by Michael Jones. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1986.

Coupland, Simon. "Carolingian Arms and Armor in the Ninth Century." *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Vol. 21 (1990), 29-50.*

Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi: Legum sectio 5: Formulae. Edited by Karl Zeumer. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1886.

Fouracre, Paul. *The Age of Charles Martel.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

Goffart, Walter. "Frankish Military Duty and the Fate of Roman Taxation." *Early Medieval Europe* Vol. 16, no. 2 (2008), 166-190.

Gregory of Tours. *A History of the Franks.* Translated by Earnest Brehaut. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916. http://gorddcymru.org/

Halsall, Guy. *Warfare and Society in the Barbarian West, 450-900.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Lex Ribuaria et Lex Francorum Chamavorum: ex Monumentis Germaniae Historicis Recusae. Edited by Rudolf Sohm. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1883.

Liber Historiae Francorum (The Book of the History of the Franks: The Last Eleven Chapters) in *Late Merovingian France: History and Hagiography, 640-720*, 87-96. Translated and edited by Paul Fouracre and Richard A. Gerberding. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Jordanes. *The Gothic History of Jordanes.* Translated by Charles Mierow. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1915.

Mappae Clavicula quoted in Bernard S. Bachrach's "On Roman Ramparts, 300-1300." In *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Warfare: the Triumph of the West*, 64-91. Edited by Geoffrey Parker. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Maurice. *Strategikon*: *Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy.* Translated by George T. Dennis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1984.

Nicolle, David. *Poitiers AD 732: Charles Martel Turns the Islamic Tide.* New York: Osprey Publishing, 2008.

Previté-Orton, Charles William. *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Vegetius Renatus, Flavius. *De Re Militari.* Translated by John Clarke. http:/www.pvv.ntnu.no.

Vita Landiberti Episcopi Traiectensis Vetustissima in *Monumentis Germaniae Histori ca:Scriptores re rum Merovingicaru:* Vol. 6, 353 -384. Edited by Bruno Krusch. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii, 1913.

Patrick Baker is a former US Army Field Artillery officer, currently a Department of Defense employee. He holds BAs in History, Political Science and Education, and an MA in European History from AMU. He is a frequent contributor to Armchairgeneral.com. His most recent history article was published in the March 2013 issue of Medieval Warfare Magazine.

The Rise of Heavy Infantry and the Demise of Heavy Cavalry at the End of the Medieval Period

Guy Williams

The Medieval era extended from approximately the fifth to fifteenth century CE. While philosophers of the time examined the works of ancient writers to understand history and human nature, military leaders of the period also looked to the past for answers to the challenge of heavy cavalry. One group in particular, the Swiss, emerged with a unique answer to the power of heavy cavalry. The Swiss reinvented the heavy infantry formations used by the ancient Greek and Roman armies to great effect against their opponents. The unique topography and circumstances of the Swiss allowed them to implement a system of heavy infantry-centric warfare that profoundly influenced the European battlefield for several centuries from the Late Middle Ages into the Renaissance period. This Swiss method of war during the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance demonstrated the effectiveness of heavy infantry against heavy cavalry formations and relegated the once dominant armored knights to a lesser role.

Before the Renaissance began, the battlefields of Europe fell sway to the dominance of heavy cavalry or the armored knight during the Middle Ages. These armored juggernauts used the speed and weight of heavily armored horses combined with men armed with lances to smash infantry formations. The high-backed saddle and stirrup allowed armored knights to couch their lances and focus the weight of rider and horse into the tip of their lance. This tactic came to the forefront during the reign of Charles Martel (688-741) and his successful campaign against invading Muslim forces. Historian Kelly DeVries commented in his 2010 *Medieval Military Technology*, "These changes in military technology could only have been induced by the use of the stirrup by the Franks. When Charles Martel realized the true military worth of the stirrup, and he alone did so, he began to insist on its use by his soldiers."[1] Although debate may exist about who introduced the stirrup, little conjecture remains about the enormous influence it exerted upon mounted warfare.

While the stirrup and high-backed saddle afforded the heavily armored warrior increased control and capabilities, it did not defray the high cost of maintaining the panoply of armor, horses, and weapons required for heavy cavalry forces. Researcher Joshua Prawer referenced classic Templar records in his 2001 *The Crusaders' Kingdom* that listed the cost of armor and weapons as 1,500 to 2,000 silver deniers (about 8.33 pounds of silver).[2] This figure did not include the cost of multiple horses required for each knight and the special training and armor for horses. Historians such as DeVries and Judith

Bennett posited that the prohibitive cost of equipping such a force gave rise to the symbiotic relationship of feudalism between the knightly or aristocratic class and the peasantry. In the 2009 book *Men at Arms,* historian Richard Preston gave further credence to the relationship between the classes with the statement, "The core of the feudal system was a contractual relationship between lord and vassal at every rung of the ladder."[3] Feudalism provided a system of collective defense amongst manorial estates and the vassals that worked the land to sustain a knightly class that protected them. Additionally, the aristocracy and knightly class maintained a military force to support the local king or ruler of a region.

The knightly class and aristocracy rose to power in Europe after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. Although the city of Rome fell in 455 to the Vandals, the Roman Empire did not cease to exist overnight.[4] Successor states emerged and loosely organized along the boundaries of former Roman territories and tribal areas of influence. Bennett noted in her 2006 *Medieval History,* "Bound together by kinship, comitatus, and law, barbarians eventually also began to form more permanent tribal kingdoms, and... a shared ethnic past."[5] These successor states looked to the military strength of a king or tribal chieftain to protect their associated populations. This symbiotic relationship gave rise to manorialism where the peasants provided for the aristocrats and in return the aristocrats provided protection for the peasants. Bennett explained manorialism as, "In essence, manorialism linked the landed elite to the peasantry in a web of social obligations."[6] This system placed greater emphasis on agrarian products and land ownership rather than any monetary system.

In an agrarian society that possessed very little in the way of currency or disposable income, land served as the most viable commodity that held any real value. By rewarding loyal subjects with land for service, the aristocracy perpetuated a system that stressed the competition for land. Bennett commented, "The granting of estates to armed supporters was a convenient way for a lord to maintain a retinue of warriors in an age when money was scarce and land abundant."[7]

The vicious cycle that resulted from a constant quest for additional lands kept feudal society in a perpetual state of warfare. Professor Brian Carey suggested in his 2009 *Warfare in the Medieval World*, "Furthermore, this dominance [heavy cavalry versus infantry] on the battlefield was reinforced by the mounted aristocracy's preeminent position in medieval society, a position that increasingly placed the militia foot soldier as a second-class citizen, one that would be used as fodder on the battlefield."[8] While heavy cavalry enjoyed a preeminent position on the battlefield, the evolution of martial technologies began to erode the dominant position of the mounted aristocracy.

The light infantry of the eleventh to thirteenth centuries marked

one such development of improved tactics and technology with such inventions as the crossbow and longbow. The improvement in missile technology allowed light infantry forces to kill at greater distances and the ability to penetrate even the thickest armor at close ranges. The knightly class viewed missile weapons with some disdain, but the battles of Crecy and Agincourt during the Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) displayed the fallacy of heavy cavalry operating independently of accompanying infantry forces especially against opponents equipped with missile weapons. While the English used the longbow to great effect with their combined formations of heavy cavalry and light infantry, the Swiss turned to ancient infantry formations to provide the answer in countering heavy cavalry forces.

The Swiss did not possess extensive land holdings or access to heavy warhorses and the costly armor associated with heavy cavalry. Due to the rugged terrain and their limited resources, the Swiss naturally favored fighting on foot rather than the mounted combat system so prevalent throughout much of Medieval Europe. Renaissance historian and philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli commented in his *Art of War*, "From this it arises that, since they were on foot and wished to defend themselves from an enemy who was on horseback, they had to search the ancient orders again and find arms that might defend them against the fury of the horse."[9] In many aspects, the Swiss militia system mirrored the hoplite warfare of the ancient Greek militias. Each Swiss citizen underwent compulsory military training and had to provide their armor and weapons. Unlike their mounted opponents, the Swiss only wore a breastplate and steel cap for armor.[10] This offered the Swiss two distinct advantages, the reduced cost of outfitting forces and an unencumbered force that moved quicker than its heavily armored opponents did. By keeping the cost to outfit forces reduced, the Swiss ensured maximum participation from their citizenry and the lightened loads allowed Swiss soldiers to muster and march quickly to defend their territory.

The Swiss developed their system of combat in response to the encroachments of feudal neighbors. Unlike many other forces of Europe, the Swiss did not fight to gain further land to perpetuate feudalism, the Swiss initially fought to defend their homes. Preston noted, "The Swiss Confederation, formed in 1291, was an alliance of the Forest Cantons of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden, whose free peasants, directed against the feudal domination of the Austrian Habsburgs."[11] The Swiss initially used a formation similar to a Greek phalanx and armed their forces with a pole arm called a halberd. This eight foot long weapon consisted of a hardwood shaft and a tip that combined an axe, spear tip, and hook into one murderously effective weapon. The halberd allowed Swiss militiamen to pull opponents from their horse, thrust with the spear into unprotected areas, and deliver a chopping blow with the axe head. The Swiss drilled their formations to quickly transit from a marching column into a battle square as the situation dictated. The relative simplicity of the form-

ation allowed the Swiss to follow the man to their front and the first four ranks to level their halberds while the remaining ranks kept their weapons upraised to quickly fill in gaps.

