MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY THIRUNELVELI- 627012

DDE, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

History of Europe (476-1453 A.D.)

Study Material Prepared by

Dr. D. Latha Kumari, MA, M.Phil, B.Ed, Ph.D

Assistant Professor (T), Department of History

MS University, Tirunelveli- 12

History of Europe, (476-1453 A.D.)

Unit I:

Rise and fall of Roman Empire – Causes for the downfall – Legacy of Rome establishment of Venice – occupation of Western Europe by Barbarians.

Unit II:

Eastern Roman Empire – Emperor Justinian – Cultural contribution – Rise and spread of Christianity – papacy - Monasteries – The Frankish Kingdom – Charlemagne – Break up of Carolingian Kingdom – Carolingian Renaissance.

Unit III:

The spread of Islam – The Legacy of Islam to Europe – The Holy Roman Empire – Henry the Fowler – Otto, the Great – Feudalism – Manorial System – The Capetian Kings of Frances – Social and economic condition.

Unit IV:

The struggle between Empire and Papacy – The Crusades – the rise of Universities – Growth of Towns – Guild System – The Hundred years War – Church during Later Medieval Ages.

Unit V:

Enlightenment and Renaissance – Plague – France and Germany during later Medieval period – Trade and Commerce – Rise and growth of Representative Institutions – The Ottoman Empire – Society at the end of Middle Age.

Reference Books:

1. A.J. Grant, Outline of European History (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1958).

2. Chifford R. Backeman, Sources of Medieval European History (Clarandon: Oxford University Press, 2014).

3. Edward Gibbon, Decline and fall of the Roman Empire (London: Modern Library Publications, 2000).

4. Christopher Tyermas, The Crusades, A very short Introduction (Clarandon: Oxford University Press, 2006).

5. Eugene Rogan, The Fall of the Ottoman Empire (London: Penguin Publications, 2016).

6. J. Dharmaraj, History of Europe (Tamil) (476 – 1453) (Sivakasi: Tensi Publications, 2016).

1. Rise and fall of Roman Empire

The Romans and their empire at its height in 117 CE was the most extensive political and social structure in western civilization. By 285 CE the empire had grown too vast to be ruled from the central government at Rome and so was divided by Emperor Diocletian (284-305 CE) into a Western and an Eastern Empire**.** The fall of the Western Roman Empire was the process of decline during which the empire failed to enforce its rule, and its vast territory was divided into several successor polities. The Roman Empire lost the strengths that had allowed it to exercise effective control; modern historians mention factors including the effectiveness and numbers of the army, the health and numbers of the Roman population, the strength of the economy, the competence of the emperor, the religious changes of the period, and the efficiency of the civil administration. Increasing pressure from barbarians outside Roman culture also contributed greatly to the collapse. The reasons for the collapse are major subjects of the historiography of the ancient world, and they inform much modern discourse on state failure.

By 476 CE, when Odoacer deposed Emperor Romulus, the Western Roman Empire wielded negligible military, political, or financial power and had no effective control over the scattered western domains that could still be described as Roman. Invading "barbarians" had established their own polities on most of the area of the Western Empire. While its legitimacy lasted for centuries longer and its cultural influence remains today, the Western Empire never had the strength to rise again. It is important to note, however, that the so-called fall of the Roman Empire specifically refers to the fall of the Western Roman Empire, since the Eastern Roman Empire, or what became known as the Byzantine Empire, whose capital was founded by Constantine, remained for another 1,000 years. Theodosius was the last emperor who ruled over the whole empire. After his death in 395, he gave the two halves of the empire to his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius; Arcadius became ruler in the east, with his capital in Constantinople, and Honorius became ruler in the west, with his capital in Milan, and later Ravenna.

Rome in the 5th Century CE

Throughout the 5th century, the empire's territories in Western Europe and north-western Africa, including Italy, fell to various invading or indigenous peoples in what is sometimes called the Migration Period, also known as the Barbarian Invasions, from the Roman and South European perspective. The first migrations of peoples were made by Germanic tribes, such as the Goths, Vandals, Angles, Saxons, Lombards, Suebi, Frisii, Jutes and Franks; they were later pushed westwards by the Huns, Avars, Slavs, and Bulgars. Although the eastern half still survived with borders essentially intact for several centuries (until the Muslim conquests), the Empire as a whole had initiated major cultural and political transformations since the Crisis of the Third Century, with the shift towards a more openly autocratic and ritualized form of government, the adoption of Christianity as the state religion, and a general rejection of the traditions and values of Classical Antiquity. The reasons for the decline of the Empire are still debated today, and are likely multiple. Historians infer that the population appears to have diminished in many provinces (especially western Europe), judging from the diminishing size of fortifications built to protect the cities from barbarian incursions from the 3rd century on. Some historians even have suggested that parts of the periphery were no longer inhabited, because these fortifications were restricted to the centre of the city only. By the late 3rd century, the city of Rome no longer served as an effective capital for the emperor, and various cities were used as new administrative capitals. Successive emperors, starting with Constantine, privileged the eastern city of Byzantium, which he had entirely rebuilt after a siege. Later renamed Constantinople, and protected by formidable walls in the late 4th and early 5th centuries, it was to become the largest and most powerful city of Christian Europe in the Early Middle Ages. Since the Crisis of the Third Century, the empire was intermittently ruled by more than one emperor at once (usually two), presiding over different regions.

The Latin-speaking west, under dreadful demographic crisis, and the wealthier Greek-speaking east, also began to diverge politically and culturally. Although this was a gradual process, still incomplete when Italy came under the rule of barbarian chieftains in the last quarter of the 5th century, it deepened further afterward, and had lasting consequences for the medieval history of Europe. In 476, after being refused lands in Italy, Orestes' Germanic mercenaries, under the leadership of the chieftain

Odoacer, captured and executed Orestes and took Ravenna, the Western Roman capital at the time, deposing Western Emperor Romulus Augustus. The whole of Italy was quickly conquered, and Odoacer's rule became recognized in the Eastern Empire. Meanwhile, much of the rest of the Western provinces were conquered by waves of Germanic invasions, most of them being disconnected politically from the east altogether, and continuing a slow decline. Although Roman political authority in the west was lost, Roman culture would last in most parts of the former western provinces into the 6th century and beyond. The various theories and explanations for the fall of the Roman Empire in the west may be very broadly classified into four schools of thought (although the classification is not without overlap):

Decay owing to general malaise

Monocausal decay

Catastrophic collapse

Transformation

The tradition positing general malaise goes back to the historian, Edward Gibbon, who argued that the edifice of the Roman Empire had been built on unsound foundations from the beginning. According to Gibbon, the fall was in the final analysis inevitable. On the other hand, Gibbon had assigned a major portion of the responsibility for the decay to the influence of Christianity, and is often, though perhaps unjustly, seen as the founding father of the school of Monocausal explanation. On the other hand, the school of catastrophic collapse holds that the fall of the empire had not been a pre-determined event and need not be taken for granted. Rather, it was due to the combined effect of a number of adverse processes, many of them set in motion by the Migration Period that together applied too much stress to the empire's basically sound structure. Finally, the transformation school challenges the whole notion of the 'fall' of the empire, asking instead to distinguish between the fall into disuse of a particular political dispensation, anyway unworkable towards its end; and the fate of the Roman civilization that under-girded the empire. According to this school, drawing its basic premise from the Pirenne thesis, the Roman world underwent a gradual (though often violent) series of transformations, morphing into the medieval world. The historians belonging to this school often prefer to speak of Late Antiquity, instead of the fall of the Roman Empire.

The age of Pericles bore rich fruit in works of poetry, drama and prose literature. Homer wrote the great epics 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' Dramas, both tragedies and comedies were written. The famous tragedy writers of the period were Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. The Greek historians were Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophone. Herodotus, the Father of History wrote the history of the Persian Wars'. Thucydides wrote the history of the Peloponnesian War. Xenophon's *Anabasis'* is a great work describing the March of the Ten Thousand to Persia. Demosthenes was the greatest orator of the Greek world. The splendour that was Greece' passed its highest water-mark by the middle of the 4th century B. C. Macedonian supremacy over Greece set up by Alexander the Great marked a change in the spread of Greek culture. Alexander founded a number of cities. The last three centuries before the Christian era when Greek culture disseminated through these cities came to be known as the Hellenistic culture as distinct from the Hellenic culture of the previous centuries. After the death of Alexander, the mission was carried on by his three generals-Seleucus in Asia Minor, Ptolemy in Egypt and Antigonus in Greece. Remarkable progress was made in art, architecture, literature and science. Architects of the period erected highly decorated structures. The new centres of civilisation were Alexandria, Pergamum, Antioch and Rhodes. Ptolemy I, the Pharaoh of Egypt, founded a library at Alexandria in honour of the Muses. It is from this that the word museum is derived.

The legacy of Greece is thus vital and universal. "Rome was not built in a day ". From the 8th century B.C. onwards. Italy was occupied by the Gauls in the North, the Etruscans in the Centre, and the Latin’s and the Samnites in the South. According to ancient legend, the eternal city of Rome was founded in 753 B. C. by Romulus and Remus, twin brothers, who had been nursed by a she-wolf. To begin with, Rome had a monarchical form of government. From 753 to 509 B. C seven Kings ruled over Rome: After the fall of monarchy, Rome experimented with a republican form of government. Rome which was 3 small cities gradually developed into a mighty empire. She established her supremacy over Italy extending over a period from 509 to 264 B. C. In her expansion over the Mediterranean region, extending over a period from 264 to 133 B. C., Rome waged wars with Carthage and Spain in the Western Mediterranean, Greece in the Eastern Mediterranean, and Pergamum in Asia Minor. At the end of these wars, Rome became the undisputed master of an Empire consisting of Italy and seven

provinces. As the Empire grew unwieldy, the Republic had to face many dangers. Sulla, a popular leader, succeeded in establishing his dictatorship. After his death, there was a scramble for power among Pompey, Crassus, Cicero and Julius Caesar. Julius Caesar succeeded and established a government which was really despotism. He was murdered in 44 B. C. After the murder of Julius Caesar, Augustus Caesar (27 B.C.-14 A.D.) defeated his rival, Mark Antony and set up a monarchy with republican forms in 27 B.C. His reign saw the marked development of architecture and literature. "He found Rome in bricks but left it in marble." Augustus Caesar may rightly be considered the first Roman Emperor. Through the twin policy of keeping 'Rome and Italy contented' and 'ruling the rest of the Empire justly and efficiently', Augustus raised the glory, power and splendour of Rome to magnificent heights**.**

Men like Caesar and Augustus could excite the people with their remarkable patriotism and devotion to public cause. However, not all the Emperors were able or devoted to good government. The absence of settled method of succession contributed to political instability Political assassinations was more frequent.

Tiberius (14-37 A.D.), a step-son of Augustus, became the Princeps in his fifty-sixth year. It was during his reign that Jesus Christ was crucified. The crucifixion of Jesus eventually changed the course of mankind's history. The death of Tiberius in 37 brought Gaius Caesar (37-41), nicknamed Caligula, to power and his four year's rule was noted for cruelty and political murders. His uncle Claudius (41-54) expanded the Roman power by conquering Mauretania and Britain. He was poisoned by his own wife Agrippina in 54 who wanted her son Nero (through an earlier marriage) to assume power. Nero (54-63) was a cruel and mean despot who brought disgrace to the office he held by extraordinary cunning and indifference to the sufferings of the population. There was a big fire in 64 and Nero is believed to have played his lyre when the central part of the city was razed to the ground by the fire. Nero committed suicide in 68. Three emperors-Galba, Otho, Vitellius-ruled for short periods when things had reached a sickening phase. Vespasian who murdered Vitellius assumed power in December 69 and with the consent of the Senate put an end to disorder. The seven years of Vespasian rule were marked by financial recovery, establishment of order in the kingdom and quelling of frontier troubles. His son Titus ruled for two years from 79. For 15 years Domitian (81-96) tried to assert the authority of the Princeps and greatly improved the condition of Rome that

had been ravaged by fire and plague during his predecessor's short-rule. He too fell a prey to assassination in 96. Trajan (98-117) a great military figure who put an end to the growing power of the military forces Praetorian guards became the Emperor in 93 following the short-rule of Nerva. His expansionist vigour brought Dacia under Roman sway. His sense of justice provided a clean administration and just taxation. The Roman policy of building huge public amphitheatres and temples continued. Alien faiths were rigorously put down. The Roman Empire reached the height of its power under Hadrian (117-138) a master in the craft of administration, he organised the finances and civil service along healthy lines. It was he who ordered the construction of the famous stone-wall in Britain bearing his name (Hadrian's Wall) in 121-122. Discipline was his watch word and it paid rich dividends as the Emperor was a tireless devotee to its cause. His administration for Greek values found vent through bounteous gifts to Greece through buildings, temples, aqueducts and roads". His inspiration saw the compilation of Edictum Julianum Codification of Roman Law. He also appointed circuit courts of appeal, rule also witnessed fierce struggle with the Jews who were brutally turned out from Judea after a great massacre.

Hadrian was succeeded by Antoninus Pius (138-161) who continued the just and wise principles of his illustrious predecessor. His was the era of The Antonine Wall named after him was plenty and prosperity, built in Britain in 142 A. D connecting the Firth of Forth and Marcus Aurelius, a distance of 36 miles. The Firth of Clyde, known in history as a philosopher-king ruled from 161-180. His death was a turning point in the history of the Roman Empire. The uninterrupted peace which prevailed in the country for a long time was marred by civil and foreign wars. The safety, security and integrity of the empire were threatened from within and without. The steady decline of the empire started from the latter half of the second century A. D. Before the final deadline was drawn in 476, Rome did produce successful pilots in the storm in the persons of Emperors like Diocletian (284-305), Constantine I the Great (306-337) and Theodosius I the Great (378-395). But they succeeded only in postponing the inevitable doomsday. The transfer of capital from Rome to Constantinople and the adoption of the Christian religion as the only legal religion in the Empire in the 4th century A.D two momentous events profoundly influenced the future course of the history of Europe in the middle Ages.

The mighty Roman Empire of the Caesars became so unwieldy that a division of the Empire became quite inevitable towards the close of the 4th century A.D. After the death of Theodosius I (378-395) in 395, the Roman Empire was divided between his sons, Arcadius and Honorius. The former became the Emperor in the East and the latter in the West with Constantinople and Rome as the respective capital cities. The Roman Empire of the West was pulled down by the barbarians in 476A D Romulus nicknamed Augustulus (475-476) was the last Roman Emperor of the West. Thus the ancient period in the history of the world came to an end in 470A.D.

2. CAUSES OF THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

Rome was not built in a day. Similarly the decline of the empire was not the result of a sudden or abrupt event but a long-drawn-out process spreading over nearly three centuries. Many underlying and deep-reaching causes were at work for a pretty long time. The death of Marcus Aurelius (161-180) in A.D 180 was a turning point in the history of the Roman Empire. The uninterrupted peace which prevailed in the country for a long time was marred by civil and foreign wars. The safety, security and integrity of the empire were threatened from within and without. The steady decline of the empire started from the latter half of the second century A. D. Before the final deadline was drawn in A. D. 476, Rome did produce successful pilots in the storm in the persons of Emperors like Diocletian (A.D. 284-305), Constantine I the Great (A.D. 306-337) and Theodosius I the Great (A.D.378-395). But they succeeded only in postponing the inevitable dooms day. The injuries wrought by time and nature. One of the causes for the decline of the mighty Roman Empire of the Caesars was the injuries wrought by time and the passage of time brought one havoc after another. Hurricanes and earthquakes, fires and inundations reduced the works of ages into dust. The irreparable losses sustained by the Romans during these calamities were incalculable and irretrievable. The conflagration during the time of Nero (A.D. 54-68) razed many buildings to the ground. Many palaces and temples overturned by the ravages wrought by the inundation of the rivers. Pestilences like plague took a heavy toll of life which adversely affected the strength of the army which in turn considerably weakened the defences of the empire. Though these natural calamities were of a transitory nature the deep scars left behind had a pernicious effect which shook up the whole frame-work. As Gibbon puts it, "the story of its ruin is simple

and obvious; and instead of enquiring why the Roman Empire was destroyed, we should rather be surprised that it had subsisted so long".

Moral-degradation

The influx of wealth into the country brought in its wake all degradation. The Romans lost all their old virtues of disciple line and duty to the State. The barbarians in strange contrast to this acquired the discipline of the Romans and exploited their weaknesses. Affluence bred indolence and debauchery. Though the Senators had lost much of their power, they still lived in great pomp and splendour. The riches as well as the poor indulged in the meanest and the basest of vices. The story of Roman decline is the story of this meaningless pursuit of idle pleasures by an indolent and opulent society. Virtue had already taken its wings and vices its roots. Virtue and temperance became mere myths. Adultery and drunkenness became accepted vices. While the lethargic Romans frittered away their energies in the amphitheatres. Theatres and circus arenas followed by an endless round of banquets. The adventurous barbarians meticulously mastered the arts of warfare.

The growth of the Christian Church as a potential rival to the empire created a new problem. It formed a state within a in an age torn as under by indiscipline and moral lapses, the Church offered new faith and hope to the tormented souls. "The decay of the Empire in the West, the growth of poverty and the spread of violence, necessitated some new ideal and hope to give men consolation in their suffering and courage in their toil: an age of power gave way to an age of faith" Action, the Church stood against the empire. In policy and it forbade its followers to serve in the army when the empire needed most the services of a number of people. This inevitably disrupted the unity of the empire and greatly weakened it. Though Christianity had become the official religion, the doctrines of mercy and kindness did not go with the maintenance of a vast empire. The success of the Church in converting a sizable population to the adoration of ethical values more than ruined the imperial notions of Rome. The conflict between the Church and the State did gross injustice to the cause of imperialism. The Church sapped the martial spirit and skill needed to consolidate and strengthen a vast empire. While the construction of Churches motivated by pious means was laudable, the neglect of the defence of the frontiers was deplorable. The Church had also a share in the demolition: of heathen monuments.

Nature of the Central Government

One of the deep-reaching causes in the dismemberment of; the Roman Empire had to be sought in the nature of the Central Government. To begin with, Rome was pre-eminently a city-state. But, in course of time, she emerged into an empire; Political mechanism of Rome with her constitution was quite. The unsuitable to an empire. Over-centralisation was the characteristic feature of the government. The Emperor wielded unbridled] powers. With the passage of time, the extent of the empire reached its saturation point. The evils of over-centralisation ate into the very vitals of the empire. Excessive work brought senselessness at the centre and paralysis at the extremities. Empire became unwieldy; the emperor was not able to exercise any effective control over the distant parts of the empire. A corrupt and expensive bureaucracy further worsened the situation.

Roman Government was no doubt autocracies. Though the Central Government had unlimited powers, full municipal liberty had been granted to the cities of the empire. But before the end of the 3rd century A.D., the cities which once breathed the air of liberty began to emit the fire of despotism. Thus the cities became faithful replicas of the Central Government in a miniature form, reflecting all the attendant evils of an autocratic form of government. This licence enjoyed by the cities as opposed to liberty deprived them of all adjustability and the requisite push and dash. It was no wonder that they fell helpless victims to the surging crowd of the barbarian invaders.

Demoralisation of the Army.