This highly effective formation presented a hedgehog of halberds that quickly pierced or chopped any opponents that came within reach, regardless of which angle they attacked the Swiss. To further enhance the control over their formations, the Swiss used a drum to control the pace of formations and some historians opined that the Swiss used cadence in their formations.[12] While the Swiss enjoyed initial success in such battles as Mortgarten in 1315, the topography of the mountain passes aided their success by negating the shock value of heavy cavalry. Narrow roads, hilly terrain, and thick forests marginalized the maneuverability of heavy cavalry. Conversely, that same restrictive terrain favored the tight formations of the Swiss as they presented a steel quill equipped porcupine that the cavalry could not maneuver around. However, the Swiss did not devise a truly effective counter to heavy cavalry until the mid-fourteenth century.

By combining the defensive superiority of the Greek phalanx equipped with pikes and the offensive capability of Roman infantry tactics, the Swiss developed a well-articulated heavy infantry formation that proved the nemesis of heavy cavalry formations of the era. Preston opined, "But, like the Romans, the Swiss were not content with mere defensive passivity: they thought in terms of attack, and shaped their tactics to suit the offensive."[13] To that end, the Swiss employed pike men equipped with pikes approximately eighteen feet in length at the fore of their formations and in the center a core of halberds that rushed out from the squares to quickly dispatch any opponents skewered at the end of the longer pikes. This formation allowed the Swiss to keep the cavalry at a fixed distance with their pikes while the halberds acted as the maneuver force to close on the cavalry. The Swiss also incorporated missile troops as skirmishers to help screen enemy forces and to protect their flanks and rear once the battle began.[14]

The Swiss tactical system began to dominate the battlefield by the late fourteenth century and by the mid fifteenth century; the Swiss enjoyed a reputation of near invincibility. During this period the Swiss militia or troops consisted of three categories as referenced by Carey, "the *Auszug* or elite forces, composed of mostly unmarried men between the ages of eighteen and thirty; the *Landwehr*, or primary combat force, composed of men willing and able to leave home if the need arose; and the *Landstrum*, or levée en masse of all able bodied men, a reserve force called to arms only in an emergency."[15] Perhaps no other campaign heightened the prestige of Swiss forces than their successful defense against the duke of Burgundy, Charles the Bold (1433-1477) during the Burgundian wars from 1476-1477. Charles developed a combined army of approximately 30,000 men that consisted of heavy cavalry, heavy infantry, light infantry

archers, handgunners and crossbowmen, and several pieces of artillery.[16] By all contemporary accounts, Charles' forces comprised the cutting edge of available military technologies.

Despite the modernity of Charles' forces, the Burgundians suffered three successive losses that culminated with the death of Charles at the Battle of Nancy in 1477. In each of the three battles that Charles faced the Swiss, he failed to disrupt the Swiss formations and account for their inherent knowledge of the landscape of their homeland. Just as the ancient Greek hoplites quickly mustered to defend their *polis* (city-state) from invaders, the Swiss also fought to defend their homelands against an existential threat. Charles did not face an army determined to fight a fixed piece battle that allowed Charles to dictate the terms of the battle, but an army determined to win at any cost. Charles incurred the wrath of the Swiss when he invaded Swiss territory and executed the garrison defenders in the city of Grandson in 1476.[17] Charles incorrectly assumed that his modern army and their superior technology provided a perfect counter to the Swiss heavy infantry formations and that his forces would easily defeat the Swiss.

In the span of a year, the Swiss disproved Charles' assumption. The relatively slow rate of fire of period artillery and Charles' inability to fix or keep the Swiss units within his fields of fire prevented Charles from significantly depleting Swiss forces before they closed upon his ranks and employed their devastating pole arms. Charles over reliance on missile weapons and lack of an effective counter to the Swiss pikes greatly increased the chances of Swiss victory any time the Swiss approached within close combat range of the Burgundian forces. One can imagine the difficulty associated with trying to defeat an opponent equipped with a pole arm some eight to eighteen feet long while only using a sword some three feet or less in length. This disparity coupled with the Swiss penchant for killing any opponent encountered on the battlefield and refusal to offer quarter, added to the growing Swiss reputation of murderous effectiveness. Carey commented, "The result of this deliberate psychological warfare was a reputation that struck terror into their enemies, adding to the mystique of this emerging tactical system."[18] The Swiss notoriety grew not from idle boasts, but from repeated success and ruthless efficiency on the battlefield.

The Swiss reputation for ferocity and discipline did not result from one battle but developed over a period of two hundred years. Even in defeat, the Swiss projected a fearsome reputation that did not waver, despite the overwhelming odds that the Swiss sometimes faced. In a battle reminiscent of the Spartan stand at Thermopylae, 1,500 Swiss pike men faced a French host of over 20,000 men at the Battle of Saint Jacob-en-Birs in 1444.[19] The Swiss, nonplussed by a foe with superior numbers attacked the French, but after five hours of withering crossbow fire and withstanding cavalry charges withdrew to the hospital of Saint Jacob where they continued to resist, but they

eventually died to the man.[20] The Swiss sought no quarter from the French and impressed their attackers with their bitter resolve.

The Swiss enjoyed such notoriety that other countries sought to hire groups of Swiss soldiers as mercenaries. Historian McKean Page recalled that Pope Julius the II hired a company of Swiss soldiers in 1506.[21] The Swiss soon proved their worth as Papal guards during the sack of Rome in 1527. The Vatican Archives recorded the valiant stand of some one hundred and eighty-two Swiss guards that fought a Spanish force that severely outnumbered the Swiss defenders, with only forty two Swiss guards that survived to guide Pope Clement VII to safety at Castel Sant'Angelo.[22] The Swiss Papal Guard continues their service to the Pope today and still wears their traditional uniforms and armaments of the sixteenth century. Other countries such as Germany, France and Spain incorporated Swiss mercenaries into their ranks and adapted the Swiss method of warfare. Machiavelli observed that other European contemporary armies "imitate the Swiss."[23] The Swiss method of heavy infantry-centric warfare exerted a profound influence during the Late Medieval period and Early Renaissance.

While the Renaissance witnessed the birth of humanism and the veneration of ancient writings and civilizations, it also marked the simultaneous decline of feudalism and the dominance of mounted knight. The knowledge of the ancients inspired philosophers such as Petrarch and Mirandola to address the capabilities of man and self-determination, but the Swiss applied the lessons of the ancients to successfully defend their territory. The Swiss did not seek a higher truth but a utilitarian answer that countered the effectiveness of heavy cavalry. What began as a dire need evolved into a highly effective system of combat that used heavy infantry tactics of the ancient Roman and Greek armies to reshape the battlefields of the Late Medieval period and the Early Renaissance. The Swiss method of war effectively ended the monopoly of heavy cavalry and used heavy infantry formations and tactics borrowed from the ancients as the instruments of change. The discipline and the ferocity of the Swiss pike wielding formations often overcame better equipped opponents and cemented the Swiss tactical system as the dominant method of combat for the era.

Notes

1 Kelly DeVries, *Medieval Military Technology* (Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2010), 101.

2 Joshua Prawer, *The Crusaders' Kingdom: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (London, UK: Phoenix Press, 2001), 338.

3 Richard Preston and others, *Men in Arms: A History of Warfare and its Interrelationships with Western Society*, 5th ed. (Mason, OH: Cengage Learning, 2005), 59.

4 John Warry, *Warfare in the Classical World: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Weapons, Warriors and Warfare in the Ancient Civilisations of Greece and Rome* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 209.

5 Judith M. Bennett, Medieval Europe: A Short History. 11th ed. (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 2011), 23.

6 Ibid., 87.

[7] Ibid., 118.

[8] Brian Carey, Warfare in the Medieval World (Barnsley, UK: Pen & Sword Military, 2006), 84.

[9] Niccolò Machiavelli, The Art of War, ed. and trans. by Christopher Lynch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 35.

[10] Preston, Men in Arms, 81.

[11] Ibid., 80.

[12] Carey, Warfare in the Medieval World, 179.

[13] Preston, Men in Arms, 81.

[14] Carey, Warfare in the Medieval World, 180.

[15] Douglas Miller and G. A. Embleton, The Swiss at War, 1300-1500 (Oxford: Osprey, 1979), 3-4, quoted in Brian Carey, Warfare in the Medieval World (Barnsley, UK: Pen & Sword Military, 2006), 180.

[16] Carey, Warfare in the Medieval World, 193.

[17] Ibid., 195.

[18] Ibid., 184.

[19] Ibid., 192.

[20] Ibid.

[21] McKean Zyromski Page, "The Swiss Guard," Catechist 40, no. 3 (2006): 47, http://search.proquest.com/docview/213795740?accountid=8289.

[22] "Swiss Guard- History," Roman Curia, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/swiss_guard/swissguard/storia_en.htm (accessed April 10, 2013).

[23] Machiavelli, Art of War, 74.