The success of any government depends upon the ability of the military personnel and its superior strategy. In the declining years of Roman imperialism the efficiency of military organisation was at its lowest ebb. Gone were the days of powerful generals who disciplined the soldiers to victorious marches. Gone too were the days of Roman legions that had struck horror and terror in the minds of the endemics. The spectacular successes of the early Romans were as much due to the dash and dare of the generals as to the enthusiasm of the rank and file. In military skill and strategy, the barbarians surpassed the Romans. Due to dearth of soldiers of Roman stock, it became an accepted practice to enlist barbarians in the army. This unfortunately brought the wooden horse into Roman Troy. The military training which they received gave them an opportunity to know about the Roman discipline and techniques of warfare. The superiority of the barbarian army

vas firmly established towards the close of the 4th century A. D. Hitherto, the victories scored by the Romans were with their infantry. Cavalry constituted only a subsidiary force. But to the Goths cavalry constituted the mainstay of the army. Worked wonders in the epoch-making battle of Adrianople in 378 in which the Goths won a signal victory. To the barbarians, especially the Huns, war was industry and rearing cattle a pastime. The Roman legionaries and Senators no doubt owed allegiance and devotion to the emperor. But their morale had sunk to such a low level that their solemn pledges in the hour of crises were as slender as the spider's web. Discipline for which the Romans distinguished themselves bid fare-well from them. The barbarians imbibed such nobler virtues which made their position superior to that of the Romans.

Economic causes

The economic condition of the country was far from satisfactory. The very existence of Rome depended upon a class of farmers. But due to loss of manpower on account of various reasons, the farmers turned into soldiers. So, many acres of land remained untilled and starvation raised its ugly head. Due to wars, famines and epidemics, agriculture and industry declined. As the empire grew in splendour and space, efforts were not made to improve industrial production and increase in commerce to sustain the increasing needs of the growing population. Quite unfortunately these efforts were sadly neglected the detriment of the prosperity of the empire. The failure to promote orderly growth of wealth through commercial mechanics became the bane of the empire. The vast network of roads was frequently used for the forced marches of the soldiers rather than as thoroughfares of merchandise. Internal trade dwindled and highway robbery increased. During times of war Rome thrived with the spoils of war. But when the wars came to an end, she was forced to stand on her own legs. The people groaned under the weight of oppressive taxation. The high extortions completely exhausted the people. During prosperous days slavery was widely prevalent. It sapped the strength and vitality of the empire. But when slavery began to decline due to the high cost of maintaining the slaves, the condition became still worse.

Barbarian invasions of the Rome.

When the star of the empire was falling into evil days, the stunning blow to the tottering empire was given by the barbarian invasions. These invasions shook up the

Roman solidarity. Barbarians like the Goths, Huns and Vandals poured into the country in large numbers and waited for the most opportune moment to strike at the trunk of the wintering empire. There were invasions of barbarians during the time of Diocletian (234-305). But in all the campaigns, the Romans succeeded. Constantine I the Great (306-337) inflicted a crushing defeat on the Visigoths in 332 when they attempted to cross the Danube. After the middle of the 4th century a nomadic set of barbarians known as the Huns swept over the plains of South Central Asia like an avalanche carrying with them death and destruction. Unable to withstand the onslaught of the Huns, the Visigoths clamoured for admission into the Empire. Valens (364-378), the Eastern Roman Emperor permitted them to cross the Danube in 375 and settle down in Moesia. But soon the Visigoths rebelled. Before Gratian (375-383), the Emperor of the West could come to the help of Valens; the Visigoths decisively defeated and killed Valens in the battle of Adrianople in 378.

The debacle at Adrianople was a signal to the fast approaching collapse of the Roman Empire. Gratian selected Theodosius I the Great (378-395) as the Eastern Roman Emperor (Emperor of the West from 392 till his death in 395). Though Theodosius I succeeded in defeating the Goths, he was not able to throw them out of the empire. He concluded a treaty with the Visigoths in 382 and permitted them to settle down as federate allies in Moesia. A little earlier Gratian contracted a similar treaty with the Ostrogoths and permitted them to settle down in Pannonia. Before the end of the reign of Theodosius I most of the Roman generals were barbarians. After the death of Theodosius I in 395, the Roman Empire was virtually divided between his two sons. The Eastern half was ruled by Arcadius (395-108) and the Western half by Honorius (395-423 both were confirmed nullities. While the Eastern half withstood the attack of the Goths, the Western half began to crumble. In 401, Alaric, the King of the Visigoths invaded Italy. But Honorius had an able Vandal general in the person of Stilicho. As long as he was alive. He outwitted the designs of the Goths. But the jealous Romans poisoned the cars of Honorius and had Stilicho executed in 408. Stilicho's exit provided Alaric with an excellent opportunity to materialise his plans. He hurled a massive attack on Rome in 410. The eternal city witnessed for three days the worst scenes of slaughter, destruction, pillage and outrage. Alaric died in the same year. The first sack of Rome in 410 did not seal the doom of the Western Roman Empire. After the death of Alaric, the Visigoths

under their king Adolphus founded the Visigoth Kingdom in Southern Gaul and Northern Spain. Due to the heavy pressure of barbarians, the Romans released Britons from allegiance in 410. Thereafter the Picts, Scots, Saxons, Angles and Jutes occupied Britain and Ireland. The Vandals, a branch of the Gothic people, under their King Genseric (Gaiseric) crossed over Africa in 429 at the invitation of the Roman Governor of Africa, Boniface. Without much resistance, the province fell into the hands of the Vandals. However, Carthage fell into their hands only in 439.

The Huns under their king, Attila, the "Scourge of God" ravaged the Eastern Empire up to the gates of Constantinople in 446. He was bought off by the Fasten Roman Emperor by paying a handsome tribute. Having done enough mischief in the East to his heart's content, he stretched his gaze to the West. He entered Gaul and threatened the Western Empire. The Visigoths made common cause with the Romans. Under the leadership of Aetius, the able Roman general and Theodoric, the aged king of the Visigoths, Attila was defeated in the battle of Chalon's (Catalonian plains) in 451. But in the next year Attila invaded Northern Italy and completely destroyed and plundered many cities. It was mainly due to the intercession of Pope Leo that Rome was saved from the onslaught of Attila in 453. Attila withdrew and died. The saga of the struggle for existence of the Western Roman Empire still lingered on but was definitely drawing nearer to a close.

The execution of Aetius, the last of the able generals of Rome in 454 by Emperor Valentina III (425-455) was an injudicious act. Valentina himself was assassinated in 455. The rest of the emperors of the Western Empire were mere confirmed nullities and majesties of mockery. Murder of the Emperors a substitute to election had long since become the order of the day. Rome was sacked by the Vandals under their king Genseric in 455. Indiscriminate plunder of the city went on for fourteen days. Genseric returned to Carthage with an immense booty. The whole of Roman Africa now lay at the feet of Genseric. The substance of power had departed from the Emperors and it had passed on to the German tribes. When things were drifting from bad to worse, the last Emperor of the Western line Romulus nicknamed Augustus's (475-476) was deposed by Odoacer, a German barbarian general in 476 and thus the Western Roman Empire of the mighty Caesars came to an inglorious end. But Odoacer did not want to become the emperor. He rest contented himself with the title of the Patrician from the Eastern Roman Emperor.

On the debris of the Western Empire rose many barbarian kingdoms. Odoacer (476493) was the first barbarian King of Italy. They were given more freedom. Trade and commerce flourished. Before the rise of Rome, the Mediterranean region was a contending ground for endless wars and quarrels. These stood in the way of peace and prosperity of the country. But the Romans were able to ensure peace, order and good government in the country. The people enjoyed the blessings of Roman peace and prosperity. The Roman Peace (Pax Romana) was the greatest contribution of Rome for the cause of human progress.

In the international field, they taught the world the ideal of a world state. They emphasized the twin principles of unity and discipline. The Romans accomplished what the Greeks had failed to achieve, namely, political unity. The Romans spared no efforts but once the territories were brought to conquer new territories. Under the imperial sway, people of the newly conquered areas were as much made to feel themselves as part and parcel of the Roman tradition and culture as the Romans themselves. This went a long way to eradicate the artificial barriers. The Romans had no prejudice against colour or race, and the pageantries of Rome were enthusiastically celebrated all over the empire in a true spirit of common citizenship. It was this principle of unity that paved the way for the political unification of Italy and later sowed the seeds for establishing a great empire. The unity of the country was preserved by taking the conquered into confidence. Privileges and concessions were enlarged and given to all law-abiding citizens. Thus the conquerors completely absorbed the conquered. The Roman idea of political unity had profoundly influenced politicians and administrators of later generations whenever fissiparous tendencies raised their head. This Roman conception led the creation of the Holy Roman Empire in the middle Ages and formed the basis of international organisations like the League of Nations and the United Nations Organisation.

Government

The Romans developed a great genius for administration. They were not only great adventurists but backed up their efficiency in the battle field with proficiency in the art of administration as well. For over five hundred years, till its decay, a very large empire was closely gathered together by the administrative skill of the Empire. While one cannot expect the thoroughness of a modern government in an ancient state, the

Romans were undoubtedly efficient to maintain such a vast empire with the creation of a splendid administrative structure. There were regular officers to look after the various functions of the state. The Emperors were able to translate their ideals into realities largely due to the elaborate officialdom. The base of the government remained democratic as is evident from the very elective nature of the Emperors. Rome surpassed all her predecessors in governing a large empire. In the beginning the provinces were given independence in local affairs. But as time went on the powers were gradually taken over by the governor and his staff. The administration was highly centralised. Rome provided an outstanding example in ancient history of a republic. In the field of government the greatest contribution of Rome was the mixed constitution with its checks and balances. In the Roman Republic, the Consuls represented the monarchical element, the Senate the aristocratic element and the popular assemblies-the Comitia cu: iota and the Comitia centuries-the democratic element. Each had a controlling influence over the others and thus the balance of power was preserved. Spite of its drawbacks, the Republic served as a model for future empire-builders. The framers of the constitution of the U. S. A. and France turned to Roman history for borrowing republican ideas and examples. Modern republics have been influenced by Roman traditions. In choosing officers, modern democratic governments follow the Roman example of selection rather than the Athenian practice of selection by lot. The very words 'republic', 'liberty' and 'senate' are Roman terms. The titles of 'Imperator' and 'Princes' assumed by the Roman Emperors later on developed into 'Empire' and 'Prince'. Rome set an example for dictatorship too. Sulla, Pompey and Julius Caesar were great dictators of Rome.

Roman Law

The greatest contribution of Rome to posterity was her spleen did system of law. The Romans were the greatest law-makers of the past and their laws have profoundly influenced modern legal systems Greece developed constitutional law which became the basis of democratic form of government. Rome on her part developed civil and criminal law for safeguarding the property and life of the people. The earliest laws of Rome were simple and they were written down in 449 B. C. and engraved on twelve bronze sheets. They described crimes and punishments. The laws of the twelve Tables were meant for Roman city-state. But as Rome grew into an empire, the laws were enlarged. As time went on, the number of laws increased leading to much confusion among the judges. In the sixth century A.D., Justinian, a Roman Emperor (527-565

A.D.) classified all the Roman laws up to his time and codified them. The Justinian Code became the basis for the legal system ns of many European countries It was the Romans who developed what is called Jus Gentian of that law is Universal and that everybody should obey it.

They also developed the law of Nature of Jus Naturale' based upon reason. It is superior to man-made law which is expected to approximate the former. The development of this natural law has led to the abolition of slavery which was against reason. The doctrine of equality propounded by politicians is also based upon natural law. In the 17th cen.ury, it inspired jurists like Hugo Grotius to develop the idea of International Law. It would not be too much to say that "The Roma gave the world law".

Roman Art

Rome was not built in a day. The three allied arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting reached a high degree of excellence The Roman art was to a certain extent a continuation of the Hellenistic art. The Romans were mighty builders. Unlike the Greeks, the Romans were not slaves of tradition and worshippers of beauty. They subordinated beauty to the needs of the time. They erected mighty structures. A big amphitheatre, the Coliseum, was constructed with many arches. It was a mixture of Greek and Roman styles. The arch, dome and vault were the unique contributions made by the Romans in the field of architecture. The best specimen of the architecture of the period was Justinian's Church of Saint Sophia at Constantinople. The Pantheon, a temple dedicated to all the gods, stands as a monument of the engineering; skill of the Romans. They also constructed aqueducts, bridges and enduring roads. Rome". Though the roads were laid down with the object of easier and quicker marches for the army, they served as arteries for the spread of Roman culture. The reign of Augustus Caesar is considered as the golden age in the history of Rome attained a high degree of perfection. It is said that he found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble".

Roman Religion

It is also interesting to find that even while Rome was slipping in political supremacy it was destined to change the course of mankind nonetheless through the precious gift of Christianity. The ideal of universal brotherhood and love transmitted by Rome to the world dominates a major portion of mankind until now. Ever since Christianity became the state religion, it had grown from strength to strength .Though in

the early years of its existence Christianity was a persecuted faith, its subsequent growth was largely due to state patronage. In course of time, it began to fill the gap created by the disappearance of the Roman Empire. Ti served as a unifying force to hold together Europeans and others in the silken mesh of love and compassion. The story of medieval Europe was largely the story of the Church which received undivided veneration from all quarters in Europe.

Rome produced some of the finest specimens in prose, poetry and Cicero is considered as the creator of modern European drama. His works are a lively exposition of the life led by the prose. It was to the Romans during the latter days of the Republic. Writings of Cicero that the Renaissance scholars like Petrarch turned and drew inspiration. Livy and Tacitus are the Herodotus Livy's history of the Roman Republic and Thucydides of Rome. There is a saying that all roads lead to is a priceless contribution to historical literature. The work extols the virtues of Rome which made it great. Tacitus, in his work, exposes the vices which ultimately brought about the decline of Rome. Julius Caesar's 'Commentaries' supply valuable information about the Gallie wars. Men of less renown also contributed their Seneca's writings on mite to the development of Latin language. Moral philosophy has exercised a profound influence on morals and standards ever since. The Institution Oratoria' of Quintilian is a useful work on oratory and education. Pliny's Natural History including botany, geography, agriculture and various subjects is still considered as a useful work by modern scholars. Plutarch, a Greek teacher, wrote a series of biographies and they are still read with deep interest. The emperor, Marcus Aurelius in his 'Meditations' gave a classical exposition of Stoic philosophy Galen wrote on a variety of subjects, the most important of them being anatomy and medicine.

Even the Christian writings in the Latin language greatly enriched it. The Holy Bible was translated into the Latin language. The New Testament was produced in the first century. The 'City of God' written by St. Augustine is matchless contribution to Latin language and a peerless work in political philosophy. The reign of Augustus Caesar is considered as the golden age of Latin language and literature. The Romans achieved remarkable progress in the field of literature. The Latin language was greatly enriched and it became the basis of the languages of many states of Southern Europe and America. Works in the Latin language came in profusion and elevated it to the status of a classical language. Even the English language contains some Latin word The

Poems of Virgil, Horace, Lucretius and Ovid have greatly enriched Latin verse and profoundly influenced European poetry Virgil's Georgics is a pastoral poem depicting farm life in Italy. Virgil is better remembered for his epic poem 'the Aeneid' Dramas. Both tragedies and comedies were written by the Romans. Seneca wrote nine tragedies. The great writers of comedies of the period were Terence and Plautus. The legacy of Rome is vital and universal as that of Greece.

3. THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE

The history of the Byzantine Empire or the Eastern Roman Empire or the Later Roman Empire began in 330 A. D. when Emperor Constantine I founded it on the old city of Byzantium. Constantinople or "New Rome" became the new capital. First emperor of this Empire was undoubtedly Constantine was he who introduced Christianity in the empire. The other rulers till the division of the Roman Empire in 395, were Constantia's, Julian, Jovian, Valens and Theodosius I. It should be clearly borne in mind that these rulers were also the rulers of the Western Roman Empire. In 395, Theodosius I divided the Roman Empire between his two sons. The Western Empire was given to Honorius and the Eastern to Arcadius. Thenceforward, the West The Nika revolt was staged by the Greens and the Blues who had its own rulers till the fall of the Roman Empire in 476 and they were but two rival factions of the populace of Constantinople East had its own rulers till the fall of the Byzantine Empire in who always took sides in any chariot race or any public issue. In 1453the Byzantine rulers from 395 till the accession of Justinian the presence of Justinian in the hippodrome, the two rival factions and I in 527 were Arcadius, clashed in 532. Theodosius II, Marcian, Leo I, Leo It assumed dangerous dimensions resulting in 11, Zeno, Basiliscus, Zeno (again), Anastasius I and Justin I. disorders and outrages. They set fire to famous buildings.

JUSTINIAN I (527 565)

Early Life

Justinian the Great was born in 483 to Illyrian parents of peasant stock in Taurisium (near Skopje in Macedonia). He owed his rise to his Uncle Justin I who also belonged to peasant stock. From humble means Justin rose to high position in the army and. finally usurped the throne in 518. He brought his nephew to Constantinople and

gave him good education. During the rule of childless Justin, Justinian held high and important offices. In 525 Justinian was conferred the title Caesar. A few months before the death of Justin in 527, Justinian was made Co-emperor with the rank of Augustus. When Justin died in 527, Justinian became the sole Emperor. After Constantine the Great he was the most distinguished ruler of this empire. Justinian was an autocrat of the most absolute possible kind. He was "a shrewd politician, a tireless administrator, and a learned theologian. He was a clever judge of men, he lacked. Precision in judgment because he was swayed by his friends often he subordinated his judgment to that of his wife Theodora who exercised profound influence over him. Though he was "an ardent devotee of assassination and robbery at times, he was also a lover of pomp capable of generosity and lenience" and splendour. He had grandiose schemes and lofty ideals in his He prided much in the grandeur that was Rome himself resolutely to the task of restoring its ancient boundaries, and increasing its splendour, improving its law and administration All these aims were realised by him at and unifying the Church a huge cost which exhausted both the ruler and the ruled.

War against the Vandals of Africa

The immediate cause of the war with the Vandals was the overthrow of the pro-Roman Hilderic (523-530) in 530 by his cousin Gelimer (530-534). Belisarius, the able general of Justinian, was entrusted with the task of conquering Vandal Africa. Belisarius defeated Gelimer in 534. Thus the Vandal kingdom established by Gaiseric came to an end after a run of 95 years. Though the Vandal kingdom came to an end in 534 trouble was fomented by the mutiny of the troops and the raid of the Berber tribes. The conquest of the province was completed only in 548; and peace was restored. The Eastern Empire in Vandal Africa stretched from Tripoli to Caesarca (Cherchel) with Sardinia and Balearic Isles and included the distant outpost of Ceuta.

War against the Ostrogoths of Italy

The dismemberment of the Ostrogoths kingdom started after the death of Theodoric (493-526) in 526. (526-534), the grandson of Theodoric, ascended the throne with Young Athalaric his mother Amalasuntha as regent. After the death of Athalaric, Amalasuntha took as partner in government her cousin Theodohad (534-536). Theodohad had Amalasuntha murdered 535 for executing three Gothic nobles. But before her death, she had been negotiating with Justinian to surrender Italy into his hands. As the remonstrances of Justinian failed, he sent in 535 Belisarius to

accomplish the task. He captured Sicily in 535 and Naples in 536. In the meantime, the Goths themselves overthrew Theodohad and supplanted him with Witigis (536-540) who married Matasuntha, the sister of Athalaric. Belisarius entered Rome in 536 and took Ravenna in 540. Witigis was thrown into prison. But Gothic courage did not die with that. They found a worthy leader in Totila who unfurled the banner of revolt. He took Rome in 546. But he made an egregious blunder in leaving Rome in order to besiege Ravenna. In the meantime, Belisarius recaptured Rome. However, Totila again took Rome in 549 and practically the whole of Italy came under his sway. The attempt of Totila was the last flicker in the saga of the struggle to uphold Ostrogothic hegemony in Italy. But Totila was not able to hold on for a long time. He was defeated and killed by Narses, a eunuch leader, sent by Justinian in 553. The surviving Ostrogoths were allowed to quit Italy safely. Thenceforward the Ostrogoths had no national existence. The "Gothic war" was lasted for 18 years. It was a costly and empty victory. Had the Ostrogoths, been permitted to continue their rule, they would have prevented any barbarian invasions. But Justinian made a blunder in completely liquidating them.

Had they been permitted to continue their existence, the Lombards would not have occupied Italy. They would have deflected their course to the Balkan Peninsula and the Eastern Question would have assumed an easier form. The victory of Justinian was short-lived because three years after his death the Lombards occupied Italy in 568. War with the Visigoths Agila (549-554) the Visigothic king made an attempt to Visigothic jugate the semi-independent Andalusian nobles. Noble by name Athanagild sought the help of Justinian. Justinian sent an expedition in 550. Agila was defeated by Athanagild Agila died in that year itself and Athanagild (554-567) became the king. As the prize for Byzantine help, Athanagild yielded a portion of south-eastern corner of Spain to Justinian.

Persian Wars in 554.

Though Justinian was on the defensive in his wars with Persia. It was provoked by the Sasanians kings of Persia. With their eastern frontiers quiet, they wanted to penetrate into the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Religious and commercial clashes served as additional causes. The spread of Christianity to Lazica and Iberia in the Caucasus region further worsened the situation. The first war which was indecisive ended in the peace of 532. Justinian yielded great concessions like giving up his

protectorate over inland Iberia and paid a rich tribute. Chosrocs I, the new King of Persia, was an ambitious person. In $40 he hurled a massive attack on the Mediterranean, sacked and burnt down Antioch, the secondary capital. In 541 he captured the fortress of Petra on the Lazican coast. The war dragged on and it ended in a fifty years' peace made in 561. Christian Lazica was retained by Justinian. He had to pay an annual tribute of 30,000 gold coins. The wars of Justinian completely drained the treasury. The costly victories greatly ruined the empire. With the exception of Southern Italy, the newly conquered territories were lost to the Byzantine Empire within a century.

Religious policy

The intellectual life of the Eastern Empire was steeped more in theological speculations than in legal interpretations. Justinian was an orthodox Christian. The burning controversy during the time was about the nature of Christ. The orthodox view was that Christ has two natures, viz., and human as well as divine. But the monophysites laid emphasis on one nature only, viz., the divine or the divine and human fused into once. This view was widely prevalent in Armenia, Syria and Egypt. The Emperor's wife Theodora herself was a Monophysite. Lest these places in the cast would be lost to the empire, Theodora suitably advised her husband to show some toleration to the monophysites. Justinian ruthlessly suppressed Paganism. The University of Athens, the stronghold of Paganism, was abolished in 529. He else rooted out Arianism from Africa. He was both Caesar and Pope or he was the true representative of Caesaropapism. The religious policy of Justinian was a transcendent failure. He failed in his most important aim of bringing uniformity in the Church of the Roman Empire.

Administrative policy

Justinian had the peculiar knack of selecting the right type of people for the different offices. He was well-served by able ministers. He aimed at rooting out corruption in administration and increasing the revenues of the empire. Trade and industry flourished. Silkworms were first brought into the country during his rule. In order to centralise administration, he brought all offices under his direct control. He took steps forbidding the practice of buying and selling offices. He undertook works of public utility like the building of Churches, monasteries, aqueducts, bridges, orphanages, hostels, etc.

Justinian Code

Justinian's greatest title to fame rests on his work as a codifier and law-giver. The Roman law was in a state of utter confusion. There were many contradictions and inconsistencies. So he appointed a Commission consisting of ten members to select from among the numerous imperial ordinances issued from time to time by the various emperors those ordinances which were of practical value and least contradictory. Tribonian was an active member of this Commission. The Commission completed its work in 14 months. The result of its work was the Code, a simplified account of the statute law. The code was promulgated in 529. The next important work of Justinian was simplifying and digesting the writings of eminent jurists. For this purpose he appointed a Commission in 530 consisting of 16 lawyers under the famous lawyer Tribonian. The Commission completed its work in three years. The opinions of distinguished jurists were arranged in topical heads this was the Digest which was published in 533. For the use of students, Tribonian and two other lawyers prepared a little text-3 book containing the civil law. This book was known as Institutes, Four and a half years had passed since the publication of the Code and the Digest. In the meantime, Justinian had issued Tribonian and four other associates incorporated many laws. This in the Code and the Revised Code was promulgated in 534. Justinian issued many ordinances between 534 and 565. These new ordinances called Novels were subsequently promulgated. The Code, the Digest, the Institutes, and the Novels taken together are known by the name "Corpus Juris Civilis" (Body of Civil Law) of Justinian or called simply as "Justinian Code".

Art and Architecture

The reign of Justinian well deserves to be called the First Golden Age of Byzantine art and architecture. By the time Justinian came to power Pagan art had bid farewell. Despite its Roman roots a typical Byzantine style developed in the 6th century. This style was reflected not only in architecture but also in mosaics and ivory carving. The best specimen of the architecture of the period was the Church of St. Sophia or Hagia Sophia (Divine Wisdom) or Santa Sophia (Holy Wisdom) at Constantinople. The beauty of this majestic structure is seen in its dome. It is a delightful sight to see the play of sunlight against polished marble surfaces inside the Church. The other three Churches constructed by Justinian in Constantinople were the Saints Sergius and Bacchus, St. Irene and the Church of the Holy Apostles. The

Church of San Vitale constructed by Justinian in Ravenna is another piece of brilliant architecture reflecting Byzantine style the two celebrated mosaic figures of the portrait groups of Justinian and his Queen Theodora are depicted in San Vitale.

The Byzantine Empire after Justinian I.

The western conquests of Justinian I were short lived in a century after his death all the places were lost. In 568 the Avars and Slavs poured into the Lombards invaded Italy. During the incompetent rule of Phocas (602-610) the eastern provinces were lost to the Persians and the Bilkins and during the rule of Heraclius Greece to the Slavs and the Bulgars. (610.641) and his immediate successors, they recovered the Balkans and Greece from the Slavs and Bulgars. Heraclius recovered the But towards the close of Byzantine territory lost to the Persians. The reign, he was not able to face the surging tide of Islam. Arab Caliph Umar I (634-644) completed the conquest of Syria in 640. By 641 Egypt fell to the Arabs. The middle of the 7th century witnessed the loss of Syria, Palestine, Egypt and North Africa to the Arabs. The next important ruler was Leo III (717-741). During his rule, the Arabs under their General Maslamah laid siege to the city of Constantinople (716-717) for more than one year. But Leo forced him lift the blockade in 718. Thenceforward the centuries the Byzantine and the Muslim -long rivalry between Empires started. This rivalry can be compared with that between Rome and Persia. Leo III also repelled the attacks of the Arabs in Asia Minor. Great recovery took place during the rule of Basil II (976-1025). He captured the whole of Bulgaria and pushed the eastern frontier up to Antioch in the south and Manzikert in the north the year 1071 was fateful in the history of the empire. It was in that year that the Normans occupied Bari, the capital of Byzantine Southern Italy. It was also in that year that Romanus IV (1057-71) was defeated by the Seljuk Truks at Manzikert. The disaster at Manzikert served as a potent cause for the crusading movement in the sense that Byzantium was no longer recognized as a great power to check the onward march of the Muslims. The immense wealth of Byzantium was an eyesore to European powers. It was no wonder that during the Fourth Crusade (1204), the army of the Cross was mismanaged and Constantinople was plundered due to Frankish fanaticism and Venitian commercial ambitions. Byzantium rallied round the disaster and continued its precarious existence till 1453 when the last ruler Constantine XI (1449-1453) was defeated and killed by Mohammed II, the Sultan of the Ottoman Turks. Constantinople was captured in 1453. Thus the Byzantine Empire came to an end after a rule of 11

centuries. "Dying Byzantium passed on its imperial heritage to Moscow-The Third Rome".

Byzantine Culture

The reign of Justinian well deserves to be called the "First Golden Age of Byzantine art and architecture" His reign marked the passage from Pagan art to the typical Byzantine art. This new art was employed to propagate the Christian religion and to display the splendour of the state. St. Sophia in Constantinople still stands as a monument to the glory and fame of Justinian. The other Churches constructed by him were Saints Sergius and Bacehus, St. Irene (all in Constantinople) and San Vitale in Ravenna. Basil I (867 886) inaugurated what is called "Second Golden Age of Byzantine art and architecture". The best specimen of architecture of this late Byzantine style can be seen in the Cathedral of St. Mark in Venice. The other important Churches of the late Byzantine style are St. Luke's in Greece (11th century) and the Little Metropolitan Church in Athens (12th century). The interior of these later Byzantine Churches is lavishly coloured by mosaics or frescoes depicting the portraits of Jesus and others**.** The cause of education was well served by Byzantium. During the early period the universities of Alexandria, Athens, Constantinople and Antioch specialised respectively in medicine, philosophy, literature and rhetoric. The greatest original medical author of the period was Alexander. The Pagan mathematician and philosopher Hypatia was a notable figure during this period. Justinian put an end to pagan teaching. Thus the study of Greek philosophy came to an end. The centre of gravity in study then shifted from philosophy to religion and from Plato to Christ. Literature also made great progress. Priscian wrote a book on the pagan classics were copied by Latin and Greek grammar. The Eastern Church and transmitted to the people in the east. Outstanding literary work during this period was done by historians. Procopius, the legal adviser to Belisarius, was a great historian. Since the time of Heraclius the Latin language was replaced Universal histories, dictionaries, encyclopaedias, by the Greek anthologies, etc poured in profusion. During this period Leo distinguished in science, Photius in religious history and Psellus in philosophy. The Byzantine civilisation lasted for more than a thousand years. During this period it stood as the main bulwark of Europe against Persian and Muslim aggressions. It roused the intellectual life of the east by recopying and transmitting the ancient classics of Greece. Byzantium brought the barbarised Bulgars and Slavs to Christianity. While the

Western Roman Empire collapsed in 476 A.D., the Byzantine Empire withstood the test of time and came to an end at a much later time, in 1453 there were many reasons for this. Constantinople was the richest city in the world. The impregnability of the city of Constantinople for some time may be one of the reasons. Had the Islamic culture risen simultaneously with that of the Christian, the city would have fallen a little earlier. While a dozen barbarian codes created confusion and chaos in Western Europe, the Justinian Code maintained uniform law and order throughout Eastern Europe. The urban and semi-industrial character of the East was in striking contrast with the ruralism of the West. While Western Europe made up the shortage of soldiers with barbarians notorious for their vagaries, the East recruited a band of loyal soldiers from its province in Asia Minor. A halo- of divinity centred round the Emperor due to the spread of Christianity which in turn kept the subject people in awe and admiration well-organised bureaucracy afforded continuity and stability to the empire.

4. Rise and spread of Christianity

Christianity is one of the most important events of the World history. Rise and spread of Christianity had and continues to have its impact on the whole world. The early Roman religion had not offered any spiritual satisfaction to the Romans. The worship of Pagan Gods became boring and the Romans for a time 'sought comfort in Persian, Egyptian, and other Eastern religious cults and philosophies.'' Finally, Christianity offered them high spiritual satisfaction and great ideals to cherish. Christianity laid stress on fatherhood of god and brotherhood of mankind. Further. It taught people about human virtues like love, pity, kindness, truth, chastity and humour.

Life of Jesus Christ

The first books of the New Testament and the book of the acts give a vague and brief sketch of the life of Jesus. He was born a Jew at Bethlehem, a small village near Jerusalem, in 4 B.C. When Herod the Great was ruling Judea, His father as Joseph of Nazareth and his mother was Virgin Mary. Jesus was born at a time when the Jews were under Roman control and the corrupt rule of King Herod. They were eagerly expecting a promised Messiah who would deliver them from the Roman authority. Jesus lived in the small village-town of Nazareth for nearly for 25 years. As a bright boy he would understand and interpret Jewish texts. At that time Judaism and the

mosaic laws were being interpreted in different ways. Controversies abounded in Judaism itself. The life of Jesus came to be profoundly influenced by his cousin, john the Baptist. John the Baptist, as a great preacher, told his people that a Messiah would arrive to deliver them from sinful life. He baptised those who sincerely repented for their sins. As John became popular, the authorities became jealous and executed him. Jesus was also baptised by John in 26 A.D. After his Baptism Jesus started a new life, he became a wandering preacher. He spent the rest of his life in teaching about the fatherhood of God. He talked about the kingdom of god where there would be justice, love and kindness. He collected a band of followers. As he was preaching to the people of villages, he conveyed his messages in the form of parables. True to his teachings he led a very simple life and mixed freely with the poor. He always went to help those who were and oppressed. All his disciples recognised him as the Messiah and Jesus acknowledged his title. Some of his teachings called into question some of the Jewish laws. He urged them to follow their spirit. The popularity of Jesus caused alarm and suspicion. King Herod and the Pharisees condemned him as a "false prophet". In 30 A.D. Jesus visited Jerusalem on the occasion of Jewish Passover and gave opportunity to his enemies to hatch a plot to kill him. Unfortunately the Romans believed that his growing popularity was a cause of public disturbances. Jesus knowingly courted arrest when he assaulted the money-changers and traders in the temple. He celebrated his last supper with his disciples including Judas Iscariot the night before his death. When Jesus was praying in the garden of Gethsemane, the temple guard arrested him. Judas betrayed the identity of his master by kissing him on his cheek and thereby giving hint to the guard who was Jesus.

His Crucifixion

The Jews handed over the Jesus to the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate, and accused him of blasphemy. The Romans levelled the charge of treason. Jesus was executed by crucifixion along with two thieves at Golgotha. Gospels say those three days after his crucifixion Jesus raised from the dead, and forty days later was seen ascending to the heaven by his disciples. His followers called themselves as Christians. The followers of Jesus established Christianity based mainly upon his teachings.

Teaching of Jesus Christ

` While the Old Testament in the bible contains everything about Judaism, the New Testament includes the life and teachings of Jesus. Jesus taught that god is the creator of the universe and mankind. He is all merciful and kind to one and all. He further said that men should live like brothers and be devoted to God. Sinners should repent and beg God's mercy. Men should develop noble character by doing good deeds. Jesus insisted that people should do good to even those who did bad things to them. He said forgiveness is a great virtue. While being nailed to the cross, he said, ''Father forgive them for they know not what they do.'' He asked his followers to desire wealth and other comforts for life. To the poor and suffering he promised the kingdom of God where there would be justice, love and plenty. He asked his followers to develop Christian virtues like brotherly love, compassion, righteous living, meekness and humanity. The spiritual message of Jesus to his followers is given in the form of a sermon-the Sermon on the Mount. Christ was crucified, but after his Resurrection his teachings were very gladly accepted by the people. His most important teachings were: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God. Blessed are they who are persecuted for the sake of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." New Testament and Old Testament give more information about Christianity and life of Jesus Christ. The Holy Bible is the Sacred Book of Christians. Christianity contributed significantly to social, economic and cultural life of the people of the world all over. Its teachings had their own impact and influence and the whole world is indebted to Christianity for giving the followers a sense of unity and also for raising moral life of the people.

5. THE FRANKISH KINGDOM

1. THE MEROVINGIANS

The Franks were a set of Germanic People. The two large tribes of the Franks were the Salians and the Ripuarians of these two got sub-divided and established many smaller kingdoms, each under a chief. By the third century, the Franks served as

soldiers in the Roman armies. In course of time, some of the Frankish kingdoms were accepted as federate allies to extend their support in frontier defence. It was in the fifth century that the Franks established their power in Northern Gaul Franks under their leader Merovich came to the succour of Actius in his war against the Huns in 451. The descendants of Merovich came to be known as Merovingian. After his death in 456, his son Childeric I became the king. He served as the most important ally of the Gallo-Romans in Northern Gaul. He died in 481. The conquest and consolidation of Gaul was left to his son Clovis (481-511), who became king when he was only 15 years old with him that the history of the Merovingian as a national dynasty. He overthrew Syagrius; the Roman ruler of North really begins. All the cities north of the Loire Gaul near Soissons in 486 stretching up to the frontiers of Brittany and Burgundy lay at his feet within two or three years. In 493 he married Clotilda, the Catholic princess of Burgundy. His conversion to Catholicism in 496 was a master-stroke of diplomacy He conquered Alsace and the valley of the Main. In 507 he launched a massive attack on the Visigoths. Alaric II, the Visigoth king, died in the battlefield at Vougle in Poitiers. Toulouse, the capital city of the Visigoths, was burnt. Clovis captured Angouleme, Saintes, Bordeaux and Tours. As a result of this expedition, the addition to his kingdom extended from Aquitaine to the Pyrenees. He also returned with an immense booty. After the death of Clovis in 511, his vast kingdom was divided among his four sons each retaining a part of Gaul north of the Loire and south of it. The four sons-Theodoric I (511-534), Chlodomir (511-524), Childebert (511-553) and Chlotar I (511558) ruled the four parts with headquarters respectively at Rheims, Orleans, Paris and Soissons. Though they were disunited they made Common cause against external foes. To avenge the ill-treatment of his sister Chrotilda (wife of Amalaric, the Visigothic king, Childebert of Paris undertook an expedition in 531. Raided main territorial divisions arose. They were Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy. The nobles also gained an upper hand in these territories. During the reign of Chlotar II (584-629), he created one Mayor of the palace in each of the three territories. Each Mayor became the Chief administrative officer of the king and the leader of the nobles. Soon the Mayor of Austrasia became the most important.

THE CAROLINGIANS

The Franks had the custom of dividing the kingdom among the sons of the ruler. Naturally this led to feuds and constant quarrels and jealousies. Dagobert (629-639)

was perhaps the last Merovingian ruler who took his duties in right earnestness. After his time Neustria, Austrasia and Burgundy became separate kingdoms in spite of the fact that they were subject to one king. While no doubt there were kings, the actual power was exercised by the Mayor of the Palace'. Naturally there was a scramble for power among the nobility to become the Mayor so that real power could be wielded by them. Austrasia took the lead and Pepin II (680:714) became the Mayor. Pepin consolidated his position in Austrasia by a victory over Neustrian Mayor at Tertry near St. Quentin. During his time the position of the Mayor was exalted He gathered the Franks together and this new lead was called "the He divided Carolingian Rising". He gave unity to the nobles. the kingdom among his boy grandsons making them mayors of different places under the regency of his widow Plectrudis Charles Martel However, Charles the Bold (719-741) or Charles Martel Neustria and pled power and became the Mayor of Austrasia. Burgundy came under his authority and Aquitaine became his vassal duchy. By holding together the Frankish territories are decided to infuse order where chaos had reigned. He was careful enough to appoint trusted friends to counties and churches had extraordinary strength and courage; hence the name Martel It was after this Charles (the hammer) was appended to Charles that the dynasty was called Carolingians. He realised the danger when the Duke of Aquitaine posed by the Muslims of Spain requested his aid against the thrust of Spanish Muslims in Southern Gaul, Charles defeated the Arab forces under their Governor.

Abdur Rahman sometimes referred to as the battle of Tours was killed in the battlefield and the Arabs withdrew beyond the Pyrenees. It was this battle which won for Charles the title "Martel" or "Hammer". The significance of this victory can hardly be exaggerated. At a time when there was no sufficient unity among the various tribes of Europe, Muslim incursions would in the traditional fashion, have completely changed Europe. Chartes divided his kingdom between his two sons, Carloman and Pepin the Short. Carloman was assigned Austrasia and the East, and Pepin, Neustria, Burgundy and the West. Pepin lil the Short (741-768) In 747 Carloman abdicated and became a monk. So, Pepin became the Mayor of the entire Frankish kingdom. Both the brothers had earlier restored Childeric III (743-751) of the Merovingian line to be the ruler. In course of time, Pepin' decided to hold the regal authority rather than acting as the first executive of the king. His valuable support to the Church of Rome in its hour of threat enabled him to obtain kingly title and status. In 751 at Soissons under the

authority of the Pope, Childeric III was deposed and Pepin was made King. Now he was the 'anointed one'. His service to the Church was significant. In different parts of the kingdom religious councils were held and the king tried his best to avoid corruption and malpractices in the Church He liberally endowed the Churches. The Lombards had been harassing the Pope. The King had insisted upon poli tax from the Romans as he was their overlord.