Bibliography

Bennett, Judith M. *Medieval Europe: A Short History.* 11th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 2011.

Carey, Brian Todd. *Warfare in the Medieval World.* Barnsley, UK: Pen and Sword Military, 2009.

Devries, Kelly. *Medieval Military Technology.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Art of War.* Edited by Christopher Lynch. Translated by Christopher Lynch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Miller, Douglas and G. A. Embleton. *The Swiss at War, 1300-1500.* Oxford: Osprey, 1979.

Page, McKean Zyromski. "The Swiss Guard." *Catechist* 40, no. 3 (2006): 47-47. http://search.proquest.com/docview/213795740?accountid=8289.

Prawer, Joshua. *The Crusaders' Kingdom: European Colonialism in the Middle Ages.* London: Phoenix Press, 2001.

Preston Richard, Alex Roland, and Sydney F. Wise. *Men in Arms: A History of Warfare and its Inter- relationships with Western Society.* 5th ed. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning, 2009.

"Swiss Guard- History." *Roman Curia.* http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/swiss_guard/swissguard/storia_en.htm (accesssed April 10, 2013).

Warry, John. *Warfare in the Classical World: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of Weapons, Warriors and Warfare in the Ancient Civilisations of Greece and Rome.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.

Guy is currently working on his thesis for an MA in Ancient and Classical History. In 2011, APUS selected Guy as the outstanding undergraduate for the school of Arts and Humanities and nominated him for the 2012 Who's Who among students in American

universities and colleges. Guy is an Army Ranger veteran of twenty-two years and works for the Army Research Laboratory as a Deputy Program Manager. Guy enjoys hiking and reading/writing about the ancients.

The Legacy of J. B. Bury, 'Progressive' Historian of Ancient Greece

Benjamin Sorensen

J. B. Bury was an amazing personality among Greek historians. He held many prestigious positions, and was the Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge when the book *The Ancient Greek Historians* was compiled from his Lane Lectures at Harvard. H. D. F Kitto referred to him as "a determined rationalist,"[1] and the Lane Lectures on ancient Greek historiography proves this point well. Very few historians have such a grasp on the nuances of Greek, or are so well-read. Very few English writers, historians or otherwise, have such a grasp of the English language as to write as captivatingly as Bury. Because of this, *The Ancient Greek Historians* proves itself to be a wonderful, insightful, and lucrative read for any person, academic or amateur, interested in the progress of Greek historiography.

The book consists of eight lectures, and because of this original format it seems that much of his information is truncated. On the other hand, the Greek is well-translated; this is an aspect of this book which is very different from Bury's other works as he has a tendency to assume that the reader is already fluent in Greek. However, because the work was originally spoken, the truncation of his points and assertions is completely understandable, and it must be said that the points he makes are nonetheless insightful, and due to the opulent footnotes, perhaps fuller than when originally presented at Harvard.

Bury, at the very beginning of his work, states, "As a Hellenist, I shall be happy if I succeed in illustrating the fact that, as in poetry and letters generally, as in art, as in philosophy, and in mathematics, so too in history, our debt to the Greeks transcends calculation." [2] The statement, he then goes on to validate from the time of the ancient Greeks, through the Romans, and to our present day. He also does his best to prove that the Greeks "were not the first to chronicle human events, but they were the first to apply criticism. And that means, they originated history."[3] Therefore, according to Bury, the study of Greek historiography is not confined in importance to only the realm of Greek historians, but rather defines the purpose and correct philosophy of history in general.

He first turns to the epic poems as historical sources. He cites that the Iliad was a "valid witness" to quarrels over land. The dearth of real history available to the ancient Greeks, Bury point out, is startling when one considers their political maturity, but the Greek identity was adequately defined in the Homeric epics. The epics, he points out, were held to such esteem that Peisistratus, the Athenian

tyrant who held power in the early sixth century before Christ, had an assembly of learned men to edit the poems; Bury asserts that if he had been of any Oriental race, he would have had "his literary friends to celebrate his own career. . . ." [4] This point may be very true: he validates this by citing Assur-bani-pal's commissioned records from Assyria in the seventh century before Christ, and that there are many inscriptions of a historical nature in Egypt and Assyria documenting contemporary deeds. However, not only does he point out that the Greeks were not subject to the desire to "secure posthumous fame,"[5] but also implies that, by virtue of his opening statements, that those inscriptions are not history as they lack criticism. In this, though a questionable assertion, he does not necessarily imply disparagement. A panegyric according to Bury would obviously not qualify as history per se due to a lack of criticism (one is left wondering, then, if Procopius' panegyric to Justinian *On Buildings* would also not be considered *history* according to Bury. G. Downey, using Bury as his basis for his own work, refers to it as a "treatise" and not a "history").[6]

He critiques, and often praises, other historians works on ancient Greece, and is very clear in citing what he agrees with and showing which points he believes are not correct. For example, he cites Gilbert Murray's lectures and agrees with his understanding of the Homeric epics as historical in the ways that they were developed in successive stages and reflected the styles of different periods.[7] He then breaks with Murray and proves that they were also historical in that the epics left many questions unanswered for later poets. Therefore, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* sparked the desire in the Greek heart for more answers about the outcome of the war and the fates of the heroes.[8] He believes that Hesiod's desire to write the genealogic poetry stemmed from this desire, and owes its impetus for creation to Homer.

From here, Bury cites Hecataeus as building the foundations of history by being the first to assess critically the truth in accounts of geographies, genealogies, and past events. Bury points out that Hecataeus, though not writing histories, did try to assess the truth in his topics of geography and genealogy as a Homeric ιστορ[9] did in legal disputes. Here Bury implies not only the beginnings of the historical inquiry, but also shows that the term ιστορια may have been coined in this sense before Herodotus fleshed out the procedure for historical inquiry. He then turns to other writers, such as Scylax, Antiochus, and Hellanicus. To these writers, he attributes the true beginnings of history, though points out that the fragments are not enough to judge their contributions to historical literature in any true fairness. Bury does his part to ensure that their contributions are not unnoticed.

To Herodotus, his choice of words is telling: "Today, we come to a work which time has not been *allowed* to destroy [emphasis added]."[10] He implies, though it may not be readily noticeable in that

sentence, that the work was of such quality that it was protected throughout the ages. He believes that the bulk of Herodotus' history was written in Greece, but that the travels that contributed so greatly to the work, to Egypt and Babylonia, occurred later in his life while he lived in Thurii. Bury also contends that the years "between his banishment from his native city and his departure for his new home seem to have been spent in Greece, perhaps chiefly at Athens, and to have been devoted. . . to investigating and composing the story of the invasion of Xerxes."[11] He even finds himself convinced that the last three books were composed before the first six in *The Histories*,[12] though also is careful to point out that dividing the work into nine books was a later development and not Herodotus' invention.

In the case of the ever-disputed digressions in *The Histories*, Bury is quick to point out that Herodotus' first obligation was to the reader or listener. He is ready to point out that the geographical deviations from the historical story were Hecataean in flavor and point to Herodotus' being influenced by that predecessor. The speeches and ethnographic diversions hearken back to Homer, and are proof that Herodotus was trying to write an epic in prose, much in the same way that Homer had done in poetry. They keep the attention of the reader or listener, and do not fatigue the audience by over-expounding his storyline. Rather, Bury attests, they break up the story and "achieve epic variety."[13]

He turns to the speeches to show another epic quality to Herodotus' writing. As Bury is quick to point out, these speeches show the Ionian epic's influence, and not that of the Athenian drama. However, because of this, Bury suggests that Herodotus was the first to see the possibility of a Homeric history rather than that of a Hesiodic styled history. He also contends that Herodotus may be shown to have more of Hecataeus' influence in these speeches, for though unfortunately he does not give us the example, he does say that "I may note that in one case at least he [Hecataeus] put words into the mouth of an actor."[14]

He does make a very interesting case for Herodotus' being the first historian to encompass the history of civilization and to write a universal history. His work, Bury points out, is not encompassing in space or time, as his writing consists of a relatively short period in a relatively localized area. However, he does present a wide view of the Greeks (though not all) and the surrounding cultures who have directly or indirectly affected Greek civilization.[15] His work is universal in scope as it does have a certain quality of *Weltgeschichte*,[16] which Bury points out is evident by the fitting the narrative to the histories of the many civilizations in relation to one another, showing a "common history of man."[17] As Bury says, "Herodotus is irreproachably comprehensive;

and his book, though he never formulates the idea, is a lesson in the unity of history."[18] He nevertheless does not spare Herodotus from the obvious criticisms of relying on theology or his incompetence in understanding military tactics. Still, Bury, so influenced by Leopold von Ranke, praises Herodotus' ability to be critical in historical endeavors, and states that Herodotus' techniques still "lie at the basis of the modern developments of what is called historical methodology."[19]

In his dealings with Thucydides, Bury writes more of a panegyric than a critique. He speaks glowingly of his ability to rely on logic as his guide in historical judgment. He defends Thucydides from all contemporary and modern criticism, and uses his language abilities in Greek even more so than with Herodotus. He is so smitten with Thucydides that he dedicates two lectures to the historian, though Herodotus' work was in many ways just as important as Thucydides.