The appeal of Pope Stephen evoked a deep response in the heart of Pepin. Pepin attacked the Lombards and forced them to remain subdued. These territories lying in the Romagna and the Marches were conferred on the Pope in 756. This came to be known as the "Donation of Pepin". This was the beginning of the papal temporal power. The papal temporal rights thus began to take shape for this intervention, the Pope anointed Pepin and his two sons Charles and Carloman he crowned himself with the famous 'Iron crown' of the Lombards. Spoleto was added to the papal authority. He confirmed the "Donation of Pepin". He assumed the rights to protect the temporal powers of Rome. His child Pepin was nominally made the Viceroy and entrusted with all the administration of Italy, excepting the papal possessions. Italian conquest of Charles prevented the union of Italy under the Lombards.

Saxony

Charles had always entertained hopes of bringing the whole of the Germanic territory under his control. This was partly due to his racial pride and partly also due to his intense desire to Christianise the heathen population of Germany. At that time his work involved an extension of direct authority over Saxony this was not an easy task because the fiercely warlike people of Saxony would not easily submit themselves to the complete authority of Charles. He turned his attention towards quelling them by king on a series of wars. These wars began early in his reign from 772 and lasted till 804. As the Patrician of Rome and a devout Christian, Charlemagne compelled the conquered people to embrace Christianity on pain of death In fact on one occasion as many as 4500 people were put to death for refusing to become Christians Eventually Saxony was annexed to his kingdom.

Spain

An opportunity came to Charlemagne to deal with the Spanish lands held by the Caliphate. There were two divisions in the Caliphate itself the Abbasids and the Umayyad. Charles was pampered by Ibn al-Arabi, the Barcelonan governor. His

incursions in 777 met with little success In fact his forces suffered much in Navarre.) But it opened the way for further concerted, effort by Charlemagne. It was in 795 that he was able to obtain Spanish March-a small territory in North east Spain.(The conquest of Spanish March heralded the beginning of Christian Spain and the basis for Christian re-conquest of Spain.

Bavaria

Bavaria had owed allegiance to the Carolingian family. But the Duke of Bavaria, Tassilo, wavered in his allegiance. He was brought to his senses. He lost his duchy in 788.

Other Campaigns

To make his south-eastern frontier more secure, Charles came into strategic grips with the Avars, settled in the middle plain of the Danube. The Avars harassed the surrounding Slav tribes, with the result that the Slavs became uncertain neighbours of the Franks. So Charles broke the defence of the Avar cavalry by conducting a series of campaigns against them between 791 and 803. A defensive march was set up at Carinthia to check their evil designs. Steps were also taken to baptize the Slavic and Germanic settlers who returned to these outlying regions. Even the leader of the Avars was converted to the Christian faith in 305 and taken to the custody of Charlemagne. In the north-eastern frontier, he drove back the Slavs settled on the other side of the river Elbe. He strengthened Frankish authority over Aquitaine. Charlemagne was not able to bring the Celts of Brittany under his subjection. The menace of the Vikings or the Northmen or Norsemen of Scandinavia was serious. Though fortifications were erected to arrest the penetration of the Vikings, it was of no avail. Charlemagne was forced to be on the defensive in his dealings with the Vikings. His empire extended from the Elbe to beyond the Pyrenees and from the North Sea to Central Italy. Venice and Southern Italy belonged to the Byzantine Empire.

Holy Roman Emperor

The extraordinary growth of Frankish Carolingian power in the first twenty-five years of Charlemagne's rule was viewed with awe and pride by the Church. e had been a devout Christian and did much to the propagation of Christianity. His victories in Saxony and Bavaria we e given a religious colour as well. There was as yet no conflict between the Greek Byzantine Empire and the Empire of Charlemagne. Charlemagne had been the Patrician of Rome and the Popes would only be too happy to elevate him

to be the head of the whole of the temporal Christendom. There could, however, be no two 'Emperors of Christendom since Byzantine power had remained intact. An opportunity arose when Irene, the Empress of the Byzantine Empire imprisoned her son Constantine VI and assumed full powers. Her cruel deposition and imprisonment of her own son caused great disappointment a: the papal headquarters. Leo I had become the Pope in 795. His authority was questioned by the kinsmen of the preceding Pope; Hadrian I. Wild rumours slandering the new Pope reduced him to the position of a fugitive. He turned-to Charlemagne, his temporal superior. Charlemagne was decidedly in favour of safe guarding the prestige of the Pope. When physical attack was mounted on the Pope, the Frankish representatives took the Pop: under their protection. Charlemagne received the Pope in Aacher. In 800 he escorted the Holy Father back to Rome and expelled the opponents. On Christmas Day the Pope placed on the head of Charlemagne a golden crown and the crowd acclaimed "to Charles Augustus, crowned by God, the great and peace-bringing Emperor of the Romans, life and victory". From the Patrician of Rome, Charles thus became the Holy Roman Emperor. Jerusalem had sent a few days earlier the keys of the Holy Sepul. Though the papal honour had been accorded for the new Western Emperor, Charlemagne preferred to maintain the best relations with the Byzantine Empire. In 811 Michael who came to the Byzantine throne recognised Charles as Co-Emperor when the latter agreed to his claims over Venice and Southern Italy Though the title of 'Holy Roman Emperor' would be honoured for a thousand years, the descendants of Charles lost many territories in a very short time.

The crowning of Charlemagne by Pope Leo III had far reaching religious and political consequences political creation, the focus of political theory in the Middle Ages It was the first It expressed in a secular institution the unity of Christendom as did the Papacy in the Christian Church".

Importance of the Coronation

The coronation increased the prestige and power of Papacy It strengthened the hands of Charlemagne against baronial opposition. As he was elevated to the position of vice-regent of God on earth, it greatly helped to advance the divine right theory of king ship. The coronation widened the gulf between the Greek and Latin Church. The centre of gravity of political power shifted from the Mediterranean to Northern Europe. There was no doubt about the theocratic approach of Charlemagne to

kingship. But he did that in an age when an aura surrounded the religious sanction. However, the master of Europe never had in mind the notion that one day papal claims on this precedent would lead to a conflict between the Church and the State. The moot question whether Christendom was an empire or a Church drifted to a dispute which raged in all its fury throughout the Middle Ages had its beginning in the reign of Charlemagne.

Administration

It is rare in the history of Europe that a great conqueror was also acclaimed a great administrator. Charlemagne had conducted more than 50 major campaigns in his rule of 46 years. After the fashion of the Franks he was immensely happy on a horseback and considered a summer wasted if there were no campaigns However, his extraordinary energy revelled more in the craft of administration than in the art of warfare. He ruled over an extensive empire with headquarters at Aachen from Crown lands. Wars brought bountiful booties. Revenue from judicial fines, tolls, gifts and tributes filled the Imperial coffers Income was also derived from rivers, forests, mountains and minerals. But the expenses of the government were many the host of officers had to be paid for. Horses had to be purchased and maintained at considerable expense in this government which heavily relied on this animal. Military operations entailed huge expenditure. Donations to the Church and benefices to vassais considerably drained the treasury. The very vast and scattered royal buildings required constant maintenance. Newer palaces meant greater expenditure Extensive patronage of education proudly undertook by Charlemagne added to the expenses. For administrative convenience, he divided the country into districts. Each district consisted of about six to ten counties. The marches or frontier districts like Spanish March were entrusted to dukes or margraves, who ruled over several counties. The counties were sub-divided into hundreds. But in other places it roughly corresponded to a bishop's diocese. Each county was put in charge of a Count to look after secular matters and a Bishop, spiritual matters. The Counts looked after administrative; judicial. The king was the fountain-head of all authority. He combined in his person all authority and ruled as a virtual autocrat. Under them were subordinate officers called and military affairs the vicars. To act as a check on the autocratic tendencies of the ruled with the assistance of household officers like Seneschal, the Count, the Emperor sent round Missi Dominici or envoys of the Butler, the Marshal,

Chamberlain, Counts of the Palace in charge master. The Missi Dominici was drawn from the ranks of counts of the administration of justice, and the head of the Chancery and bishops. A Missi Dominici consisted of two persons-a count as the king moved from place to who was always an ecclesiastic and a bishop, the king dispensed place, the court also moved with him. They were expected to make annual visits to a number of counties and hear complaints of the people of the justice, heard appeals, issued royal orders, settled land-disputes locality against the bishop and the count. There was no difficulty for and laid down the norms for faxes. In the process the subjects to gain access to the King's ears. For counsel he redressed the grievances of the people and rectified the wrongs turned to his trusted friends consisting of nobles and ecclesiastics. They also communicated the royal orders to the local officials. But he was not bound by their advice. As later events proved, this way the Missi Dominici acted as a link between the central Kings himself decided the course of action in almost all matters of government and the local government. Charles himself toured throughout the country and stood as the champion of justice and peace. Wisdom and energy of the king alone could not withstand a vast empire without adequate economic resources. As the king himself was the largest land-owner in the land, revenue poured, the institution of Missi dominici with sweeping powers replete with instances when civilisations are toppled down by nomadic tribes. Three important tribes to make their incursions into the Carolingian kingdom were the Vikings (the Norsemen) from the North, the Magyars (Hungarians) from the East and the Saracens (Muslims) from the South. Their attacks posed serious "threats to civilisation and Christianity" The Vikings were known by different names in different places. In England they were known by the name Danes, in Gaul by the name Northmen and in Germany by Eastmen. They were also known by the name Norsemen.

The Vikings.

The Vikings or Northmen or Norsemen hailed from the three Scandinavian countries of Norway, Denmark and Sweden. In the beginning they were traders. But later on they became raiders. "The term Viking given to men who sailed on raids at home or abroad means one who haunts a bay or inlet or creek (Vik) as a base for this kind of warfare" Love of war and of booties goaded them on to undertake tedious and hazardous enterprises. The Viking raids were a regular feature throughout the first half of the eighth century. Even Charles the Great tried to use much of his resources to

keep these people at bay. Even though he made defensive arrangements at Boulogne and Ghent and fortified the mouths of the rivers, he was not able to arrest the penetration of the Vikings. He was to be on the defensive in his dealings with the Vikings. From 834 the thrust of the Vikings in the Frisian coast of Francia became uncontrollable: During the rule of Louis the Pious, they effectively controlled the mouths of the Loire, Seine and the Rhine. The kings resorted to paying tributes and bribes to ward off these hordes. Their plundering raids in 844 in Spain from Cadiz to Cordoba were crowned with they became emboldened and began to attack great success. Paris at repeated intervals. In 857 Paris, Chartres and Blois were all sacked and burnt. Charles purchased peace from the Northmen Vikings by paying bribes and huge ransoms, became established settlers at the mouths of the Somme, Seine, Loire and Garonne. When Paris was besieged by the Northmen. The defence of the city was ably conducted by, Odo, the Count of Paris from 835 to 885 Charles the Fat did not offer to fight the hordes but offered a heavy bribe and a free hand to them to loot Burgundy. The Viking Rollo became a convert to the Christian faith. He also became a faithful vassal of the French king. The significance of this settlement can hardly be exaggerated. The Norsemen now had come to stay. The Gallo Roman blood mixed with Norsemen spirit and the fusion infused a new spirit and fresh outlook. The Northmen of Normandy became the Normans. The Normans conquered England in 1066 completed the conquest of Southern Italy in 1071 and Sicily in 1091.

The Vikings did not spare England and Ireland. The Norsemen merrily plundered Ireland. The Danish invasion of England started during the time of Egbert (802-839). The Danisi rule in England came to an end in 1042. By this time, the Danes completely got absorbed in the social fabric of the country. It was the Normans of Normandy under William the Conqueror who laid the foundation of the Norman dynasty in England in 1066.

The Magyars

Another tribe that caused terror in the minds of the people was the Magyars (Hungarians). This tribe was a warlike clan noted for its cruelty. They were probably a mixture of Huns and Turks (who belonged to the Mongol race). They were excellent horsemen. The confused political situations fired their imagination and ambition. From the last quarter of the ninth century, they began their regular incursions. Ukraine was their base during these years and in 889 they conducted raids

in Bessarabia and Moldavia. In the closing years of the 9th century under the inspiring leadership of Arpad, the systematic conquest of Hungary was attempted and mostly succeeded not content with a settled life; they chose to sack Italy and indulged in slaughter and destruction. They were a great scourge to mankind

King Berengar, however, mustered a large force of 15000 but sustained a crushing defeat at 899 at Brenta at the hands of the hordes. The Magyar raids became a regular feature ruining the economy and paralysing the administration. The kings and local chieftains were unable to stem the tide of Magyar onrush. Henry the Fowler defeated them in the battle of Unstrut in 933. Otto the Great won a decisive victory over the Magyars in the battle of Lechfeld fought in 955. The victory marked the end of Hungarian raids. It was this victory that won for Otto, the title "Great". Finally the Magyars embraced Christianity and reconciled themselves to the lot of a settled life.

The Saracens

The Saracens (a term attributed to Arabs and Turks in particular and Muslims in general) invaded France during the time of Charles Martel. When the Duke of Aquitaine requested his aid against the thrust of Spanish Muslims in Southern Gaul, Charles defeated the Arab forces under their Governor Abdur Rahman in a pitched battle at Poitiers in 732. This battle is also sometimes referred to as the battle of Tours. Abdur Rahman was killed in the battlefield and the Arabs withdrew beyond the Pyrenees. It was this battle which won for Charles the title "Martel" or "Hammer". The significance of this victory can hardly be exaggerated. At a time when there was no sufficient unity among the various tribes of Europe, Muslim incursions would have completely changed Europe.

Saracen power in Africa had grown even during the time of Charles the Great. With the death of Charles the Great, a new boldness and daring enabled them to capture Corsica, Sardinia, the Balearic Islands, Candia Sicily and Malta. They even managed to impose their authority in the Duchy of Beneventum. Rome, too, faced a grave peril and the resolute Pope Leo IV was able to muster sufficient forces to defeat the advance of the Saracens by a victory at Ostia in 849. Provence and Dauphire, however, were not spared by the Saracens. They were, however, driven out from their establishments on the coast of Provence by about 972. Their sporadic but terrific thrusts in Southern Italy continued till the reign of Otto III. They were finally driven out from Sicily and Southern Italy by the Normans in the 11th century. While

the Norsemen and the Magyars embraced Christianity, the Saracens struck to their faith as firm as the rock of Gibraltar.

THE CAROLINGIAN DECLINE

It has been well remarked that only a second Charlemagne would have ruled intact his vast empire with tact and firmness. Unfortunately the successors of Charlemagne were not equal to the task of protecting such a great Empire. The unwieldy nature of the Empire was one of the causes for the decline of the Empire. The traditional practice of the Frankish kings to divide the kingdom among their sons was another cause for the dismemberment. The successors of Charlemagne were weak from the North, the Magyars from the East and the Saracens from The coming of the Vikings the South was another potent cause for the dissolution, development of Feudalism and the growth of the Church were also contributing factors to the decline counts and local rulers asserted their independence. Under weak rulers the civil wars among the claimants to throne disrupted the unity of the frequent the country and served as a potent cause for the liquidation of the Empire.

Louis the Pious (813-840)

Charlemagne nominated his son Louis the Pious as co-emperor in 813. After the death of Charlemagne in 814, Louis became the sole Emperor. His sense of justice was remarkable. His firm resolve to infuse great discipline among the clergy also raised many problems for him. In 817 he decreed at Aachen the Rule for conduct of clergy but did not possess the energy to enforce the same. While external relations with other powers continued as of past, quarrels with his own sons regarding the division of the Empire set the ball of disintegration rolling. Civil war ensued. Louis was imprisoned in 833 People and nobles were unhappy that so good a king should have been cruelly treated. He was restored in 834 He forgave his sons for their rebellion. Louis died in 840.

Treaty of Verdun (843)

By the scramble for power among his sons Lothar, Ludwig (Louis the German) and Charles the Bald began, Though Lothar was the emperor; his rule did not go unchallenged. The two brothers Charles and Ludwig were not happy with a subordinate position shown by the new emperor. They forgot mutual jealousies, came together and defeated Lothar at Fontenoy in 841. The Treaty of Vercun, the three brothers agreed to a partition 843. The empire of Charlemagne was divided among

the three rulers. It is remarked that "the history of modern Europe is an exposition of the treaty of Verdun". Lothar (840 855) who was recognised as Emperor got a narrow strip of territory between the Rhine and the Rhone extending from the Mediterranean to the North Sea. It consisted of Italy, Provence, most of Burgundy, a part of Austrasia, and Frisia. Louis the German (840-876) got the eastern part between the Rhine and the Elbe consisting of Bavaria. Swabia, part of Austrasia, Saxony and Thuringia. Chartes II the Bald (843-877) (Emperor 875 77; was assigned the western part of the empire consisting of Neustria, small part of Burgundy, Spanish March and Aquitaine. The kingdom of Louis the German anticipated Germany and that of Charles, France.

THE CAROLINGIAN RENAISSANCE

The Carolingian political scene witnessed instability after the death of Charlemagne. But the spirit of learning induced by the exemplary efforts of the great ruler continued for a long time. The revival in art, architecture and letters is often referred to as the Carolingian Renaissance. There is a great difference between the Renaissance that took place about the same time in the Byzantine Empire and that of the Carolingian renaissance. The Byzantine revival was the product of a mature civilisation of a people who were already enjoying a higher sense of values trying to evolve new norms and ideals. The Carolingian Renaissance by contrast was the birth of a new spirit among an almost unlettered people trying to find values in old Latin and Greek, besides enriching the newly-gotten gem of education. The new movement considerably paved the way for literacy movement in the western part of Europe and this formed the basis for subsequent development of education and culture in the middle Ages. Education

The decline of the state patronage to education ever since the decline of Western Europe after 476 greatly undermined the intellectual activities for hundreds of years. In fact only a handful of monasteries were having the tradition of imparting education, of preserving and transmitting the intellectual tradition of the past to the present. The general majority of the people were steeped in superstition, illiteracy and ignorance. Life was lived in bare contentment of material pleasures to the neglect of finer values. Reading and writing was unknown to a greater part of the population. Charlemagne was shocked at the disturbing state of affairs. By his far-sightedness and cultured outlook, he thought that the only remedy lay in spreading

education under extensive royal patronage. He laid down the rule that every cathedral must have a school for laity and clergy. Monastery and expressed his desire through a capitulary to throw open the portals The Emperor of knowledge to everyone emphasis on an educated clergy, particularly at the village level, including the artisan class according to Charlemagne would lead to widespread appreciation of learning and intellectual pursuits. Thought his ideas could not mature immediately, he was happy to note that good progress was made in his own lifetime not only by the lower orders of the clergy but by the new generation of learners. In fact he chastised the rich Sons of nobility for their indifference to education. Thus cathedral and monastic schools sprang up throughout the country. A capitulary of Charlemagne exhorted the directors of these schools to take care to make no difference between the sons of serfs and of freemen, so that they might come and sit on the same benches to study grammar, music and arithmetic". The Palace school of Charles at Aachen in which his sons, nobles and others studied acted as a great centre of learning. Charlemagne invited teachers from England and Italy to impart good education. Among the foreign scholars mention must be made of Peter, the grammarian, and Paul the deacon, the historian of the Lombards who came from Italy. Theodulf the Visigoth and Agobard both from Spain and Alcuin from England. Among the foreign scholars, Alcuin who headed the Palace school at for many years was undoubtedly the greatest.

Greek work into Latin.

His great work "De divisione naturae" (On the Division of Nature) was "an attempt to reconcile Christianity with Greek philosophy" Special mention must be made of Benedict (e. 751-821), who established a monastery at Aniane in Aquitaine based on the rule of St. Benedict of Nursia. This became a famous centre of learning and the norms of learning laid down here were models for further development in this field. Fulda in Franconia, Corvey in Saxony. St. Gall, Reichenau, Liege, Lyons were all Benedictine abbeys disseminating knowledge and also allowing exchange of different cultural heritages. During the period of Charles the Bald, many abbeys came up which larges the intellectual activities of the seekers of knowledge. if to vie with these monastic schools, cathedral schools in Rheims, Orleans and Metz were also attracting the attention of educated The schools were also rise Europe as centres of higher learning possible for dispelling pagan beliefs and general superstitious

vestiges of the past. Such indeed were the guidelines provided for them by the capitulary of Charlemagne. The Carolingian script called the Caroline minuscule (of which the present Roman type is an offshoot) replaced the hitherto crude form of script prevalent in Western Europe.

Arts

Much attention had been bestowed on the development of music during the Carolinigan Renaissance. The reason was religious need and inspiration. Charlemagne had decreed that the clergy should have good knowledge of "Roman Chant" that purpose being to ensure uniformity throughout the empire in rendering songs in Churches. The music of the period is said to be a fusion of "oriental tradition with Greco Roman music". It was a long way to notation-system of modern times but writing of music indicating voice-fluctuations began during this period. Musica Enchiriadis written by Hucbald, a monk of St. Amand explained the modes of the Church music. This largely formed the basis for uniformity in subsequent times. "The golden age of liturgical chanting of mass and office, with the year-long communal meditation on the mysteries of the life of Christ, had come" influences to be In architecture, there were three broad In the first place the noticed in the Carolingian Renaissance. Original or innate taste of the barbarians (now turning towards a Christian life) could not be completely erased. Secondly, keeping in with the desire to re-discover Greco-Roman values in the field of education, efforts were made in architectural glories to bring the third important one was the out the best of such tradition. Influence exerted by Eastern contacts oriental as well as Byzantine, There was undoubtedly though Byzantine models predominated a blending of these influences in architecture.

The Carolingian times did not have the need for such importing public places like the Roman "carved capitals and colonnaded halls". Their need was for ornamentation of Church which In architectural styles the Romans or Greeks had no need at all of buildings and Churches and palaces, therefore, we find a desire to imitate Roman style but no model was available for the particular needs. However, Byzantine came to the rescue of the Carolingian imagination for excellent models for Churches, dome, many-coloured marbles and mosaic decoration" characterised St. Sophia was the pride the Byzantine Churches of any size of Byzantine in church architecture culminating in the works at Ravenna and Rome. The royal palace at

Aachen was largely Charlemagne also erected modelled after St. Vitale at Ravenna. The mosaic works, carved palaces at Ingelheim and Nijmegen, ivory works and palaces on the pattern of Roman villas were some Particular men of the niceties taken from Byzantine influence must be made of the art of painting illuminated tablets on the walls of the Churches. They served to explain the sequences throughout from the life of Jesus and important quotations. Europe this type of work excelled in number and quality. Though sculpture was not greatly developed by the Carolingian artists, the paintings, mosaic floorings, illuminated glass-work and the minute icons testify to their artistic appetite. It is true that we do not find imposing buildings after the Roman patterns."There was trans mitted from Pagan antiquity the sense of grandeur and the sense of humanity".

The spread of Islam

Islam- Prophet Muhammad

The story of Islam starts with the prophet Muhammad. However, Islam rose in a certain historical and geographical context. What was Arabia like before Muhammad and the rise of the Islamic religion? The Arabian Peninsula was originally the home of nomadic peoples who coped with the desert climate by migrating every season ("Arab" roughly translates as "desert dweller"). When some people groups began to establish settlements around the fifth century BC, many chose Mecca, near the west coast of Saudi Arabia, as their home. It did not offer a favourable climate or many natural resources, but it was the site of the Ka'ba, a large cubical shrine dedicated to various deities. The religion of the Arab world before the advent of Islam was an animistic polytheism. It was believed that the desert was populated with fiery spirits called jinn. Numerous gods were worshipped as well, with most towns having their own patron god. Mecca soon became the religious centre, with 360 shrines, one for each day in the lunar year. Local merchants depended heavily on pilgrims to these shrines for their livelihood, a fact which would become significant for Muhammad.

His Early Life

Arab polytheism was focused entirely on the earthly life, and religion was not a source of morality. By Muhammad's time, blood feuds, violence, and general immorality abounded. Yet monotheism was not unheard of among the Arabs. There was contact with Zoroastrianism, which was the official state religion of Persia from the 3rd century B.C. to the 8th century A.D. and influential on its neighbours. It was

a dualistic religion with beliefs in heaven, hell and a final judgment. In addition, both Judaism and Christianity had established a presence on the Arabian Peninsula, especially in the south. In Yathrib (later renamed Medina), the Jewish population was especially influential. Even among the innumerable deities of Arabian polytheism was a god who was more impressive than the rest. Allah (Arabic for "the god") was "the creator, provider and determiner of human destiny," and "he was capable of inspiring authentic religious feeling and genuine devotion" (Smith, 225). In general, Allah was regarded as the greatest among the many gods deserving worship, but one contemplative sect, the hanifs, worshiped Allah exclusively. It was into this world of sporadic monotheism and rampant immorality that Islam was born. Upon the death of Muhammad, his followers were faced with the decision of who should take his place as the leader of Islam. This leadership position was called the kalifa, which means "deputy" or "successor" in Arabic.

The Umayyad family established a system of hereditary succession for the leader of the Muslim world. Mu'awiya assumed this position for the first 20 years of the Dynasty's rule. Under the Umayyad, the Islamic Empire spread to North Africa, Spain and central Asia. Abbasid was the 158 dynastic names generally given to the caliphs of Baghdad, the second of the two great Sunni dynasties of the Muslim empire that overthrew the Umayyad caliphs. The Ottoman Empire was founded by Osman I (in Arabic Uthman, hence the name Ottoman Empire). As sultan Mohamed II conquered Constantinople (Istanbul) in 1453, the state grew into a mighty empire.

Five Pillars of Islam

The Five Pillars of Islam (Arabic arkan -ud-Din, "pillars of the faith") are the five religious duties expected of every Muslim. The five pillars are mentioned individually throughout the Qur'an and Muhammad listed them together in the Hadith when he was asked to define Islam. a. Confession of faith (shahada) the first of the Five Pillars of Islam is the shahada. Shahada is the Muslim profession of faith, expressing the two simple, fundamental beliefs that make one a Muslim: La ilaha illa Allah wa-Muhammad rasul Allah. There is no god but God and Muhammad is the prophet of God. b. Ritual prayer (salat) Perhaps the most well-known Muslim practices among non-Muslims is ritual prayer, or salat, which is performed five times a day: at dawn (al-fajr), midday (al-zuhr), afternoon (al-'asr), sunset (al-maghrib) and evening (al-'isha). c. Alms tax (zakat). Almsgiving is a

central activity in Islam. The Quran explicitly requires it and often places it alongside prayer when discussing a Muslim's duties. ("Perform the prayer and give the alms." 2:43, 110, 277)

For those who are greedy and use their money outside of the will of Allah, the Quran has harsh words: the fires of hell will heat up the coins and the greedy will be branded with it (9:34-35). d. Fasting during the month of Ramadan (sawm) Sawm (also siyam), fasting, commemorates the revelation of the Quran to humanity during Ramadan, the ninth month of the Islamic year. e. Pilgrimage to Mecca (hajj) At least once in his or her lifetime, each Muslim is expected to undertake a pilgrimage to Mecca, the sacred city of Islam. This holy journey is called the hajj in Arabic. There is no God but God (Allah), and Muhammad is his Prophet. The Qur'an is a perfect record of God's revelation to Muhammad. Angels exist to serve Allah. Afterlife is Paradise or Hell. God(s) One God (Allah in Arabic); the same God revealed (imperfectly) in the Jewish and Christian Bibles. Beliefs are very important in Islam. To be considered a Muslim, one must believe and recite a statement of faith known as the Shahada: "There is no God but God, and Muhammad is his Prophet." There is no other official creed to which one must adhere to be considered a Muslim. However, the "Six Articles of Faith" summarizes Islamic beliefs about God, angels, prophets, the Qu'ran, the afterlife, and predestination. Islam is one of the largest religions in the world, with over 1 billion followers. It is a monotheistic faith based on revelations received by the Prophet Muhammad in 7th-century Saudi Arabia.

The Arabic word Islam means “submission,” reflecting the faith's central tenet of submitting to the will of God. Followers of Islam are called Muslims. According to Islamic tradition, the angel Gabriel appeared to the Prophet over the course of 20 years, revealing to him many messages from God. Muslims recognize some earlier Judeo-Christian prophets including Moses and Jesus as messengers of the same true God. But in Islam, but Muhammad is the last and greatest of the prophets, whose revelations alone are pure and uncorrupted. The Prophet dedicated the remainder of his life to spreading a message of monotheism in a polytheistic world. In 622, he fled north to the city of Medina to escape growing persecution. This event marks the beginning of the Islamic calendar. Eight years later, Muhammad returned to Mecca with an army and conquered the city for Islam. By

Muhammad's death, 50 years later, the entire Arabian Peninsula had come under Muslim control. The sacred text of Islam, the Qur'an, was written in Arabic within 30 years of Muhammad's death. Muslims believe it contains the literal word of God. Also important is the tradition of the sayings and actions of Muhammad and his companions, collected in the Hadith. Islamic practices centre on the Five Pillars of Islam faith; prayer; fasting; pilgrimage to Mecca; and alms and include several holidays and rituals as well. Ethics are the rules or standards that govern moral human behaviour. Islamic ethics are based primarily on the Qu'ran, the sacred text of Islam, and the Hadith, an authoritative collection of sayings attributed to the Prophet Muhammad. Ethical behaviour is also governed by Sharia, or Islamic law, which has been developed by Muslim authorities over the centuries.

Islam and the Judeo-Christian West have had a challenging relationship for centuries and today's conflicts in the Middle East are religiously charged. Thus a focus on the facts and efforts towards mutual understanding are particularly important when it comes to Islam. In Islamic history, upon the death of Muhammad, his followers were faced with the decision of who should take his place as the leader of Islam. This leadership position was called the kalifa, which means "deputy" or "successor" in Arabic. The decision over who should be the first caliph (the anglicized form of kalifa) resulted in a division that has endured to this day. One group of followers held that Muhammad himself had chosen 'Ali, his cousin and son-in-law, as his successor. Others insisted that Abu Bakr, Muhammad's good friend and father-in-law, be given the caliphate. In the end, Abu Bakr would become the first of four caliphs, each of whom contributed significantly to the development and spread of Islam. Abu Bakr served as caliph from 632 until his death in 634. His first major accomplishment was to deal with the problem of the Bedouins (nomadic Arabs). Although some had converted under Muhammad, after his death they rejected Islam and refused to obey Abu Bakr. In 633, the caliph defeated the Bedouin revolt, known as the Ridda, and thereby secured the entire Arabian Peninsula for Islam. The experience served to convince Abu Bakr that Islam needed to expand beyond Arabia in order to be secure. He set his sights on the two neighbouring empires he viewed as threats to Islam: the Sassanid Empire to the east in Persia and Iraq, and the Byzantine Empire to the

west in Europe, Syria, Egypt, and the Mediterranean Sea. He declared a jihad against the Byzantine Christians, but died before he was able to carry it out.

The second caliph was Umar, another father-in-law of Muhammad, who had been named by Bakr as his successor. His caliphate lasted from 634 to 644. One of his first contributions was to add "Commander of the Faithful" to his title, which was used by all subsequent caliphs. His primary contribution, though, was a series of military victories resulting in the rapid expansion of Islam. He conquered Damascus in 635 and Jerusalem in 637, both from Syria in the Byzantine Empire. Realizing the importance of loyalty in his new subjects, Umar instituted a policy of religious tolerance in his new lands. This was received gratefully by Jews and Christians, who had been persecuted under the Byzantines. He instituted two taxes, the kharaj for landowners with productive fields and the jizya, which non-Muslims paid in return for the privilege of practicing their religion. At the same time, Muslim forces were moving against the Sassanid Empire in the east. Once he had secured his place in Syria, Umar succeeded in conquering the Sassanid capital, Ctesiphon, in 637. Turning west yet again, with a Muslim Syria assisting, Umar's forces set out for Egypt. Babylon fell in 641 and Alexandria in 642. Christians have not ruled in Egypt since. Umar continued the policy of tolerance in the newly conquered lands, and Muslims did not force conversion to Islam. They depended too much on the revenue from the jizya tax and the non resistance of the outnumbering non-Muslims. Muslims would find that it was not as easy to placate Persia as other conquered lands. By the time Islam arrived, the Persians had become a fiercely nationalistic people. They had their own national religion, Zoroastrianism, and considered the invading Arab Muslims inferior. Caliph Umar, Commander of the Faithful, was assassinated by a Persian Christian in 644. But by the time of Umar's death, the Muslim Empire was second only to the Chinese Empire in size.

Uthman, a member of the influential Umayyad family, was chosen as Umar's successor, leaving Ali's supporters once again disappointed and angry. Uthman served as the third caliph from 644 to 656. In 645, he defeated a Byzantine attempt to recover Alexandria, and in 647 he began expanding the Muslim Empire west of Egypt. He conquered Cyprus in 649 and his forces reached the easternmost boundary of Persia in 653. Some of Uthman's other accomplishments, however,

were not as popular among Muslims. He appointed fellow members of the Umayyad family to administrative positions, depleted the treasury with his lavish spending habits and lack of financial planning, and perhaps most controversial of all, he sought to create a single, definitive text of the Quran. He succeeded in accomplishing his goal, and thereby significantly reduced doctrinal disagreements, but not without criticism from those who suspected Uthman of tampering with the sacred texts. In any case, Uthman's compilation of the Quran must certainly be considered a significant accomplishment for Islam. Discontent abounded in the new empire. In 656 Uthman was assassinated in his home by a group of Egyptians, and civil war immediately erupted. Muslim fought Muslim over who would next assume leadership. The never-resolved conflict between Ali's supporters and other Muslims came to a head. Ali declared himself the fourth caliph, a claim which was promptly challenged by Mu'awiya, Uthman's cousin and the governor of Syria. At the "Battle of the Camel" in December 656, Ali's forces killed two of Muhammad's friends and kidnapped one of his widows. Before long, a strong public outcry against the violence led Ali and Mu'awiya to agree to submit to the decision of a council, which would use the Qur'an as a guide in deciding who should be caliph. But when the council concluded that both should step down, Ali refused, and civil war continued. It was at this point that another division arose within Islam.

The Kharijites, a group of Shiites and supporters of Ali, were angry at his ever agreeing to submit to a human decision on a matter that should only be decided by Allah. Refusing allegiance to Ali and Mu'awiya, the Kharijites appointed their own caliph. In July 660, Mu'awiya declared himself caliph in Jerusalem. He had on his side not only Egypt and Syrian forces, but the Kharijites as well. The latter, intending to kill both Ali and Mu'awiya, got to Ali first. With Ali out of the picture, Mu'awiya was finally successful in claiming control of the Islamic Empire. The civil war came to an end, and the Umayyad Dynasty began.

THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

The Carolingian failure to sustain the Empire created by Charlemagne, led to disintegration and disorder in Germany. By the beginning of the 10th century A D. there remained four principal duchies in Germany, viz., Swabia and Bavaria in the south, Franconia in the centre and Saxony in the north. By the turn

of events Saxony assumed the over lordship over other territories and eventually its ruler became the Holy Roman Emperor. The four duchies were having separate laws and customs. The death of Louis the Child in 911, the last of the German Carolingian line, necessitated a king to head the German tribes. It became a custom among them to elect one important duke to be the king to overlord the whole of the kingdom. However, the dukes were not prepared to completely act as agents of the king as they should have done in 911 the choice of the nobles fell on Conrad I (911913), the Duke of Franconia. This was not a happy choice as the ruler proved to be incapable of holding together the reins of power and allowed the dukes a free hand. The Magyar plunders during his rule occurred four times and the entire kingdom was left to local resources to face the crises. While the people suffered much, the Church properties were also considerably looted. Henry the Fowler (919-936)

Conrad bequeathed his duchy of Franconia to his brother Eberhard in 918 but expressed the desire that Hey, Duke of Saxony, should be elected King. It was formally carried out. Eberhard, the Duke of Franconia, immediately accepted his over lordship. Henry easily brought under subjection Swabia in the very first year of his rule. The ruler of Swabia, Burchard, could not resist the thrust of Saxony. In the case of Bavaria, Duke) Arnulf the Bad, accepted Henry's authority by 921. Bavaria understood the significance of Saxonian hegemony in the light of

OTTO THE GREAT

Henry the Fowler had been content to bring the whole German tribes under his control and rule as King of Germany. It was the only possible course under the then circumstances and she had the sense to understand his limitations. Otto 1 (936-973), his son, had been characterised as the German Charlemagne and in many respects resembled Charles the Great. Endowed with superb energy and tact, he nurtured imperial ambitions but worked his way up carefully through the jealous climate and conflicting internal and external forces. He was relentless in pursue goal and if the need arose could be vengeful. Magnanimous to the fallen foe, he combined in himself the admirable mixture of nobility and tact. His ambitions expanded with his fortunes. He early assumed the position of chief among the Western kings, and with the conquest of Italy and his new style of

Emperor he aimed at the restoration of Charlemagne's Empire and the secular headship of Christendom".

When Otto I decided to enforce the central authority over the stand taken by Otto I was different duchies, trouble started. Bitterly opposed by the dukes. Even in Saxony his own brothers the dukes fomented trouble. Thankmar and Henry who were other troublemakers among the dukes were Eberhard of Franconia and Gilbert of Lotharingia. Frederick, Archbishop of Mainz, also entered the fray. Louis IV, the Carolingian King of France, who coveted Lotharingia wanted to fish in troubled waters. Otto installed Berthold, the brother of Arnulf, as the duke of Bavaria. Thankmar was debut later on he was deposed and defeated and killed. When Otto's brother Henry rebelled against him in 939, Eberhard of Franconia and Gilbert of Lotharingia Eber Louis IV lent support to them, joined forces with him was drowned while taking to hard died in battle, and Gilbert flight. Otto took over the direct administration of Franconia in 939. He pardoned Henry and later on made him the Duke of Bavaria in 947. The archbishoprics of The Duke of Mainz and Cologne were given to his nominees. Bohemia threw off the German yoke and adopted an independent attitude. But the duke was brought to his senses by Otto I in 950 and he promised to pay tribute. But Bohemia did not become a buffer-state on the part of the German Empire. It served as eastern frontier. Italian territories had been in a state of turmoil who was the king of Italy from 888 became Emperor in 915. In 922 Rudolph II of Bur he was not able to deliver the goods murdered in 924. Berengar was But soon Rudolph was removed from the throne and the magnates placed on the throne in 926 Count Hugh of Arles, a descendant of Lothar. The counts and bishops and even popes had been viciously involved in power-politics and Italy was seething with unrest. Hugh made matters worse by his treacherous rule Berengar of Ivrea, the most dangerous marquees and the grandson of Emperor Berengar, fearing the evil machinations of Hugh, fled from the country and sought asylum in Otto's court. He was acceded a rousing reception by the bishops and magnates when he returned in 945. Hugh and his co-regent son Lothar II were allowed to carry on the administration with real powers in the hands of Berengar. Hugh died in 948 and Lothar II in 950. Berengar II and his son Adalbert were elected joint-rulers of Italy. But a large discontented party of

bishops and magnates rallied round Adelaide, the widowed Queen of Lothar II. She was forced to take shelter at the castle of Canossa. The Dukes of Swabia and Bavaria intervened in the affair. In 951 Otto himself decided to invade Italy and his entry was acclaimed by nobles and bishops. He proclaimed himself King of Italy. Romance was added to the conquest. Otto occupied again his Italian possessions in 961, reduced Berengar and was crowned Emperor in St. Peters in 962. Pope John XII was merely trying to strengthen his own hands.