To speak of Thucydides' competence as an historian, Bury finds that he has to discern between *αιτια* and *προφασις* in defending the alleged causes of the Peloponnesian War. *Προφασις,* or "pretext," Bury argues is used as "cause." *Αιτια,* however, is used as "blame" or "charge." While the concept of causality is more fluid in Greek than in English, just as the verb "to know" is more differentiated in Slovak than in English,[20] this Bury uses in defense of Thucydides adroitly, showing that "reason" in English[20] is just as elastic a word as Thucydides' use of *προφασις* as "cause."[21] Also, Bury cautions, Thucydides had two distinct understandings of why: why the war started at all, and why it started *when* it did.[22] With this, Bury finds Thucydides' understanding of the war quite sufficient and "adequate."[23]

In dealing with a topic that was obviously close to Bury's heart, he documents an often-neglected aspect of Thucydides' work, his dealing of non-contemporary history. Here Bury continues his panegyric, and shows the methods of Thucydides to be "modern."[24] Thucydides accepted much of Homer and the legends of Minos, Pelops, and Agamemnon, as well as fact that the Trojan War actually took place. Bury defends this by stating that ". . .we have come to know within the last thirty years more than Thucydides could discover."[25] He goes on to show that Thucydides was able to create a masterfully ordered history from the legends and traditions, and took the time to create "a reasoned march of development, furnishing the proofs of his conclusions."[26]

As far as the disparities of styles in Thucydides are concerned, Bury reminds us that this is not fickleness; he asserts that the sometimes odd variations in the Greek are deliberate. "Such caprice would not be artistic, and it would not be Greek."[27] He asserts that the points of convoluted Greek are points where Thucydides is "making points of his own."[28] This possibility has been given credence by other scholars, namely H. Rackham at Christ's College in Cambridge, UK.[29] One can only wish, though, that Bury were more critical of Thucydides' shortcomings; then there may be some semblance of fair-

ness in relation to Herodotus' work. He states, "The work of Thucydides has limitations which we must beware of underrating; but it marks the longest and most decisive step that has ever been taken by a single man towards making history what it is today."[30] While it is true that critical history "*wie es eigentlich gewesen*"[31] began with Thucydides, one may also argue that Herodotus' looking at the past as a reason why the present is the way it is, and to search for causality for events beyond the realms of Tyche and the Gods, was a much larger step.

Bury then concentrates on those historians that were after Thucydides, and gives each perfunctory coverage; yet, he is always careful to prove that they were influenced by the earlier historians. Polybius, as expected, gets the most attention as he is most obviously influenced by Thucydides. He admires the fact that Polybius "was not taken in by 'authority. . . .'"[32] His take on Polybius' understanding of the difference between "$\alpha\iota\tau\iota\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$"[33] hearkens back to his defense on Thucydides, and his comment on Polybius' belief in Fortune (or, in Greek, $\tau\upsilon\chi\eta$ or Tyche) is incongruent in his defense of Thucydides' use of Tyche as "chance."[34]

In conclusion, however, Bury does modern history well in achieving his desire to show that the Greeks helped give history its places in academia and literature. Bury can be forgiven his need to identify history as a "science"[35] in the strictest sense as was in vogue at the time. He shows that it was the ancient Greek historians that gave us the concept of progress in modern history, and his book, though sometimes flawed in its favoritisms, would do every historian well to have in his library.

Notes

[1] H. D. F. Kitto, *The Greeks* (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 91.

[2] J. B. Bury, *The Ancient Greek Historians (*New York: Dover Publications, 1958), 1.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 3.

[5] Ibid.

[6] G. Downey, "The Composition of Procopius, De Aedificiis," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 171-183.

[7] Ibid., 4.

[8] Ibid., 4-5.

[9] Pronounced "histor," this is a person who discerns the truth from arguments and facts in mediating arguments in Homer's works.

[10] Ibid., 36.

[11] Ibid., 37.

[12] Ibid., 39.

[13] Ibid., 42.

[14] Ibid., 43. However, rather than expounding on his assertion, he uses the footnote to dispel earlier assertions by Marcellinus.

[15] Ibid., 45.

[16] Ibid. This is German for "World History," a term that was not at all in much use in English during Bury's life, especially apparent due to the fact that he gives the term in German. It is interesting that Bury foreshadows the academic movement towards "World History" by citing the *first* historian.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., 71.

[20] "Poznať" means "to know, to be familiar with," and "vedieť" means "to know intellectually." I state this to show that concepts can be often more fluid or differentiated in other languages than in English.

[21] Ibid., 93.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., 102.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid., 103.

[27] Ibid., 112.

[28] Ibid., 112-113.

[29] H. Rackham, review of *The Ancient Greek Historians*, by J. B. Bury, *The Classical Review* 23, no. 7 (November 1909): 226-227.

[30] Bury, 147.

[31] Often attributed to Leopold von Ranke, this term was shown to be, ironically, a paraphrase of Thucydides. See Konrad Repgen, "Über Rankes Diktum von 1824," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 102 (1982): 439-49.

[32] Ibid., 197.

[33] Causes and beginnings.

[34] Ibid., 125.

[35] Ibid., 259.

Bibliography

Bury, J. B. *The Ancient Greek Historians.* New York: Dover Publications, 1958.

Downey, G. "The Composition of Procopius, De Aedificiis." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 78 (1947): 171-183.

Kitto, H. D. F. *The Greeks.* London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Repgen, Konrad. "Über Rankes Diktum von 1824." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 102 (1982): 439-49.

Benjamin Sorensen has a good history of teaching; he once held the position of Area Coordinator at the Akademia Vzdelavania (Academy of Education) in Poprad, Slovakia. He was also an ESL instructor there with a very good record of preparing students to pass the British Council's First Certificate Exam and Advanced Certificate Exam in English. He also taught English to business owners and professionals all over the country. Upon his moving back to the United States, he entered corporate America in the cell phone industry; however, his heart was always in teaching.

He entered the MA in History program at American Public University to honor his favorite professor Dr. Walter Hanak, leaving the cell phone industry right before he began his thesis. Graduating with honors, Benjamin began teaching in North Carolina's community college system. Teaching ESL and Western Civilization at two local community colleges, Benjamin also gives lecture series through Brunswick Community College on various aspects of local history. He is also employed as an online adjunct faculty at Ashford University. Currently enrolled in the American Revolution Studies graduate certificate program at APU, Benjamin plans to further his studies by earning a PhD. His real strength in history, is in the Byzantine Empire, with strong focuses on the reign of Justinian and the missions of the Saints Constantine Cyril and Methodius. Benjamin currently serves as an editor for the Saber and Scroll Journal.

Outside of his academic career, Benjamin is very active. President of the Cape Fear Revolutionary War Round Table, he is also an active Freemason, belonging to the oldest lodge in North Carolina, St. John's No. 1. An officer in the lodge and the lodge historian, as well as the historian for the Scottish Rite Valley of Wilmington, he is fluent in English, Slovak, and Czech, and proficient at reading several others. Musically talented, Ben sings and plays several instruments including the largest gothic Slovak flute, the fujara. Ben has a lovely wife and two children, all of whom are Slovak nationals, with his children being dual citizens.

ROY E. APPLEMAN. *East of Chosin: Entrapment and Breakout in Korea, 1950.* College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1987.

It is evident from the opening lines of the preface to military historian Roy E. Appleman's *East of Chosin: Entrapment and Breakout in Korea, 1950* that a number of recent press releases from the Department of Defense POW/Missing Personnel Office would have been welcome news to him. Appleman wrote his extraordinary book in part to preserve the memory of the Army men who fell to the east of the Chosin Reservoir during one of the most horrific battles of the Korean War. Appleman notes that these men "have not white-marble markers at their final resting places as do thousands of others memorialized in Arlington National Cemetery."[1] He would certainly have appreciated the exertions made by the Department of Defense to bring their mortal remains home. Due to the efforts of a joint U.S. and Democratic People's Republic of Korea team in September and October 2001 to excavate a mass grave on the eastern shore of the Chosin Reservoir, at least one of those left behind during the dreadful breakout attempt of early December 1950 was buried at Arlington National Cemetery in August 2012. How that young man, Army Corporal Kenneth R. Block, and his comrades came to be at the inhospitable Chosin Reservoir and the utter failure of U.S. Army and Marine communication, command and control to bring him and almost one thousand other young men back home to their families alive is the story that Appleman sought to recreate.[2]

Appleman, who served with the U.S. Tenth Army in Okinawa, Japan as a combat historian and captain, was later promoted to lieutenant colonel with the X Corps in Korea.[3] He was "ordered from reserve status to active duty with the Army and sent to Korea as a combat historian for the purpose of studying the action there and preparing the Army's history of the Korean War."[4] Based upon his experience with the X Corps in Korea and his training as a historian, Appleman was eminently qualified to write the story of the Army's tragedy at Chosin. Appleman painstakingly reconstructed the story of the men from the U.S. Army's 7th Infantry Division who had been quickly assembled into a near regimental-size task force and sent north to the frigid Chosin Reservoir area in late November 1950 to protect the east flank of a Marine force that had been directed to the area as part of General Douglas MacArthur's strategy to push the Communist forces north of the Yalu River and out of Korea.[5]

Appleman's initial research into the Chosin campaign found near-complete records of the Marines' experience in the area, but virtually nothing, other than short reports prepared by several of the surviving officers; Major Robert E. Jones, Major William R. Lynch, Jr., and Captain Robert E. Drake to document the fate of the Army's task force. Appleman quickly realized that the only way to compile and

preserve the memory of the Army task force's brutal experience at Chosin was to seek out the survivors. Appleman's own previous experience as the Army's combat historian for the Korean War undoubtedly allowed him greater access to the survivors and the ability to form a unique bond with them as he sought to piece together their written records and notes; compare, contrast and weigh the evidence from their recollections, and match divergent accounts to determine the most accurate representation of the actual events that led to "one of the worst disaster for American soldiers in the Korean War."[6]

Appleman labored seven years to bring *East of Chosin* to life; his work not only includes a searing narrative of the disaster at Chosin but also contains maps he created to portray troop positions and movements as well as detailed weather conditions and area topography descriptions that are essential for the reader to appreciate the enormity of the challenges faced by the Army's task force. The task force, initially known as the 31st regimental combat team (RCT), was comprised of Army 7th Division units, including infantry and artillery elements. The task force was originally led by Colonel Allen D. MacLean. Upon MacLean's capture by enemy forces on November 29, 1950 the team was subsequently led by Lieutenant Colonel Don C. Faith.[7] The fate that befell the RCT, upon the loss of MacLean known as Task Force Faith, is difficult to comprehend; poor planning, deplorable communications, extreme weather, the lack of critical supplies, the loss of key leaders and an unrelenting, merciless enemy combined to cause the death of as many as one third of the task force. However, it is as Appleman describes, the inability of the Army command to understand and appreciate the threat posed by the Chinese Communist Forces (CCF), which essentially sealed the fate of the task force.[8]

Appleman's *East of Chosin* is military history with a purpose; it is not meant to document the social or cultural background of the men who fought the campaign but to analyze the causes and effects of particular command choices. Appleman clearly hopes that by providing extensive analysis into the debacle, the circumstances surrounding the destruction of Task Force Faith can be avoided in the future.

East of Chosin is difficult to read on many levels; the detail provided can be overwhelming to many readers and the horrifying experiences faced by Task Force Faith during their attempted breakout from positions held east of the reservoir to join the Marines at nearby Hagaru-ri sear the reader's thoughts with unforgettable images. Appleman documents courage and valor as well as cowardice and betrayal. Primarily, however, he indicts senior level commanders for their command failures, poor decision making and lack of effective leadership. He nevertheless provides well-deserved credit to many who sacrificed all they had to provide a future for their comrades in arms. This is a book meant to educate a specific audience. It is primarily directed to those who can learn from its lessons, and taking

heed of them, prevent a repeat of the tragedy at Chosin.

<div align="right">ANNE MIDGLEY</div>

Notes
    [1] Roy E. Appleman, *East of Chosin: Entrapment and Breakout in Korea*, 1950 (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1987), xi.
    [2] "Soldier Missing from Korean War Identified." *Targeted News Service*, Aug 24, 2012. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1037554319?accountid=8289 (accessed February 19, 2013).
    [3] George Davidson, "Roy E. Appleman 1904-1992" *National Park Service: The First 75 Years: Biographical Vignette*, http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/sontag/ appleman.htm (accessed February 20, 2013).
    [4] Roy E. Appleman, *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Military History United States Army, 1992), viii. http://www.history.army.mil/ books/korea/20-2-1/toc.htm (accessed February 20, 2013).
    [5] Appleman, *East of Chosin*, xi-xii, 7.
    [6] Ibid., 305.
    [7] Ibid., 10, 145-152.
    [8] Ibid., xiii, 303, 305.

Bibliography
Appleman, Roy E. *East of Chosin: Entrapment and Breakout in Korea, 1950.* College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1987.

_____. *South to the Naktong, North to the Yalu.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Military History United States Army, 1992. http://www.history.army.mil/books/korea/20-2-1/toc.htm (accessed February 20, 2013).

George Davidson, "Roy E. Appleman 1904-1992" *National Park Service: The First 75 Years: Biographical Vignette.* http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/ sontag/appleman.htm (accessed February 20, 2013).

"Soldier Missing from Korean War Identified." *Targeted News Service*, Aug 24, 2012. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1037554319?accountid=8289 (accessed February 19, 2013).

ANDREW J. BACEVICH. *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books. 2008. x + 206 pp.

In *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism*, Andrew Bacevich outlines what he sees as the major problems confronting American exceptionalism, or the idea that America is fundamentally different from other countries by virtue of its origins and unique role in geopolitics. These problems have manifested themselves in three distinct areas: the economy, the government, and the military, the combination of which presents America with a "triple crisis" which threatens the very existence of the United States. Bacevich paints America as a self-righteous bully who does little more than pay lip service to true values such as liberty and freedom in the implementation of its foreign policy. Over time, the United States (especially in the decades during and since the Cold War, and particularly in the proliferation of "small wars" such as those that have been and are currently being fought in Iraq and Afghanistan) has twisted and perverted these concepts to serve what is for all intents and purposes an American Empire. From its very early stages,

the United States always had a mission "not to liberate but to expand… [and has achieved this expansion] by any means necessary… [including] diplomacy, hard bargaining, bluster, chicanery, intimidation, or naked coercion." (pp. 20) Bacevich's image of the United States as this type of wily, impudent aggressor is in sharp historical contrast to such visions of Americans as "God's new Chosen People, [erecting America as a "city upon a hill"] destined to illuminate the world." (pp. 20) Bacevich often cites Christian theologian and social-political commentator Reinhold Niebuhr, whom he refers to as "our prophet," (pp. 182) and who is remembered for positing the idea that "the most significant moral characteristic of a nation is its hypocrisy." (pp. 42) Bacevich sees the United States fitting this Niebuhrian mold perfectly, and it is in this pessimistic vein that Bacevich addresses what he sees as America's current existential dilemma.

Bacevich suggests that at the very core of the "triple crisis" facing the United States is an even bigger crisis of profligacy, or wasteful spending that has pervaded American society and manifested itself in many insidious forms for generations. Though America professes to be beholden to the ideas of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," (pp. 15) Bacevich asserts that what really lies at the core of American ideology can be summed up in one word: more. For the vast majority of Americans, these ideals are rarely sought after in such noble or grandiose terms; rather, Americans mostly find themselves living by such mottos as "Whoever dies with the most toys wins" and "If it feels good, do it." (pp. 16) Bacevich believes this obsession with material excess has affected American foreign policy in many ways, chiefly by making the United States grossly dependent on other nations for consumer products such as oil. By virtue of this intolerable dependence, Americans are "no longer masters of their own fate." (pp. 17) This crisis of profligacy has plagued America at least since the French observer Alexis de Tocqueville toured the nation in the 1830s and noted the "feverish ardor" (pp. 17) with which Americans strive to accumulate things. American profligacy came to infect the foreign policy of the United States, who had from its founding been devoted to expansion, and whose founding fathers "viewed stasis as tantamount to suicide." (pp. 20) Far from the glorious vision of America as a beneficent liberator of oppressed peoples or "[the uplifter] of little brown brother" (pp. 20), Bacevich portrays America as bent on expansion by any means necessary, who merely uses paeans or allusions to America's "manifest destiny" to justify actions around the world that otherwise would appear to be reproachable. American expansionism has historically worked out generally very well for the American people until (roughly) the "tipping point" (pp. 29) that occurred from around 1965 (when President Johnson ordered U.S. troops to South Vietnam) through 1973 (when President Nixon ended direct U.S. involvement in Vietnam). America had been experiencing a significant, protracted economic downturn since the end of WWII, which was exacerbated during this "tipping

point," whereby Americans saw themselves becoming increasingly dependent on foreign oil. Bacevich cites another specific "tipping point" which solidified Americans' staunch desire to hold fast to the tenets of material excess: This was the response to Jimmy Carter's "cross-of-malaise" (pp. 35) speech, in which Carter called upon the American people to live within their means and replace materialism and greed with frugality. Americans did not respond well to Carter's speech; on the contrary, Carter sealed his political fate by delivering this oration. Americans, as always, were not interested in frugality and thrift. They were not looking to change from within; rather, they were looking for further justification for greed and abundance that had always gone hand in hand with American exceptionalism and "manifest destiny." They found what they were looking for when Ronald Reagan took to the throne in the White House.