Administration of Otto

The sitemap of local government drawn in the beginning by Otto was to keep the duchies solely reserved to the members of the blood royal. But the experiment proved a failure reverted to the old practice of appointing local counts as dukes. So he Though Otto reserved the right of appointing these dukes, the office soon became hereditary He greatly reduced the power of Te unwieldy and strategic duchy of Lotharingia was divided into two in 959 and entrusted the administration of each part to a count. He established his over lordship over Burgundy which served as a buffer-state in the south-west in the same manner as Bohemia in the cast. He appointed one Count-palatine in each duchy. But whether the Counts-palatine were created with the ostensible purpose of acting as a check on ducal authority we cannot say with exactness They were the representatives of the king who acted possibly as judges and certainly as stewards of crown lands. Whatever might have been the ulterior motive in instituting this new office, it may be said that they might have acted as an effective check on ducal authority.

The German Church was a source of great strength to the king as opposed to the counts and dukes with all its attendant evils was a hereditary feudalism source of danger to the safety and security of the kingdom. The loyalty and obedience of the counts and dukes were notorious for their vagaries. The circumstances, Otto heavily relied on the bishops to carry on under the administration. The celibate bishops and abbots with no possibility bequeath their lands and office on hereditary principle was less dangerous Military service exacted from them was heavier than that of lay vassals. Grants of lands poured in profusion to the Churches. The motive behind these grants unadulterated altruism but self-interest. According to the canon law, every important town had

a Bishop. The Bishop to whom royal authority was delegated acted as the royal officer-in-charge of the town and its adjacent areas Otto effectively controlled the appointment of bishops. He appointed members of the royal family as archbishops. Being an educated class among a majority of illiterate people, the higher clergy manned the various departments of the kingdom. As state officials and holders of lands, the bishops paid homage and took the oath of loyalty to the king. In a way Otto got the unstinted support of the clergy on whose trustworthiness he could safely rely on at a time when the lay officials wavered in their allegiance. Of course such absolute reliance on the clergy was not without its pernicious effects. It no doubt paid rich dividends in the short run. The Church no doubt promoted education and learning. The proselytizing policy of the Church helped a great deal in consolidating the conquered heathen lands. The smooth running of the government depended upon the continued support of the Church without any resentment on the part of the laity. But this was not the case as later events proved in the next century. The independent attitude adopted by the Church and the attack of the laity greatly undermined the prestige of the monarchy.

Otto and the Holy Roman Empire

The dismemberment of the Carolingian empire started after the death of Charlemagne in 814. The successors of Arnulf Louis the Child, Conrad I and Henry the Fowler-did not hold the title 'Emperor'. It was with Otto the Great that the imperial title was revived in 962. He was crowned Roman Emperor by John XII in 962. It was after hectic struggle that the Saxon King Otto I created the Holy Roman Empire. Though Arnulf assumed imperial title, it was without authority even in Italy. The Holy Roman Empire virtually remained suspended from 887 after the deposition of Charles the Fat to the coronation of Otto I in 962. So it is better to say that Otto recreated the Holy Roman Empire rather than revived it. It was no wonder that some historians date the Holy Roman Empire from 962. But the fact cannot be denied that Otto ruled over a less extensive empire than Charlemagne and his rule was not as critic as was the case with Charlemagne.

Otto I was called the German Charlemagne. He reduced the power of the dukes. He was the recreate of the Holy Roman Empire which remained virtually

suspended from 887 onwards. His mastery over the Magyars at Lechfeld in 955 marked the end of their raids. He welded the German tribes into a powerful state He established his by using Christianity as a unifying force virtual control over Lotharingia, asserted his supremacy over Burgundy, reduced the Slavs to abject subjection, brought to senses the duke of Bohemia and assumed the kingship of Italy. HIS greatest achievement was the consolidation of the kingdom of tat East Franks. His victorious wars brought peace and security to Germany which in turn resulted in the flowering of culture which is described as "the Ottoman Renaissance". He raised the prestige of the throne to great heights rivalling that of Charlemigne with Otto began the real medieval empire, "the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation".

Otto I was succeeded by his son Otto II (973-933) through Adelaide. He crowned co-emperor in 967. He married Theophano, the daughter of Romanus II, the Byzantine Emperor in 972 He held the empire of Otto I intact. He put down the rebellion of Henry the Wrangler, the Duke of Bavaria, saved Lorraine from slipping out of his hands, and defeated the King of Denmark and made him pay tribute. He attempted to drive out the Greeks from Southern Italy and annex that to the empire But the Greeks sought the help of the Saracens. Otto II had t taste a defeat at the hands of the Saracens in 982. Otto II was succeeded by his 3 year old son Otto III (983 (002) During his minority, his mother Theophano acted as the regent till her death in 991 and later on his grandmother Adelaide acted as the regent. In 994 when he was 14 years old he took over the administration into his own hands. He got himself crowned as emperor in 996. He desired to renew the Roman Empire with Rome as its capital. But he remained a visionary. Political imperialism soon brought him in collision with Germany' and especially with the German Church". He deviated from the policy of Henry the Fowler and Otto the Germany united and strong and bringing the Church under the Great in making control of the State. Before he could realise his utopian schemes of renewing the Roman Empire he died in 1902. Otto III was succeeded by Henry 11 (1092.1024), the Duke of The childless Bavaria; He was the last Saxon ruler of Germany

With Conrad II (1024-1039) began the Franconian or Salian line of Emperors. During his rule Burgundy was annexed to the empire. He was

succeeded by his son Henry III (1039--1055). He raised the prestige of the Holy Roman Empire to that exalted place which it had held during the time of Otto the Great rule witnessed the culminating point of the Holy Roman Empire", Henry III was succeeded by his son Henry IV (1956-1106) when he was six years old. During his period the lovestiture Contest raged in all its fury (for details refer struggle between the Empire and Papacy). Henry V (1106-1125), the son of Henry IV, was the last ruler of the Salian link. During his rule the Investiture Contest came to an end by the Concordat of Worms in 1122.

Hereditary succession to the throne was the guiding principle from the time of Otto the Great to 1125. But when Henry V died childless in 1125, the lay and spiritual princes asserted their right of selecting the German Emperor in precedence to a similar one which they had put forth in 1077 when Henry IV was declared deposed by Pope Gregory VII. The German princes in consonance with the wish of the Pope then selected Rudolf of Swabia as an anti- emperor. In a similar fashion, they selected Lothar II (1125-1137), Duke of Saxony, as the emperor.

Germany was ruled by the Hohenstaufen line of Emperors. The first distinguished member of this line was Conrad III (1138 1152). He participated in the unsuccessful Second Crusade. The other two distinguished members of this line were Frederick I Barbarossa (1152-1190) and Frederick II (1212-1250). During the time of Frederick I Barbarossa, the second phase of the struggle between Empire and Papacy started. Though he failed against Papacy, he crushed the feudal forces in Germany and revived the imperial power in Italy due to internal dissensions of the Lombard League. The division of the great Duchies marked the beginning of the modern German states of Austria, Brandenburg. Saxony and the Palatinate. Frederick I Barbarossa participated in the Third Crusade. The two rulers figured prominently in the struggle between the Empire and Papacy (For details refer struggle between the Empire and Papacy). Conrad IV (1250-54) was the last ruler of this line. With the execution of Conradin, the son of Conrad IV, in 1268, the Hohenstaufen stock came to an end.

After an interregnum from 1254-1273, the Holy Roman Emperors were selected from various houses from 1273 to 1437 until the Hapsburg line of rulers came to power. A regular electoral system for the selection of the Holy Roman

Emperor was promulgated by the Golden Bull of Charles IV (1347-78) in 1356. According to this system, it was laid down that the emperor was to be elected by seven electoral princes- both lay and spiritual-consisting of the Archbishops of Mainz, Trier and Cologne, the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg In 1648, the Prince of Bavaria and in 1692 the Prince of Hanover became the two additional electors. The Hapsburg line of Emperors ruled from 1438 to 1740. The most distinguished member of this line was Charles V (1519-1556). The Bavarian Emperor Charles VII ruled from 1742 to 1745. The Hapsburg-Lorraine line of Emperors ruled Francis II (1792-1806) was the last Holy Napoleon Bonaparte abolished the Holy Roman from 1745 to 1806.

The Holy Roman Empire lasted from 800 A. D. to 1806. Whether this empire of the West had any justification in calling itself as the Holy Roman Empire? When an anatomy of the phrase is made, it reveals so many facts. The term "Holy Roman Empire" dates only from 1254. The title "Holy Empire" starts from 1157. The term "Roman Empire" is in vogue from 1034. The term "Roman Emperor" reaches back to the time of Otto II. It is worth mentioning that from Charlemagne to Otto the Great the title assumed by the rulers "Imperator was Augustus" The detailed without adding anything about the territory anatomy would have by this time confused the average reader. If we proceed step by step taking each word it will only make confusion more confounded. The term "holy" is misleading. From the history of the Empire it has no practical significance. Empire became holy because the Pope placed the Crown on the head of Charlemagne in 800. The Emperor was anointed by the But many emperors were never crowned by the spiritual touch. Pope Sanctity of the office without the sanction of the Pope no halo of holiness surrounding it except the hollowness of a hole. The term "Roman" should not be identified with "German" and vice versa. With the march of time, Italy was cut looser and looser until it was completely cut off from the Empire in course of him: Roman Empire without Rome is like the trunk without the head. In 1356 the title of the empire was changed to Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation". The expansion and explanation of the title is not only absurd but highly unsatisfactory. It suffers from the fallacy of petition principal or begging the question.

"Empire" implies universality and autocracy. Universality may be true in the case of Charlemagne because he ruled over practically the whole of Christian Europe. But it was not the case with regard to others. Even Otto the Great ruled over Charlemagne's empire minus France. With the march of time one territory after another dropped out until and at last the empire roughly corresponded to modern united Germany. The seven electoral princes assumed sovereignty within their territories. But scant regard was shown to the imperial authority, which was freely and frequently tampered with. The elective nature of the Emperor was the bane of its weakness. Towards the end, the empire existed only in name. "The medieval emperor was perpetually finding himself overtopped by one or other of his nominal vassals, and history has few more pitiable spectacles than some that were presented by the Holy Roman Empire-men bearing the great names of Caesar and Augustus-tossed helplessly to and fro on the waves of European polities, the laughing stock of their own barons and marquises, and often unable to provide for the ordinary expenses of their households". Napoleon Bonaparte abolished it in 1806 as it had outlived it’s exist was wonder that fence for a pretty long time. The Holy Roman Empire was wholly a Roman Empire. To use the epigram of Voltaire, "it was neither holy, nor Roman nor an empire".

Origin and growth of Feudalism

An important feature of the middle Ages was Feudalism. The word "Feudalism" is derived from the Latin word "feudum" which means a fief or land held on condition of service. The break-up of the Carolingian Empire led to a general decline in law and order. In the absence of effective imperial control anarchy raised its ugly and monstrous head. The need of the hour was local protection and collective defence of the kingdoms. The institution of Feudalism admirably fitted in this context, to check decay and preserve agriculture and small industry. Principally bent on agricultural promotion, feudalism sustained military valour and encouraged a new social and political order Europe defended itself in isolated fragments through the institution of Feudalism.

The disintegration of the Carolingian Empire brought in its wake the invasions of the Vikings (Northman or Danes or Norsemen) from the North, Magyars (Hungarians) from the East and the Saracens from the South. The

foremost duty which fell on the drive out these rulers of England, France and Germany was The Danes started. Invaders and then evolve an orderly life. The pouring into England during the reign of Egbert (802-839). Admirable task of driving out the Danes was done in England by the successors of Alfred (871-899)- Edward the Elder (899.924). Athelstan (924-939), Edmund the Magnificent! (919-946) and Edred (946-955) the work was completed by Fdgar the Peaceful (959-975) With the accession of Ethelred II the Unready (978-1016) the man without good counsel the unity of the kingdom began Feudalism showed its true colour. The division to break country in the four earldoms of Wessex, Mercia. Northamber land and East Anglia during the time of the Dane ruler Canute (1016 1035) indirectly paved the way for the rise in power of the earls or nobles. The division produced its worst effects during the rule of Edward the Confessor (1042-1066) and Harold (1056) the evil forces of feudalism raised their ugly head and struck deep roots during this period. It was the Norman William the Conqueror (1066-1087) who set things right by asserting the central power.

It was Charles Martel and his successors who paved the way for the rise of feudalism in the 8th and 9th centuries. The duke's margraves and counts were granted lands by them in return for supporting them with arms in the hour of peril. The feudal forces asserted themselves in the fullest form in France at a much earlier date than in Germany and England. The nobles rose to the throne of France in Odo, the Count of Paris, in recognition of his able defence of Paris in 885-886 when the Northmen attacked it. It was the threat of common danger that forged unity among the nobles. When Charles the Simple (898 - 922) came the throne after the death of Odo in 898, the nobles went about their own way. It was Charles the Simple who permitted the Northmen under Rollo to settle down in Normandy by a treaty signed in 911. The Carolingian line in France continued its precarious existence till 937 when Hugh Capet laid the foundation of the Capetian dynasty. The intervening period was a trying one in the history of France when feudal forces appeared in their complete.

In Germany after the death of Louis the Child in 911, the last of the German Carolingian line, the necessity arose to elect a new ruler. It became a custom among them to elect one important duke to overlord the whole kingdom.

The choice of the dukes feil on Conrad I 911-913), the Duke of Franconia. It was 30 unhappy choices because he was not able to stem the idea of Magyar (Hungarian) incursions which occurred four times during his period. However, a deliverer came in the person of Henry the Fowler (919 936) who became the ruler of Germany dukes under proper restraint and defeated the Magyars in the He kept the battle of Unstrut in 933. His son Otto I the Great (936-973) defeated the Magyars at Lechfeld in 955. This victory marked the end of Magyar raids. Though he suppressed the dukes, he had a very tough time with them. The reign of Henry III (1039-1056) "witnessed the culminating point of the Holy Roman Empire". The nobles who were already powerful became all the more powerful after the death of Henry Ill One can understand the position wielded by an emperor when he was elected by the dukes. The elective principle became the bane of the empire and a boon to the dukes.

The Saracens made their thrust in Southern Gaul during the time of Charles Martel. He defeated them in the battle of Tours. After the death of Charles the Great, they made their thrusts in the southern parts of the empire. Their sporadic but terrific thrust in Southern Italy continued till the reign of Otto III (983-1002). They were finally driven out from Sicily and Southern Italy by the Normans in the 11th century. The Normans carried feudalism to Southern Italy. Feudalism failed to take deep roots in Northern Italy because of the love of municipal freedom of the cities.

Thus feudalism had its beginning in the early part of the 8th century. The cradle-land of feudalism was the kingdom of the Franks between the Rhine and the Loire rivers. It attained its fullest form between the middle of the 11th and the middle of the 13th centuries and its climax in the 12th century. It is against this background that the system of feudalism has to be perceived.

Causes of the rise of Feudalism

(1) Reward for Service tress.

The confusion following the Charlemagne and the gradual disintegration of the Carolingian empire created the need for trusted and efficient nobility to support kings in constant disking, as the ultimate owners of the land, distributed the territories to nobles, known as Tenants-in Chier, as reward for their services. These lands were to be held for life in return for specific services and to be held

in trust for the King. In course of time, the nobility, the grants tended to become hereditary. Whose fortunes were linked with those of its overlord or the king did its best to protect the authority of the King. The social insecurity prompted the nobles to realise their valuable role and the

In course of were mere twin tasks of civil and military assistance were admirably performed by them. In the early years, the gifts of territories for the as benefices lifetime of the nobles were known time, when the hereditary claims of barons or nobles in vogue, the same gifts were known as fiefs or feuds. The principle fully recognised the most important aspect of feudalism, viz, that the king was the ultimate owner of all land and from kingship emanated authority and honour and that he was the focal point and apex of the pyramidal social set up.

(2) Commendation

There was another method whereby feudal authority took a definite shape there were countless nobles in different parts of the kingdom constantly harassed by trouble makers and brigands many of them thought that their hold on land and power over the people could be effectively safeguarded if they got backing from powerful kings or nobles in the neighbourhood. This entailed mutual duties and obligations. This was known as Commendation. The barons who offered protection were usually very powerful people with men and materials to undertake the res possibility of safeguarding the interests of their fiefs. They were also men of higher organising ability who could inspire the lesser magnates with confidence.

(3) Usurpation

Under the troubled circumstances some nobles took advantage of the weak rule or the ineffective central authority to declare themselves free from the feudal obligations to higher authority. This was known as Usurpation. Such nobles often assumed the right to mint their own coins and render assistance to only those whom they believed would not interfere in their baronial power Ambition and adventure displayed by the nobles of this category often led to endless skirmishes.

4. Need for self-protection

The European middle ages were preceded by sets of circumstances unfavourable for safe-living in towns. The authority of the Emperors and Kings constantly broke down leading to weak. They had to protect themselves, rely on their own strength and money-power and promote village self-sufficiency. Europe defended itself in isolated fragments through the institution of feudalism.

(5) The rise of the Knight-Errant

The increase in the prestige of horsemen in defending led to the rise of a special class of Knights. They protected the noble man's castle. They also protected the entire village from the ravages of violent elements. This horse ten were granted lands in return for their military service and this custom spread throughout the country. These knights specialised in the craft of defence and the art of offence. The lords of the castles and holders of various small trades and professions harassed by the unending attacks of the invaders looked upon these knights as their saviours.

(6) Unsafe commercial thoroughfares

Still, where agriculture and organised trade prevailed, where commerce and transportation increased the material conditions of life, and where unsafe trade passages wended their dangerous routes, in these entire places feudalistic pattern took deep roots. France, England, portions of Italy and Germany were the main places where feudalism thrived.123 were celibate, the king had the consolation in making up the loss The king by resort to simony whenever a bishopric fell vacant. Thus in his turn granted protection to them in times of danger. Divided the land into several manors and gave each manor to a sub. The sub-tenant in his turn divided tenant on similar conditions. His land into smaller bits and gave them to freemen and serfs who the process of sub-dividing were the actual tillers of the soil Thus the as sub in feudaliosssn land into several bits was known three important features of feudalism were feudal tenure, vassalage and Immunity. The first connoted the peculiar tenure under which land was held. The second meant the military and other services rendered by the vassals. The third referred to the special privilege of holding a court by the lord to decide the cases of the vassals. "Feudalism was the economic subjection and military allegiance of a man to a superior in return for economic organisation and military

protection". Society began to form along feudalistic lines with well-defined spheres of duties and responsibilities.

Features of Feudalism

At the apex of the feudal society stood the king. His territorial possessions were not just land-holdings alone. They denoted his sovereignty over the territories. He distributed the land, issued forth administrative regulations; arranged military protection controlled the barons or lords supervised the security arrangements, maintained law and order, dispensed justice and evolved order out of chaos theoretical supremacy, however, was Feudalism was an organisation of society and government greatly modified when ambitious or impetuous vassals with power based on land ownership According to this system all land be and resources tried to assert themselves. However, in form Longed to the king who divided the kingdom into several field's and condition of great was the moral binding of the norms of the relationship than gave each to a baron or tenant-in chief the king's authority was feared and respected. As the fields were granted to the vassal paid military service and other aids. homage to the King surrounded by his Court, by humbly kneeling bishops and other Church dignitaries, they also came under the before him and placing his folded hands between those of his lord Sometimes they may be exempted category of tenants in-chief. He then took the oath of fealty by saying "I become your man from these services and aids in which case they did not render any from this day forward of life and limb, and unto you, shall be true earthly services but only spiritual services by offering prayers for and faithful, and bear to you faith for the tenements claim to the soul of the donor. As almost all bishops in Western Europe hold of you". The King then kissed and raised him to his feet. The king then presented him with a sword or lance or glove as a token of investing him with the field. It emphasized the paternal solicitude which the king must show for his subjects. It also set the pattern of social standards. It stressed the interdependent nature of relationship between the king and his vassals. The Lord

The link between the King and the villages was provided by the feudal lords who were the landed aristocrats. The feudal lord owed his position to a higher-ranking noble or to the king depending on the extent of his territorial rights. The bond in all feudal ranks was based on the golden principles of mutual trust and discharge

of obligations. He managed the estates through his serfs but was also responsible for protection of all people in his domain. He provided protection to the people under his care and organised defence or offence for his king as and when the occasion demanded. He looked after the economic, social, political, commercial and even religious welfare of his people. He presided over the manor court but often this function was relegated to He was the bass for the development of responsible local men the lot of the people and a conscientious lord did much to improve the lot of the people. He often protected different manors by constructing castles protected by moats. The castle was the nerve-centre for the activities of the manor. "All lords were the vassals of the king..... In theory feudalism was a magnificent system of moral reciprocity, binding the men of an endangered society to one another in complex web of mutual obligation, protection and fidelity".

In this set-up a class of people just to meet the dangers of attack from expected as well as unexpected quarters sprang up. The Knights of the middle Ages were of aristocratic-stock. Their way of life pointed out to a code of honour and selflessness. They were usually the first-born of the privileged class with titles and rank. They developed a code of honour which was branded as Chivalry. The aspirants to knighthood received severe drilling from the tender age of 7 to 8 in theology as well as warfare. The knight was initiated into the order with a Holy Bath' and awarded white tunis, red robe and black coat symbolising moral purity, shedding of blood for God, and willingness to face death at any time. The knight would be required to develop skill in the use of various arms. He must always learn to think in terms of protecting the weak, honouring women and serving the cause of God, He participated in a number of tournaments in the kingdom to exhibit his skill in horsemanship, archery, swordsmanship fencing. His name was often glorified in the local anecdotes and immortalised in the ballads etc.

When the peaceful conditions of life were constantly threatened by feudal wars and insecure kingdoms, the knights organised and led offences and prepared defence operations to help the kings, and suppressed brigandage and highway robbery. In fact the ideals of knighthood recaptured the ancient spirit of fighting at an exalted and nobler level. In the early centuries of triumph of the

Church, fighting was discouraged and the saint appropriated the honour much more than a warrior. The gradual decline in the martial spirit led to disastrous consequences in the society and people realised the need for heroism coupled with honour for the preservation of values in society. This was provided by the Knight Errants.

The distribution of land by the Church and the King led to entrusting many freemen to the care of cultivation. The serfs were degraded tillers when the cultivating tenant-class engaged them. There were freemen who utilised their services besides putting in their own efforts of cultivating the soil fation was the order of the day. It had no scruples in engaging slaves and serfs under dehumanising terms. The success of agriculture and thereby of economy required co-operation of all people in the villages. Life was frugal but sufficient enough to keep their body and soul together. There was plenty of work for able-bodied persons in the form of clearing marshy lands, maintaining pastures, providing irrigational facilities, organising defence, developing trade and commerce, etc.

The Serf or Villein

The serf class constituted the next rung in the ladder was virtually the mainstay of feudalism. The vast portions of the baron's lands were cultivated by the serfs. These were the cultivating tenants. They tilled the baron's land for monetary benefits. Normally no serf was deprived of his holding so long as he paid his dues regularly, and rendered various other services. Theoretically, he cultivated the land during the pleasure of the lord; in practice of course he was left free.

But this freedom was hampered by many crushing taxes paid by the serf to his lord. Money and payments in kind were in vogue. Some of the important taxes included a small head-tax to the government, annual rent, surtax on rent and a tenth of his livestock. The serf must work without pay for a specific number of days every week in the estate of his lord. This was known as week-work. He should grind the corn, bake the bread, brew the beer and do a hundred similar odd jobs to the lord without expect for his own operations of ting any compensation for the work the above nature. He must pay to the lord fixed charges at the If he must fish or hunt, additional fees pleasure of the lord. Besides these, he must be ready to do must be paid to the lord. In case of

disputes with military service to his lord at any time fellow-serfs was final and binding. The decision of the lord he must pay his own still, if his lord was captured by enemies allotted share of ransom so that his lord could safely return generally he was discouraged from getting his son educated as there was the danger of losing a future semi-slave to the baronial.

The various taxes and extortions nearly totalled more than half or up to two-thirds of the produce of the land held by the serf by itself it were high, still some hold the view that since no other taxes fell on him, the position of the serf was not bad got the use of roads, irrigational facilities, and protection from plan. A major portion of his waking hours was consumed by work. Though he could augment his income by developing poultry or gardening, additional levies on them would not make them worth cultivating. His clothing was woeful His food was sumptuous because then only he could work hard without tiring out "He could not read; a literate serf would have been an offence to his illiterate lord. He was ignorant of everything but farming and not too skilled in that manners were rough and hearty, perhaps gross; in this turmoil of European history he had to survive by being a good animal and he managed it. He was greedy because poor, cruel because fearful. He was the mainstay of the Church, but he had more superstition than religion". In the lowest rung of the society were the slaves. These unfortunate people had no hopes of ever getting out from their pitiable position until death blissfully relieved them of a tiresome and harsh life. Slavery, while useful in the economic sphere was degrading morally. It flourished in a fairly widespread manner throughout Europe.

The slave worked in the Lord's manorsm or estates of the Church. It is curious to observe that amidst much talk about human virtues, both secular and church interests never denounced the practice of slavery or renounced the institution of slavery. In the early times of feudalism, people did not have any scruples to capture men from pagan races and enslave them for doing menial service for them. The astonishing feature was that the Church committed to propagate the brotherhood of man, held considerable slaves under its barbarous wings. D the feudal times, the contact with the Arab world merely gave an impetus for the increase in slave-trade. There was a general decline in slavery as

the serf became as time went on a better instrument to increase production than an unlettered barbaric slave Feudal services

The feudal services were of three kinds-military, political and financial. Of the three, military service was the most important. During defensive operations, the vassal's obligation was unlimited. But in offensive operations, the vassal's service was limited to 6 weeks or 40 days. In case it exceeded the stipulated period, the lord had to pay his vassal's expenses. Political service meant the vassal's attendance in the lord's court. The vassal should also render his counsel to the lord. Financial service included the three customary aids, viz, (1) to ransom the king, (2) to meet the expenses when his eldest daughter was married, and (3) to meet the expenses when his eldest son was knighted In France a fourth customary aid was included, viz., the aid to carry on the Crusade

Besides these services, the lord claimed other rights over his vassais known as feudal incidents" which meant those rights incidental to the feudal relationship. The feudal incidents were:

(1) If the vassal died, his successor had to pay an inheritance tax to the lord. This was known as relief or succession duty.

(2) The lord was the legal guardian of his vassal during his minority. He received an income for his guardianship. This was known as ward ship

(3) The Lord had also the right of giving his female ward in marriage and receives an income from the suitor. This was known as "marriage".

(4) When no heir was left, the law of escheat returned the land to the lord.

(5) The lord also enjoyed ne power of depriving the tenancy of the feudal inferior in case the latter rebelled against him. Independently of escheat the rebel had to lose his land. This was known as forfeiture.

(6) It was also required that the feudal inferior would bear the costs, lodging and boarding expenses of the lord when he made inspection of the baronial land. It should be clearly borne in mind that these services rendered and incidental payments made by the tenants-in-chief to the king or the sub-tenant to the tenant in-chief as the cise may bend the corresponding duties and obligations of the King to the tenant-inchief and the tenant-in-chief to the sub-tenant in giving protection in times of danger were applicable only to the above-mention But under the Manorial System which categories of persons was quite different from

Feudalism the peasants both free and unfree at the manor did certain menial economic duties and made payments in the form of taxes, fees and fines to the sub-tenant So the services rendered and payments made under the feudal contract should not be confused with the menial economic duties and payments made under the Manorial System by the peasants to the sub-tenant who was their lord.

Merits of Feudalism

1. At a time when orderly life was threatened by lack of strong central authority, feudalism proved to be a useful institution to protect the people from chaos and anarchy.

2. The linking of military and agricultural services with a well-graded social hierarchy fixed specific rights and duties upon the rulers and the ruled.

3. The manorial system, an integral economic part of the feudal system, saved Europe from utter confusion in the farm. Front. Under the patronage of benevolent barons fillip was giver to promote agriculture.

4 The knight errant's, idolized by the society were the happy fruits of the feudal system. Plighted word, exalted bravery and willingness to risk lives for they upheld the sanctity of the noble causes, raised the position of woman in the upper class, and evolved a code of honour known as chivalry.

5. The properties conferred on the Church by Kings enhanced its prestige. Religious-centred life made much headway and the influence of the Church gradually grew the common methods of worship and collective approach to Along with it also life throughout Europe in a uniform manner.

Demerits of Feudalism

1. Feudalism was not an unmixed blessing. It brought in its wake the growth of baronial power. The local lords seized the opportunity to enlarge their power whenever Kings were weak.

2, Jealousies among the barons and suspicion between the King and the lords many a time encouraged local feuds. The King bad to rely upon the military services provided by his vassals. He had to be scheming on to keep the barons from coming together.

3. The growth of the temporal possessions of the Church excited the jealousy of Kings. The extensive holdings of the Church gradually created a wedge between

the State and the Church leading to conflict between the Popes and the Kings at period.

4. Private wars between the barons on many occasions sapped they drained the brittle finances the energies of the society. Which could well have been utilised for promoting trade, agriculture and small-scale industries.

5. The condition of the serfs and slaves was miserable. The crushing economic burden on the former and the inhuman and callous attitude towards the latter were blots on Medieval Europe. Even the Church did not have any compunction to utilise the services of the slaves and exploiting their haplessness. They were reduced to the position of mere chattels "hewers of wood and drawers of water, the helots of the empire".

6 The hereditary succession to nobility which became a marked feature denied opportunities to talented people in other walks of life. The suppression of talent led to much heartburn.

7. Feudalism degenerated into the sharp division of society of the haves and the have-nots.

8. Growth of learning and organisation of sound education Society was did not materialise in the full bloom of feudalism driven with superstitious beliefs and practices.

9. Justice became a mockery under the feudal pattern early attitude of paternal solicitude gave way to the decrying of justice by the barons who wanted to promote their own interests. Feudalism as a social force began to decline even from the 12th century onwards and as a political force from the 13th century.

The growth of representative institutions in different parts of Europe undermined the feudal set-up Representative institutions like the parliament effectively served to fulfil the political aspirations of the people. True to the established social order many nobles participated in the Crusades. Many lost their lives. The reduction in the number of powerful nobles automatically weakened feudalism. The Crusades and the invention of gunpowder sounded the death knell of feudalism. The invention of gunpowder made the castles of the barons less vulnerable. During pestilences like the Black Death, the serfs who were the actual tillers of the so it under feudalism died like flies. Consequently,

the demand for farm-labourers increased. A large number of free labourers came forward to till the soil without any feudal obligations

Decline of the power of Papacy

During the Age of Faith, the conflict between spiritual author rity and temporal power often resulted in victory to the former. The opportunity was taken advantage of by the nobles who fished in troubled waters. They often vacillated between subjection to sacerdotal authority and insurrection against imperial power. Quite often the scales were tilted in favour of the former. The endless feuds between the two created confusion and chaos. From the 13th century onwards. Papacy fell on evil days. This was 3 blessing in disguise because the Church which had functioned as a state within a state came to an end. The Age of Faith was gradually giving place to the Age of Reason. The growth of towns

The growth of towns in wealth and power greatly weakened feudalism because the towns forged their own social concepts which ran counter to those of feudal values. Renewed study of Roman law. The renewed study of Roman law made people understand the superiority of such a law as against the clumsy feudal laws.

Manorial System

Manorial System as it was known in England was known in Western Europe as Seigneurialism. Feudalism and Manorialism were two different concepts. While Feudalism rested on political, military and social system of the nobility, Manorial System was the economic aspect of feudalism. Feudal contacts existed among the same class of course between the higher and lower of the same cadre. The contracting parties were bound by mutual rights and obligations. But under Manorialism there was no contract but only relationship between a superior and an interior. The lord being the superior kept down his subjects who were chiefly peasants in an inferior position socially and politically. A fief generally consisted of several manors which were under the control of a lord. Just as the lord of a manor had to render feudal services to his immediate lord so as to keep his fief, similarly the peasants of the manor had to do odd economic jobs so as to hold their bits of land. The former category included a set of free nobles discharging honourable services to their immediate

lords. The latter category consisting of free and unfree peasants discharged ignoble economic jobs in return for a small strip of land. The land possessed by the lord was known as manor. The manor-house or the residence of the lord was the nerve-centre of the manor. The lord's barns, oven, mill, garden and fruit-trees were situated near the manor-house. The dwellings of the peasants were situated at a farther distance. Adjacent to that was the Parish Church with a house for the Parish priest.

The woods of the peasants were surrounded by cultivated lands and wastelands were situated still farther. The land in the manor was divided into demesne land or land held by the lord and land held in villeinage or land held by the tenant. Each peasant got 20 to 30 acres not concentrated in one place. These strips lay scattered in three fields throughout the manor. Under the circumsinces the open-field system prevailed in agriculture. Cultivation was based on the three-field system under which two-thirds of the land was cultivated and the remaining one-third was left fallow.

In return for the land held by the serfs or villeins, they had to perform certain economic duties each villein or serf had to cultivate the lord's land for two or three days in the week. This was known as "week-work". But in busy seasons like sowing and harvesting, they had to do extra work known as "boon. They had to pay rent to the lord in cash or kind. The villagers should use the lord's mill oven and wine press for all which the lord got payment in the form of flour, bread and wine. They had to render routine services called labour services like re pairing roads, constructing bridges, fortifications, etc. in the waters or hunting in the forests a small levy was paid by For fishing him He has to pay a fine to the lord in case the serf sent his son to a school or Church as such act deprived the manor the services of a farm-hand. The serf has to pay a tax to the lord in he gave his son or daughter away in marriage to anyone outside the lord's manor He himself had to make of his own marriage Apart from these menial duties, the peasants had to pay annual rents, inheritance tax, head tax, marketing fees, etc The lord had also his court which served as a source of income to him. The villager had to pay one-tenth of the pro fuse to the Parish priest divided into two categories-free and unfree. The serfs of the manor were tilled the soil of the Lord for a fixed payment and was absolutely free-tenant free to leave the manor

at any time. But in the case of the unfroucase payment in case tenant he was bound to the manor. He had to obtain the lord's permission to marry and could not leave the manor

The manor was a self-sufficient and self-contained unit Administration of the manor was carried on by the lord with the help of the Steward and the Bailiff. The Steward was the representative of the lord in the manor and acted on his behalf. The Bailiff attended to the details of cultivation and the management of the manor. Manorial System disappeared from most parts of Western Europe in the 15th century.

Struggle between Empire and papacy

From the middle of the 11th century the situation began to change. One cause was the rapid progress of European economic recovery, which brought shifts of power detrimental to Germany. More immediately important was the revival of the papacy, which the emperors had done so much to further. After Henry III’s death in 1056 the initiative passed into papal hands. It was favoured by the long minority until 1065 of Henry IV (crowned 1084; died 1106), which enabled the papacy to act without fear of intervention from north of the Alps, and by the appearance of allies particularly the Normans of the Kingdom of Sicily, who for their own purposes supported the papacy against the empire. As they reached maturity the peoples of Europe turned to the pope as leader of Christendom. Even within the imperial frontiers the emperor’s power meant more to the Germans than to the inhabitants of Burgundy or of Italy, for whom it betokened subjection to German rule. Furthermore, only Otto III and he for less than four years made Rome the seat of empire; all the rest, from Charlemagne onward, concentrated their efforts north of the Alps. In practice, therefore, the empire was a very imperfect realization of the ideal of an imperium Christianum; and as soon as it was in a position to vindicate its independence, the papacy found many adherents.

Under Pope Gregory VII (1073–85) the papal theory of the empire, as formulated in the 9th century, was revived, but on broader and firmer foundations. The result was the conflict, from 1076 until 1122, known as the Investiture Controversy, ostensibly centring on the question of whether lay overlords had the authority to “invest” bishops and abbots within their

domains—that is, to appoint them and formally give them the symbols of their office. The real issue, however, was not the investiture of bishoprics and abbacies but the place of the emperor in Christian society and his relations with the papacy. Only the pope, Gregory VII asserted, might use the imperial insignia; he might lawfully depose emperors but should himself be judged by none (these lapidary statements are among the 27 included in the Dictatus papae of 1075 and were set down in Gregory's register). Thus the claim to independence turned rapidly into a claim to superiority. In particular, the sacred character of the emperor was challenged, as was his claim to be responsible directly to God. Instead, on the basis of the Donation of Constantine and a papal interpretation of the coronation of 800, it was argued that it was for the pope to convey the imperial dignity and, if he thought fit, to withhold or withdraw it. The Investiture Controversy was brought to a close by compromise in the Concordat of Worms of 1122 between Pope Calixtus II and the emperor Henry V; but Gregory VII's claims were taken up again by popes Alexander III, Innocent III, Innocent IV, and Boniface VIII, in a series of conflicts that shook the empire to its foundations.

The challenge thrown out by Gregory VII forced the emperors to seek new foundations for their position. Gregory's great opponent, the emperor Henry IV, had still asserted the traditional rights of his father. His successors in the 12th century, Henry V (1106–25; crowned 1111), Lothar II (1125–37; crowned 1133), Frederick I Barbarossa (1152–90; crowned 1155), and Henry VI (1190–97; crowned 1191), shifted their ground. To counter the arguments of church lawyers they grasped the weapons provided by the revival of Roman law. A new and more exalted conception of the empire was the result. Best known was the addition by Frederick I Barbarossa, in 1157, of the word sacrum to the name of the empire, which then became the Sacrum Imperium (Holy Empire) as a counterbalance to the Sancta Ecclesia (Holy Church). Equally characteristic was the canonization of Charlemagne by Frederick's antipope Paschal III in 1165. In this way Frederick emphasized continuity with the Frankish past and asserted his rights as Charlemagne's successor. They derived, he argued, not from conferment by the pope or by the Roman people but from Frankish conquest.

Unlike earlier emperors, who had based their position on their special relation with the church, the Hohenstaufen emperors emphasized its secular foundations. Against Pope Innocent III's claims to confer the imperial crown, imperial lawyers asserted that "he who is chosen by the election of the princes alone is the true emperor, even before he has been confirmed by the pope." Nor is it surprising that, confronted with the universal claims of the papacy, the Hohenstaufen emperors asserted rights no less universal. Though in day-to-day politics, in their relations with the kings of France or of England, for example, there is no sign that they were seeking world dominion, nevertheless the new imperialism soon called forth protests from all sides from England and France, from Denmark and Hungary. "Who," asked John of Salisbury, "appointed the Germans to be judges over the nations?"

Meanwhile, the conflict with the papacy and the desire to restore the territorial basis of imperial power, which the Investiture Controversy had shattered, drew the emperors more and more into Italy, where they encountered the same national reaction. Unable to defeat the Lombard League, a northern Italian urban coalition, Frederick I patched up the Peace of Constance in 1183. His ultimate sovereignty was recognized, but his power in Italy was fatally compromised. After his son, Henry VI had through marriage inherited the kingdom of southern Italy and Sicily, the power of the Norman kingdom was used to restore the imperial position in Italy. It was a grandiose policy but overstrained. The papacy, fearing that Rome would be engulfed, reacted violently.