Bacevich describes Reagan, along with all subsequent Presidents to a certain extent, as a great placater of the American people, and above all else as an enabler of American profligacy. Whereas Carter encouraged Americans to be frugal, Reagan encouraged unquenchable greed and always assured Americans that they could have more. His successors summarily followed in his footsteps: Take for example George H.W. Bush who affirmed to the American people in 1992 that "The American way of life is not negotiable." (pp. 53) One unfortunate, major consequence of this "non-negotiable" mentality has been the tendency of the United States, a nation supposedly opposed to starting fights with other nations, to use its military to do exactly this and to perpetuate the problem of profligacy which has grown in the last several decades from a small nuisance to a potentially nation-ending problem. Bacevich details the exploits of the U.S. military since the end of the Vietnam War, asserting that in virtually every conflict the American people have been misled by politicians who at the very least are severely misguided and at the very worst are overtly corrupt. While America has supposedly gone around the world as a great liberator bringing freedom to the oppressed and downtrodden, Bacevich says this has all been a façade. He believes it has been the tendency of the U.S. to engage in "gratuitous air war and... preposterously frivolous legislation," (pp. 57) particularly in the years since the events of 9/11/01 in what has become the Global War on Terror. After 9/11, it has become the policy of the United States to engage itself in multiple wars on many different fronts concurrently, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan, predominantly in the name of rooting out terrorists and (to a lesser extent) bringing the fruits of liberty and freedom to the people of these nations. More hot air, says Bacevich. What has actually happened is that America has vastly overextended itself militarily and financially in the attempt to fight what has become an almost holy war against terrorism. This has led to what Bacevich describes as a gap between the perception of what the American military is capable of and what it actually can accomplish. According to Bacevich this gap is very wide, and we had better come

to realize this before it is too late. The Bush Doctrine, which is large-ly based on the concept of preventive war, could ultimately lead to a condition which Bacevich describes as "war without end," (pp. 119) which has actually been discussed at the very highest levels of na-tional defense amongst the "Wise Men... from Forrestal through Nitze to Wolfowitz." (pp. 119). These men actually contemplate the possi-bilities of generational (even multi-generational) warfare that would make Vietnam look like a minor military exercise.

Bacevich paints a bleak picture for the future of the United States; he offers possible solutions to the problem of American profligacy which has caused the "triple crisis" that he sees as potentially re-sponsible for America's downfall, but he mentions these solutions almost as a passing thought, or maybe more fittingly as an alterna-tive in a parallel universe. For example, he talks about the possibility of bringing back the draft and then immediately shoots the idea down, saying that it would never happen in America for many rea-sons, the most obvious being its economic unfeasibility and the fact that, due to the current social climate in the U.S., the draft would be totally unenforceable. Bacevich also suggests America should aban-don the Bush Doctrine and the concepts of "preventive war" and "war without end," but he also points to the obvious indicators that this is very unlikely to happen. Bacevich even suggests that nuclear dis-armament become a national priority, but points to the failure of Presidential administrations dating back to Truman to make any seri-ous progress along these lines. Bacevich ultimately concludes by pointing once again to "our prophet" Niebuhr: "To the end of history, social orders will probably destroy themselves in the effort to prove that they are indestructible." (pp. 182) This is a very bitter pill to swallow for the average American, but one cannot help to acknowledge the flaws that Bacevich points out. The Limits of Power opens with a quote from the Bible: "Set thine house in order." (2 Kings 20:1) This was supposedly God pointing out the mortality of Hezekiah and giving him some solemn advice before he died. Similar-ly with this book, Bacevich shows us that America is also mortal, and had better take care of its affairs before it too dies. In this fashion, he appears as a sober (if somewhat apocryphal and apocalyptic) voice in the current sea of current historical commentary. This book is a scathing exposé of America's most powerful institutions: It calls into question their methods and motivations in an urgent, forthright manner that will appear refreshing to some, while to others it may be difficult to read.

<div align="right">GREG BALLIET</div>

KELLY DEVRIES. Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Dis-cipline, Tactics, and Technology. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1996. 216 pages.

In his book Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology, Kelly DeVries contends that his analysis and findings differ from most historians of medieval warfare, as he asserts that infantry alone could and did win battles. Through the use of primary and secondary sources, a narrative of fourteen battles, interwoven with contemporary descriptions, is produced which provides a detailed account of the chosen battles that were fought in the first half of the fourteenth century. Each chapter covers one battle and provides, where known, some background on the fight, topography of the battlefield, opposing commanders, and, composition of the opposing armies. Also covered in each chapter is an analysis of the causes of victory and defeat. Additionally the book also contains an appendix titled "Ambushes." (pp. 188) "Ambushes" details three fights where the victorious army initially used surprise when initiating battle. All of the battles covered in the appendix occurred in the same early fourteenth century time period. The book ends with a chapter titled "Conclusion" that summarizes the authors initial thesis and reinforces the conclusions he reached by the end of his study. *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology* also includes an eleven-page bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

The author uses a wide variety of primary and secondary sources, both literal and poetic that cover an assortment of subjects relevant to the time period studied. It appears from reading the bibliography, and the extensive footnotes found throughout the book that the author used sources that cover the sociology of the period of the high to late middle ages as well as biographies of rulers, leaders, and nobles. Military treaties and contemporary histories are also utilized as well as modern studies on almost every area and aspect of life in medieval Western Europe. The cited sources cover almost every location in Western Europe. Sources on the political, societal, and military organization and other aspects of life in medieval Western Europe are listed as well. The bibliography is a strong and useful reference on the late medieval time frame and can be used as a springboard for further research and study.

Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century provides not only a contemporary look at early fourteenth century combat, but also a concise analysis of why the victors won and the mistakes made by the defeated armies. DeVries illustrates this point with a description of a ledger account of the defeated French commander at the Battle of Courtrai. The ledger account details how the French commander bought a map of the battlefield that included details of the very trenches that would cause the deaths of so many of his soldiers. (pp. 15) Even though the French commander had knowledge of the trenches dug and camouflaged in front of the Flemish positions, he ordered his attack to be conducted directly into the Flemish positions protected by the trenches. DeVries points out that the combination of disregarding the trenches and stiff Flemish resistance lead to

the defeat of the attack and the deaths of the cream of French nobility. DeVries analyzes the tactics, techniques, and weapons used in each battle. The book uses a variety of primary and secondary sources written in both Latin and Middle English to provide as accurate and complete a picture of the battle covered as possible. DeVries also attempts to explain and mitigate any nationalistic prejudice of the sources used. The author uses sources, which conflict with each other, and provides a plausible explanation for the discrepancies. DeVries frames his explanations in a manner that adds to the depth of the battle without confusing the reader.

Many students of medieval military history believe that the armored knight dominated the battlefield and that until the introduction of viable firearms an army of mounted knights would always defeat foot soldiers. Before reading *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century* it is easy to picture the armored knight riding down and impaling his enemies with impunity; breaking any infantry formation and cutting down all who would dare to resist him. After reading this book the reader begins to realize that regardless of the time period studied, the terrain and weapons have more of an impact on an army's chances of victory than almost any other factor. The book also reinforces the belief that the terrain can act as a combat multiplier and increase the effectiveness of weapons and the efficiency of the battle plan a commander constructs to ensure victory.

This is a very easily read and thoroughly enjoyable book, on a subject that could be very dry and boring. Where appropriate the author provides a level of detail that brings the battle to life, but not so much as to inundate the reader with too much information. *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century* can be read and enjoyed by the casual reader of military history as much as the well-informed student; it makes a significant contribution to the literature of medieval warfare and to a better understanding of the infantry's role in fighting and winning battles during the first half of the fourteenth century.

<div align="right">Francis M. Hoeflinger</div>

Joseph J. Ellis. *Founding Brothers: The Revolutionary Generation*. New York: Vintage Books. 2002.

In the first decade of its existence, the American republic was like an infant in an incubator, in need of constant attention and care. The ten years following the signing of the Constitution were the "most crucial and consequential in American history." (pp. 11) This decade "set the precedents, and established in palatable fact what the Constitution had only outlined in purposely ambiguous theory."(pp. 11) The main point of discussion among the caretakers of the new nation was how exactly the promise of 1776 was to be carried out. Or, according to Joseph Ellis in *Founding Brothers*: What was the "true

meaning" of the American Revolution? This conflict would, by the dawning of the nineteenth century, give rise to the separation of the founders into two ideological camps: The Federalists and the Republicans.

Joseph Ellis examines the political dialogue that arose among the "band of brothers" that started the revolution, created the Constitution, and became the first leaders of the brand new United States. In his book, he attempts to answer "How did they do it?" by examining six key episodes in the decade, centered around eight of the founders: Abigail and John Adams, Aaron Burr, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and George Washington.

The republic was created by men of diverse personalities and ideologies. This mix, according to Ellis, generated a "dynamic form of balance and equilibrium." (pp.17) The multiple personalities and philosophies checked each other and brought a sense of moderation to the discussion.

Ellis' "founding brothers" are a group engaged in a conversation that spans the decade following the signing of the Constitution. Through letters and other papers, Ellis puts our "ear to the keyhole" as the revolutionary generation discusses the issues of slavery, states' rights, and the very nature of the American republic.

The ideological battle that embodies the central conflict over the nature of the promise of 1776 most is the friendship and rivalry of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. The last two chapters of *Founding Brothers* are devoted to the relationship between the two. Over a friendship that lasted from the early days of the revolution until their deaths on the same day, Jefferson and Adams often found themselves on opposite sides of the philosophical debate that defined the 1790's. Ellis looks at the elections following the retirement of George Washington as the two heirs apparent battled in the first American elections that involved political parties, presenting the two men, "bonded at a personal and emotional level that defied their merely philosophical differences," (pp.164) as unwilling enemies. Their ideological differences pitted them against each other and, in Jefferson's case, gave rise to a new political party to challenge the ideas of his old friend.

Founding Brothers delves deeper into the history of the post revolutionary years than many Americans have ventured. Ellis takes the founders off of their pedestals and introduces us to them as real people, experimenting and struggling with the idea of a country created under a republican government, and deciding just what form that government and country should take.

Ellis' book assumes that the reader already has a good grounding in American history, and is fully familiar with the history of the revolution and the Constitution. Casual readers, not well versed in the background behind the conflicts of the 1790's may find themselves lost from time to time and reaching for their high school history

textbooks. For those looking for a more in-depth, yet quite readable examination of the early days of the United States, *Founding Brothers* is an engrossing, approachable study.

<div align="right">KEVIN EDGAR</div>

CHRIS KYLE. *American Sniper.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2012.

Navy SEAL Chris Kyle holds the record of the most sniper kills in U.S. military history, over 150 confirmed kills in a ten year span. Kyle's autobiography provides an excellent insight into the life of a SEAL, by sharing his memoirs and including excerpts written by his wife to see how this life affects both the service member and his family.

Kyle did not write this book to bring glory to himself. He was uncomfortable with the idea of writing the book and took care to shield the identities of his fellow Team members to protect them. He felt, "if you want to know what life as a SEAL is like, you should go get your own Trident: earn our medal, the symbol of who we are. Go through our training, make the sacrifices, physical and mental. That's the only way you'll know."[1]

Kyle shared insight into his life growing up and how he loved to hunt and ride horses, "you could say I've always been a cowboy."[2] One of the most important things he learned from breaking horses was patience. "I wasn't a patient person by nature. I had to develop that talent working with horses; it would end up being extremely valuable when I became a sniper – and even when I was courting my wife."[3] He loved being involved in rodeo competitions and thought about becoming a ranch manager, but he also debated joining the military to become an aviator or a Marine. "I wanted to see real action. I liked the idea of fighting. I also heard a bit about special operations, and thought about joining Marine Recon, which is the Corps' elite special warfare unit."[4] Out of respect for his parents, he followed their wishes of attending college before joining the military. A serious fall ended his rodeo career and his need for cash while attending school led him to a job as a ranch hand, which gave him plenty of time to think about his future. He decided it was time to quit college and go into the military.

In 1996, he was determined to enlist. The Marine recruiter was out to lunch, the Army recruiter said he must be an E-5 to be considered for Special Forces, but the Navy recruiter explained all about the SEALs. The training would be difficult, but he "liked that kind of challenge…when I left there, I wanted to be a SEAL in the worst way."[5] He was willing to turn down a signing bonus to get a SEAL contract, but his rodeo injury which left him with pins in his arm disqualified him from enlisting. He quit school anyway and worked on the ranch until he got a phone call from the Navy recruiter several

years later, asking if he still wanted to be a SEAL.

Kyle enlisted and in February 1999, he reported to boot camp, which he felt was too easy, causing him to gain weight and to get out of shape. After boot camp, he went to intelligence specialty training and he was inspired to get in shape, after he saw some real SEALS on the base. "I was beginning to develop the right mind-set: Do whatever it takes."[6] After six months of being in the Navy, he finally received orders to report to BUD/S training, the first step to becoming a SEAL. Even a fractured foot did not stop him from reaching his goal, "if you have the psychological fortitude to come back from an injury and complete the program, you stand a decent chance of being a good SEAL."[7] After advanced training (SQT, SEAL Qualifying Training), he got orders to join a SEAL team, "we didn't consider ourselves real SEALs yet; it was only when we joined a Team that we would get our Tridents – and even then we'd have to prove ourselves first."[8] He was assigned to SEAL Team 3, in Coronado, California. He met Taya in nearby San Diego in April 2001. The events of September 11 would have a major impact on his life, with more training to prepare for deployment and war. Chris and Taya married just before his deployment.

Throughout the book, Taya shares her insights of her first impression of him, her fears during deployments, readjustments when he returned home, anger when he deployed again after the birth of each of their children and when he reenlisted against her wishes, emotional conflicts that separations cause, the stories of war, the reality that some of the Team members do not come home alive, and the challenges of life after military service. She soon realized that, "He thought dying on the battlefield was the greatest" and "Being a SEAL is more important to him than being a father or a husband."[9]

Kyle discussed training missions, weapons, his equipment, nicknames for each other, and the realities of being in combat. Kyle did not feel he was the best shot in the world, but he felt the war gave him opportunity to become a good sniper. Kyle and two other snipers soon had the most confirmed kills, "kills that someone else witnessed, and cases where the enemy could be confirmed dead."[10] By the time he left the military in 2009, Kyle was the top sniper in U.S. military history.

Two uncles of this reviewer highly recommended this book, because it also told the story of a family member, Ryan Job, the son of her second cousin. Kyle's first impression of Job was that he was too fat and they constantly harassed him. "He lost weight and got into better shape....He was such a hard worker, so sincere, and so damn funny, that at some point we just went, *I love you. You are the man.* Because no matter how he looked, he truly *was* a SEAL."[11] His humor earned him the nickname of Biggles the Desert Hippo. Kyle felt devastated when Job and another SEAL Marc Lee were shot on a mission. A bullet hit Job's "rifle first, then ricocheted into his face."[12] Kyle helped him down the stairs to a personnel carrier. "I was sure he was

going to die. I was sure I'd just lost a brother. A big, goofy, lovable, great brother. *Biggles.* Nothing I'd experienced in Iraq had ever affected me like this."[13] Lee did not survive and they held a memorial service for him in Camp Ramadi before his body was shipped home. Kyle turned to his faith to find comfort, but he still felt responsible when he learned that Job survived his injuries but lost his eyesight.

Kyle learned that his young daughter was sick and being tested for possible leukemia. "A cloud of helplessness descended over me....The loss of Marc and Ryan's extreme injuries had taken a toll. My blood pressure had shot up and I couldn't sleep. Hearing the news about my daughter pushed me to my breaking point."[14] A Red Cross letter started the process to send him home, but he felt torn about leaving his men. "It was a conflict – family and country, family and brothers in arms – that I never really resolved. I'd had even more kills in Ramadi than in Fallujah. Not only did I finish with more kills than anyone else on that deployment, but my overall total made me the most prolific American sniper of all time – to use the fancy official language. And yet I still felt like a quitter, a guy who didn't do enough."

His daughter got better, but while he was home, he learned another SEAL, Mike Monsoor, had been killed. The funeral gave Kyle a chance to see his friend Job again. "They say friendships forged in war are strong ones. Ours would prove that truism."[15] Their friendship continued to grow after that. He was proud of Job's new accomplishments: getting married, attending college and graduating with honors; and accomplishing a number of physical challenges (mountain climbing, hunting, and a triathlon). He felt Job was "a true patriot. A genuine warrior, with a heart of gold."[16] Unfortunately, Job would lose his life due to an error at the hospital after further reconstruction surgery. "It was a tragic end to a heroic life. I'm not sure any of us who knew him have gotten over it. I don't think I ever will."[17] Job's wife was pregnant when he died, so he never got to meet his daughter.

Kyle finally left the Navy and he and three friends started Craft International, to train military and police units. Their logo "came from the Punisher symbol, with a crusader crosshair in the right eye in honor of Ryan Job. He also inspired our company slogan.... 'Despite what your mama told you...violence does solve problems.'"[18] Kyle had trouble with PTSD and resented leaving the SEALs. Depression and heavy drinking caused him to total his truck, but the accident made him realize that he needed to take care of his family and to take care of others. He got involved with Lone Survivor Foundation, which helps wounded warriors enjoy life again. On February 2, 2013, Kyle and his friend Chad Littlefield took one of those veterans, Eddie Ray Routh, to a remote shooting range. Routh, also suffering from PTSD, turned his weapon on the two men and killed them. Thousands attended Kyle's funeral in the Dallas Cowboys Stadium. Kyle protected American troops in Iraq as a sniper and helped

veterans overcome PTSD. "Though his book became a best seller, he never collected money from it, friends said, donating the proceeds to the families of two friends and fallen SEAL members, Ryan Job and Marc Lee."[19] Not only did this reviewer get to learn more about a family hero she never had the privilege to meet, she also got to learn more about a real American hero, Chris Kyle.

<div align="right">Jennifer Thompson</div>

Notes

[1] Chris Kyle, *American Sniper* (New York: Harper, 2012), 5.
[2] Ibid., 9.
[3] Ibid., 14.
[4] Ibid., 16.
[5] Ibid., 22.
[6] Ibid., 28.
[7] Ibid., 42.
[8] Ibid., 45.
[9] Ibid., 224, 243.
[10] Ibid., 303.
[11] Ibid., 244.
[12] Ibid., 320.
[13] Ibid., 321-322.
[14] Ibid., 344.
[15] Ibid., 354.
[16] Ibid., 415.
[17] Ibid., 415-416.
[18] Ibid., 419.
[19] Manny Fernandez, "At Texas Service, Mourners Remember Slain Ex-Sniper as Warrior and Family Man," *The New York Times*, February 11, 2013, accessed March 15, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/12/us/chris-kyle-ex-sniper-recalled-as-warrior-and-father.html?_r=0.

Cokie Roberts. *Founding Mothers: The Women Who Raised Our Nation.* New York: Harper Perennial. 2004.

Cokie Roberts, the long-time political commentator for ABC News, bestselling author, and daughter of former Congresswoman Lindy Boggs; asked the question in the introduction of her book, "while the men were busy founding the nation, what were the women up to?" (pp. xvi) It is a question easily asked and difficult to answer because most of the women of the era destroyed their letters and few diaries have surfaced to tell us what they thought. Roberts provides some good answers to this question in *Founding Mothers.*

Men write most of the scholarship of the era about the founding fathers, yet the wives, sweethearts, mothers, sisters, and daughters who supported, advised and encouraged the men who gave birth to a nation go largely unreported. This book brings to light the stories of some of the extraordinary women of the period who fought as bravely the men, defending their homes from the British. Women had to take the reins of their husbands' businesses, run the family farms, and continue to raise their families while their men went to war and to the Continental Congress. These women were just as much a part

of the founding of the United States as the men who spent months or even years away from their families.

In this time before modern communications, letter writing was the only means of contact for those separated by distance. Roberts uses primary sources, including personal correspondence, journals, and even recipes to give the reader a glimpse in to the life of women from the colonial era through the first presidential election and the raising of the new nation. The book has a delightful and engaging tone that is full of anecdotes and the everyday trials of life in the early days of this country.

The book covers the founding women of the country from Abigail Adams to Martha Washington. In *Founding Mothers*, Roberts tells stories of famous women as well as those less well known. Each of these women played a role in giving birth to our nation. The book opens with the story of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, wife of Charles Pinckney. At the age of sixteen, Eliza took over running her family's interests when her father "left Antigua to rejoin his regiment in fighting the war against Spain" (pp. 4). The author writes of the education and intelligence of this young woman. Eliza and Charles' marriage was a happy one and a reported love match, even though there is a difference of over twenty years in their ages.

The book closes with the years after the Revolution when the founding fathers and mothers were raising the newfound nation of the United States. Roberts relates the story of the women of Trenton who greeted President-elect George Washington with a banner they commissioned which proclaimed Washington "The Defender of the Mothers Will Be the Protector of the Daughters" (pp. 227). There are references to the everyday life of Martha Washington and Abigail Adams in the closing chapter. An advertisement for a cook for the family of the President shows that there was a normal life going on behind the outward appearance of the President.

Roberts also discusses the interest of some of the founding mothers in the education of the young women of the new nation. Abigail Adams was a proponent of educating young women because they would be better able to fulfill their duties to the United States "if they were more formally educated. And the new republic, if it were to function as the Founders envisaged would require the participation of its citizens...someone would have to train those citizens" (pp. 251). Roberts quotes John Adams as saying, "it is by the female world that the greatest and best characters among men are formed" (pp. 251).

The inclusion of some colonial and old family recipes of the founding mothers gives the book a homey touch at the end. The fact that Roberts does not attempt to change the language of these items makes for both a wonderful and at times difficult-to-understand-the-exact meaning look at how the founding mothers used the items they had at hand to provide for their families. It also shows the thriftiness of these women in the example of how to dress a calves head.

The chatty story telling tone of this work may put off a serious academic while others will find it makes the book more entertaining as well as informative. In Roberts's defense, the primary sources used for this book are taken from the personal letters and journals of the women referenced. These are not the works documenting the official records of the day; but women who are telling their friends, loved ones and the man of the household what is happening while they are distant from their families. While this book is not written in a scholarly tone, it is well documented with the primary sources used by Roberts. It gives the casual reader a more interesting look at the lives of the founding mothers than a dry academic work but the use of reliable sources provides good discussion and evaluation of the primary source material used by the author. Covering a wide period of time from early colonial days until after the election of George Washington provides ample examples of the lives of the women who were standing behind their men and this country.

ANITA KAY O'PRY

MATTHEW H. SPRING. *With Zeal and Bayonets Only: The British Army on Campaign in North America, 1775-1783.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008. xxiv + 381 ppg.

Matthew Spring has expanded his doctoral dissertation into a full length book and in the process debunked many fallacies about how the British Army operated in North America during the American Revolution. He drew upon the writings of the officers from both sides of the war as well as diaries and letters of the enlisted men, and those of the Hessians who served under the British flag. In Spring's pages, the visual concept of perfect rows of British soldiers marching over open fields to engage the Continental Army is pushed aside in favor of what actually took place; British troops advancing in skirmish lines across terrain that was broken by fences, brush, and heavily wooded areas. The British Army's reliance on shock tactics including the famed bayonet charge were usually effective, but over time as the Continental Army gained experience and used the terrain to their advantage these tactics failed.

Still, the British Army won most of the Revolution's battles but failed to win the war due to strategic and logistical problems presented by the sheer size of the colonies. In addition, the political factors brought about by France entering the war decreased the manpower available to the British generals who begged for more troops throughout the war. Spring's chapters explore how the British maneuvered, their formations, their units, and how the men were recruited and organized. The book could have used more detailed information on the actual units, the campaigns and battles they fought in, and the weaponry involved beyond the basic arms. Still, it gives a fascinating explanation of the British Army that shatters the

misconceptions held by many.

The facts were that the British soldier fought extremely well and with great pride throughout the war. The soldiers themselves fought in different manners depending on units, but were let down by the lack of resources needed to exploit their battlefield victories while being unable to replace losses late in the war. The image Spring leaves with the reader is one of a proud seasoned British veteran that fought in North America as part of a professional army. Illustrations by Don Troiani add to that image. The book is well written and organized by topic into each chapter which allows the reader to move through the pages by subject conveniently. Tactics, military organization, logistics, and the use of the bayonet as well as both small arms and artillery are explained in their corresponding chapters. His use of supporting statistics serves to add to the information and expands the topic rather than overwhelm the reader with a plethora of numbers.

Spring takes the time to explain how the British regiments recruited their men in the Home Isles, trained them, and sent them into the ranks of the parent units in North America. He also devotes a chapter to the leadership of the regiments and how those officers were instrumental on the battlefield in rallying broken units while also employing intelligent small unit tactics to counter the Continental Army's bushfighting strategy. In addition he explains why the British failed to defeat the Continentals. When the British and Americans clashed in major set piece battles the British carried the day almost every time, but from the very beginning the British commanders were hamstrung by their lack of numbers needed to defeat the Continentals and pacify the countryside. At no time did they have enough men to meet the political goals of the British Parliament. When France and Spain entered the war on the American side and expanded the conflict into a truly global war the British Army in the North American colonies was cut in half. The West Indies were considered far more valuable than the thirteen American colonies and substantial numbers of troops were redeployed from the force in North America in order to protect the island colonies from French and Spanish depredations.

Generally Spring does not go into much detail beyond the strategic military situation of the forces fighting in North America, however to explain the situation so that the reader will understand why the rebellion succeeded he had to outline the handicaps which the British fought under during the conflict. The British attempt to use military force to resolve a political dispute in this manner strongly implies that most members of Parliament as well as the King and his advisors failed to understand the logistical issues as well as the sheer size of the colonies. There is no question that the British Army was by far and above superior to the forces the Americans had, but due to the failure of Parliament to create a force large enough to meet its goals most British victories ended up being Pyrrhic as they

could ill afford to lose any substantial number of men. It was this failure that Spring concludes was the primary reason behind the success of American Independence to overcome the better quality British troops.

All in all the book is a refreshing challenge to the hoary tales of British troops marching into sheets of American firepower ignoring their losses until they finally met into close combat. Instead, the reader is left imagining the British troops using the terrain as cover, employing light infantry to skirmish with and distract the Americans, while quickly closing with the Americans in their defensive positions and often causing the Continental lines to break in fear. In other words, the British Army has been given back its status of the preeminent fighting machine of its day.

JIMMY DICK

Call for Papers
Summer 2013

The Saber and Scroll Journal is proud to announce that its summer 2013 journal will be **open topic**.

The Saber and Scroll Journal is currently soliciting articles and reviews for its summer 2013 edition. Published by APUS' Saber and Scroll History Club, this edition will accept works on all topics of history and historiography. All historical time periods and geographic regions are welcome provided they address a topic of historical interest. Short book reviews, opinion pieces and exhibition should be on recent events or publications. Students are welcome to use previously submitted and corrected coursework, provided it has not been published. All submissions should meet high academic standards and will be reviewed by a group of graduate and undergraduate APUS student editors.

Abstract Deadline: July 1, 2013
Manuscript Deadline: August 1, 2013

The Saber and Scroll is an Online University Historical Research Society affiliated with the American Public University School System. The purpose of this organization is the promotion of historical studies through the encouragement of academic research and the development of a rigorously edited online publication; the broadening of historical knowledge among the   membership that includes social communications, topical discussions, historical lectures and the pursuit of other kindred activities in the interest of history; and service opportunities to the school and community. We strive to bring students, faculty, alumni, and historians-at-large together for intellectual and social exchanges, which promote and assist historical research and publication by our members.

Club Officers

Carrie-Ann Saigeon-Crunk, President

Lew Taylor, Interim Vice President

Kay O'Pry-Reynolds, Interim Secretary

Dr. Richard Hines, Faculty Advisory

American Public University System

www.apus.edu