Frederick II

Pope Innocent III, profiting from German dissensions after the early death of Henry VI (1197), played upon the German factions (Otto IV, not established as king until 1208, was crowned emperor in 1209). Henry VI's son Frederick II (1212–50; crowned 1220), by the Privilegium in favorem principum ecclesiasticorum (1220) and by the Statutum in favorem principum (1232), made far-reaching concessions to the German princes in order to ensure their support for his Italian policy, but in vain. In spite of his striking victory at Cortenuova in 1237, Frederick II failed to crush the Lombards and was excommunicated in 1239 and deposed in 1245. His death in 1250 marked the effective end of the

medieval empire. In Germany a long interregnum (from 1250 to 1273) brought down the imperial structure. In Italy, to ensure that there could be no restoration, the papacy called in Charles of Anjou, a younger son from the French royal house, who conquered the south and became King Charles I of Naples and Sicily (1266–85). When Rudolf I of Habsburg succeeded as German king in 1273, he was only the head of a federation of princes, while in Italy he abandoned all claims over the centre and south, and he retained only titular rights in Lombard.

The empire after Frederick II

It is characteristic of the new situation that Rudolf I of Habsburg, though he made a number of attempts, never formally achieved the imperial dignity. Henceforward the title of emperor, though it continued, usually did not have the sanction of personal crowning by a pope or papal legate. For a century after Frederick II's death the only "true" emperor was Henry VII (king from 1308 to 1313), who was crowned in Rome in 1312 by legates of the Avignon pope. Thereafter until the end of the empire there were in all only four emperors who were duly crowned: Charles IV, crowned by a legate in 1355; Sigismund, by the pope in 1433; Frederick III, in 1452; and Charles V, by the pope but at Bologna, in 1530. If the empire and imperial title continued to exist, it resulted partly from the force of tradition, partly from the exigencies of German politics, and partly from fear of the dangerous conflict of interests that any plan for its abolition would necessarily involve.

The Germans, naturally, were unwilling to surrender hope of regaining something of the empire's former power: both Henry VII and Louis IV (king from 1314 to 1347; his Roman coronation in 1327 was by representatives of the people) sought to revive the Italian policies of the Hohenstaufen. But the balance had swung against them. France was already striving for the imperial position that Napoleon was ultimately to secure, and France determined that the Germans should not recover the imperial prerogatives. Moreover, in Germany itself, civil war had undermined the power of the kingship, and the elective monarchy was effectively controlled by the princes through the college of electors definitely established soon after 1250. French pretensions to leadership in Europe provoked a last tardy revival of imperialist sentiment both in Germany (Alexander of Roes at the end of the 13th century, Engelbert of Admont at the beginning of the 14th)

and in Italy (Marsilius of Padua and Dante), but the emperor Charles IV, a sober realist, drew the necessary conclusions. By then the axiom that "the king is emperor in his kingdom" was firmly established; it marked the end of any Universalist dream. Charles set out accordingly to make the empire a specifically German institution. By agreement with Pope Clement V, he formally abandoned Italy; he would enter Rome only on the day fixed for his coronation and leave again the same day. This he did on April 5, 1355. Then he turned to the definition of the German constitution, particularly the rights of the electors, in the Golden Bull of 1356. The change was reflected in the final evolution of the empire's title: Sacrum Romanum Imperium Nationis Germanicae (Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation). This title, which appears under Frederick III (king from 1440, emperor from 1452 to 1493), indicates that the emperor's powers were limited to his German lands. In 1508 Frederick's successor Maximilian I, unable to go to Rome, assumed with papal consent the style "elected emperor" or "chosen emperor" (Latin imperator electus; German erwählter Kaiser).

The history of the empire after the promulgation of the Golden Bull may be treated briefly, because from that time it is essentially a part of German history. It is true that memories of an imperial past continued to have an influence on German thinking and that in the Habsburg lands there was a sense of belonging to a multinational empire. A few emperors Sigismund in the 15th century, Charles V in the 16th may even have thought to recover part of the old imperial prerogative. It was also possible to make something of the empire's leadership of Christendom against the Turks. But institutionally the role of the empire was almost continuously whittled away. After the failure of the project of imperial reform sponsored in 1495 by the elector of Mainz, Berthold of Henneberg, the hope vanished of endowing the empire with permanent institutions effective beyond the limits of the different principalities. The Reformation entrenched the princes firmly in their rights and accentuated their autonomy. When Charles V, opening the Diet of Worms in 1521, declared that "the empire from of old had not many masters, but one, and it is our intention to be that one," he was shutting his eyes to the realities.

The extent of his dominions was imposing, but they were a weak dynastic agglomeration; and though Charles championed the Roman Catholic Church against the Reformation, his empire was neither in spirit nor in fact a revival of the medieval empire. When he accepted the Peace of Augsburg in 1555 and abdicated in 1556, the change that was begun with the accession of Rudolf I of Habsburg was completed. With Germany split into two religious camps, the emperor was little more than the head of a religious faction. Furthermore, after Sigismund's death (1437), with one short intermission for Charles VII from 1742 to 1745, the imperial crown, though in theory elective, was hereditary in the Habsburg dynasty of Austria; and this fact produced a cleavage of interests between emperor and empire.

The end of the empire

From 1556 until its end under Francis II in 1806 the empire meant little more than a loose federation of the different princes of Germany, lay and ecclesiastical, under the presidency of the House of Habsburg. After the Thirty Years' War (1618–48), no emperor again attempted, as Charles V had done, to re-establish a strengthened central authority; and the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 marked the empire's final organization on federal lines. Yet, even at the end, the empire had loyal adherents, particularly among the small knights and noblemen of western Germany, who regarded it as their safeguard against princely absolutism; and its role was not so entirely negative as is sometimes thought. Its loose structure still suited to some degree the cosmopolitan spirit of the 18th century. But with the French Revolution, and the intensified nationalism that followed, it became an anachronism. As far back as the end of the 13th century, French kings had been scheming to annex the title as well as to absorb the outlying territories of the empire. With Napoleon's rise to power this ambition came within reach. Posing as the new Charlemagne ("because, like Charlemagne, I unite the crown of France to that of the Lombards, and my empire marches with the east"), he resolved in 1806 to oust Francis II from his title and to make the Holy Roman Empire a part of the Napoleonic "new order." He was anticipated, however, by Francis II, who in 1804 had assumed the title "hereditary emperor of Austria" and who, resolving that no other should wear the

crown that he was powerless to defend, resigned the old imperial dignity on August 6, 1806.

So perished the Holy Roman Empire. The extent and character of its influence will always be a matter for debate, but it left a deep imprint on Europe. Nor did it cease to be influential after its extinction. The debate about the medieval empire was an ideological background to the creation of the Second Reich, or German Empire, in 1871, and even Adolf Hitler's Third Reich drew sustenance from memories, often thwarted and perverted, of Charlemagne and Otto the Great and Frederick II.

The Crusades

The Crusades, which began in 1095 were holy wars carried on at intervals in the 12th and 13th centuries by the Christians with the approval of the Pope for the purpose of recovering from the hands of Muslims the holy places of Palestine These wars O the 'Cross against the Crescent according to tradition were eight in number. The first four were major Crusades and the last four minor Crusades. The fall of Acre, the last crusading outpost in 1291 into the hands of the Muslims is usually regarded as marking the end of the Crusades.

Causes

Religious zeal

One of the important causes of the Crusades was the religious zeal and fanaticism of the people. Christendom was never united politically. But against the common danger fomented by the Muslims, sentimentally at least they drew closer. It was no doubt an age of faith. But it was also an age of war necessitated by the exigencies of the feudal set-up. Every pious Christian considered it his sacred duty to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The holy places were in the hands of the Arabs who gave some concessions to the Christian pilgrims. But the position changed for the worse when the Seljuk Turks captured Jerusalem in 1071 from the Fatimid Caliph of Egypt. Thenceforward the persecution of the Christian pilgrims became the order of the day position became intolerable and the woeful tales of indignities to Gradually the pilgrims touched the tender conscience of all in the Christendom To save themselves from persecution and humiliation, the Christians undertook a crusade against the Turks.

The Impact of Islam

The Islamic culture radiated in all its glory throughout Europe ever since the rise of Islam in the 7th century. It posed a serious threat to the Christian culture The Muslims were a factor to be reckoned with in the politics of Europe. Though they were driven out of Southern Italy and Sicily by the Normans in the 11th century, they still held out in Spain. The Islamic empire included Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Northern coast lands of Africa. The Byzantine Empire received its rudest from the Seljuk Turks. The impact of Islam was formidable indeed.

The ambition of the Popes

The ambition of the Popes was another cause that led to the Crusades. It was an age of faith when people blindly believed and obeyed the commands of the Popes. The Popes seized the opportunity to enhance their position and power. Feudal set up; the vast land-holdings of the Church conferred on it a unique spiritual and temporal authority far exceeding the position of even the kings. The authority of the Church was wider than the secular and narrow authorities of the kings. As the embodiment of people's faith, the Church had to redeem its glory by recovering the holy places though it could not raise armies to defend the faith. But Urban II saw in the threat of Muslims to the Byzantine power a general threat to the whole of European Christian world. The Great Eastern Schism of 1054 separating the Greek from Latin Christianity gave a rude shock to the prestige of papacy. He saw in the situation an opportunity to bring the Eastern Roman Church under papal control. Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1031-1118) earnestly entreated Pope. The Pope was] Urban II to save him from the impending peril only too glad to avail himself of the opportunity to promote unity among the Christians and rally them under a single banner for a common cause.

Some Italian towns like Venice, Genoa, Pisa, etc., participated in the Crusades as these towns saw in them an opportunity to extend their trade at the expense of the Muslim traders. Circumstances favourable to the Crusades

(¹) The Magyars or Hungarians embraced the Christian faith. This helped the Crusaders to have access to a straight land route to the east.

(2) As the Mediterranean Sea was freed from the periodical piratical raids of the Muslims, a free sea passage to Palestine became a fait accomplishment...

(3) The frequent civil wars in the empire of the Seljuk Turks gave an excellent opportunity to the Crusaders to advance their interests in the Holy Land.

(4) The frequent feuds between the Arabs and the Turks provided the Crusaders with a favourable opportunity to fish in troubled waters.

The weakening of the Byzantine Empire

The Muslims made constant inroads into the territory of the Eastern Emperors. At this stage the Byzantine Empire was in a weak position. The imperial splendour was only a forgotten dream and its army very ineffective. The Emperors were not reconciled to the authority of Rome in Church matters as the Schism in 1054 had practically divided the two sings The crushing defeat of Emperor, Romanus IV Diogenes (1067 71) at the hands of the to participate in such 'armed pilgrimages (6) The enormous growth in the power of the Pope was another circumstance which favoured the crusading enterprises. Religious zeal of the people had already touched the boiling point.

(5) The idea of a crusade appealed to countless knights and warriors who were athirst for military glories and personal distinctions. Their warlike ambitions were protection and safety utilised for religious. The love of adventure and the desire to earn name and fame instigated the princes and nobles of the age to enter into the Crusades must be admitted that many were moved by religious enthusiasm. Though personal motives crept in, it

Seljuk Turks in 1071 at Manzikert made the situation still worse. The Byzantine Empire had faced many a crisis ever since its inception. But the defeat at Manzikert at the hands of the Turks was the unkindest cut of all. In 1085 they captured Antioch, the last only a leader was needed to sound the clarion call when things took a critical turn the humpet call came from Pope. He summoned a meeting at Clermont in France. He preached the First Crusade in 1095 at Clermont. His passionate and tervent appeal to the Assembly had the desired feet. Thousands who beard him shouted "God wills it. Immediately after the meeting they affixed the Crees to their garments. The Muslims Thus the

Crusades, the longhad a crescent on their banner drawn-out wars of the Cross against the Crescent began.

People's Crusade (1035-1096)

The People's Crusade formed the prelude to the First Crusade. That mere enthusiasm even it is for the sake of religious glory could not be an effective substitute for organized military action was demonstrated when a vast concourse of men, women, and children, inspired by religious fervour alone proceeded towards Jerusalem. This motley gathering was led by Peter the Hermit and Walter the Penniless. It's distressing journey was filled with any tales of hunger and woe. Unorganised marches through inhospitable regions resulted in their easily being broken to the point of extinction. Their position was worsened when regular Turkish forces swooped down upon them and mercilessly reduced their numbers. The survivors of the holocaust were offered a choice between conversion to Islam and death. Most of them preferred martyrdom through death.

First Crusade (1096-99)

The First Crusade was purely a French-dominated expedition. The three important crowned heads of Germany (Henry IV), England (William II) and France (Philip I) did not participate in this Crusade. The First Crusade was organised by feudal barons of France. The important leaders were Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lotharingia, Count Raymond of Toulouse, Robert, Count of Flanders. Count Bohemund of Taranto, Robert, the Duke of Normandy (brother of the English King). Count Hugh of Vermandois (brother of the French King), Count Stephen of Blois, etc they arrived at their destinations through dire different routes. The first was the usual pahiupoute three Hungary and Serbia, the second through North Faly and Dalmatia, and the third across the Adriatic from Bact in South Italy to Durazno in the coast of Greece. The first route was taken by Godfrey of Bouillon, the second by Raymond of Toulouse and the third by Robert of Flanders and Bohemund, The combined forces were very much helped by Greek-supply line and information on topography. The remarkable enthusiasm coupled with careful direction of the operations by able leaders enabled the Crusaders to obtain more gains than they had hoped for. On the definite understanding that the newly conquered territories would be handed over to Alexius, the Byzantine Emperor lent able military support. The first prize of

the expedition was the capture of Nicaea in 1097. This was handed over to Alexius. The Turks were decisively defeated at Dorylaeum in 1097. After that the victorious army marched towards Iconium. Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey, succeeded in setting up the first Latin principality-County of Edessa-in 1098. The siege of Antioch which was a protracted one began in October 1097. The crusading army reached Jerusalem in 1099 year ago that the Turks were driven out of Jerusalem by the Fatimid's of Egypt. After much slaughter and bloodshed, Jerusalem was captured from the Fatimid's in 1099. This was a standing achievement. Godfrey who had guided much of the destinies of the forces was chosen to be the King of Jerusalem. He did not wear a crown and preferred to style Linsell as the Defender of the Holy Sepulchre". Many European elements supported this move of setting up a Christian Kingdom to gain personal favours like trade concessions. Though Raymond of Toulouse championed the cause of Alexius to Antioch, he was rewarded with the county of Tripolis south of the principality of Antioch. But the city of Tripolis itself not captured then. It fell only in 1109 during the rule of his son Bertrand. The conquests in the First Crusade led to the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch and the counties of Edessa and Tripolis. The First Crusade was 21 great successes. Two Orders-The Knights Templers and Knights Hospitallers the first to protect the Christian pilgrims and pilgrimages, the second to sustain charitable bodies like hospitals-in course time assumed military character. "These Orders tried to blend the asceticism of them monk with the courage and vigour of the soldiers". Soon the two Orders grew enormously rich. no wonder that Philip IV of France at a later time laid his hands on the riches of the Knights Templers.

Second Crusade (1147-1148)

The Muslims could not be contained for long. Zangi a Muslim Chieftain of Mosul put an end to the independent existence of Edessa. The news of the loss of Edessa provoked the Christian world for a concerted action. In this loss the Christians feared the dangerous onslaught of the Mohammedans. St. Bernard of Clairvaux was the author of the Second Crusade. Conrad III of Germany along with the French King Louis VII organised the Second Crusade. A large number of untrained soldiers and enthusiastic but less efficient civil camp-followers added to the military problems. The Second Crusade was a thorough failure. The

Second Crusade was responsible for inspiring a stir in the Christian world though it accomplished nothing. The power of the Mohammedan strength began to be appreciated and to be emulated. The appeal of the King of Jerusalem to the Byzantine Empire fell on deaf ears The latter was motivated only personal considerations of his empire and was not so keen on strengthening the newly established Latin kingdoms by the First Crusade. Saladin, the Egyptian Amir, lost no time in effectively seizing the opportunity of a disunited Christian West to capture Jerusalem and put an end to the Christian kingdom. The Latin HISTORY OF EUROPE butchered and though they were brave enough were not numerous Thus in 1187 the loss enough to stem the tide of Saladin's thrust of Jerusalem became an established fact and the whole of Europe once again contemplated a third Crusade to wreak vengeance Third Crusade (1189-1192)

The Third Crusade was the most spectacular of all the Crusades. Three nick-named Kings of Europe, Frederick Bar Richard the Barossa of Germany, Philip Augustus of France and There was Lion heart of England participated in the Crusade. Unfortunately divided counsel on the nature of the campaigns to he executed and it seriously affected the tone and morale of the forces Frederick Barbarossa set out in 118. But he was drowned in a stream in Cilicia in 1190. It was after this that Philip Augustus and Richard I started in 1190. The depleted forces of Frederick along with other Crusaders were engaged in besieging Acre, Philip Landed early in Acre. Richard captured Cyprus in 1191 and arrived at Acre in the same year. It was after his arrival that Acre fell in 1191. Soon after the fall of Acre, Philip II returned to France on the pretext of his illness, but really to wrest the territories of the Richard in France. So Richard alone was left out to carry on Crusade. Richard I defeated Saladin in the battle of Arsuf. It was this battle which won for Richard the title of "Lion-heart". He then captured Jaffa, refortified Ascalon and reached the neighbourhood of Jerusalem within 12 miles. But he was not able to accomplish anything further. He obtained in 1192 a truce for three years and Saladin also granted free access to the pilgrim centres. Though he was Richard was held in ransom by the Germans released after two years in 1194. His death in one of the minor skirmishes in 1199 in France is altogether a different story thing tangible, therefore, out of this Crusade save the generosity and chivalry of the Saracen Saladin in permitting the pilgrims to visit

the city of Jerusalem." The Third Crusade was s partial success. A new military order called Teutonic Knights was founded during the Third Crusade.

Fourth Crusade (1202-1204)

The leader of this Crusade was Boniface, Marquess of Mantas conveyance through sea had to be arranged, and the Crusaders turned to the Italian cities of Venice, Pisa and Genoa. The city of Venice itself entered the Crusade exacting a portion of the pound of flesh towards the hiring of ships. The army of the Cross was mismanaged and Zara was captured from Hungary and duly handed over to Venice. The Italian towns like Venice which had amassed huge riches by carrying on profitable trade with the Muslims in the east had as their chief rivals in the trade the merchants of Constantinople. A disputed succession to the throne of Constantinople gave them an opportunity to interfere in the affairs of Constantinople. The Byzantine prince Alexius besides paying a huge amount of money promised to bring the Greek Church under the Latin Church in return for reinstating his father Isaac II Angeleus to the throne of "Constantinople. In 1203 the Byzantine prince's namesake Alexius III was deposed and Isaac along with his son Alexius IV was res. to red to power. The new rulers were not able to keep up their promises. In the meanwhile, a palace revolution was launched by a prince. Isaac and Alexius IV were deposed and the prince assumed the title of Alexius V.

The Crusaders now decided to conquer the Byzantine Empire itself. The sack of Constantinople began in 1204. The plunder of the city and the destruction of a large number of Churches and treasures of art was sordid chapter unjustified by the motives of the Crusaders. A Latin Empire was set up at Constantinople with Baldwin of Flanders as the first Emperor. Though Innocent III disapproved of the sack of Constantinople, he found consolation in the fact that the Greek Church was brought under his subjection. The Latin empire which was inaugurated in 1204 lasted till 1261. The Fourth Crusade was one in which the army of the Cross was mismanaged.

Results of the Crusades

(1) Establishment of Christian kingdoms

The Muslims were driven out of the Iberian Peninsula. Loss of Byzantine prestige. The Crusades in the end left Byzantine power vastly while the earlier Courades strengthened in prestige and honour. Turks, the Fourth Cru the Empire's position by driving out the side dealt a severe blow to Constantinople led to religious submission as well, and the loss of Byzantine was never fully recovered. The Crusading spirit spread like a contagious disease and it led to the conversion of Slav races on the shores of the Baltic Sea Thus to Christianity and the Germanisation of the population. The Christian civilisation was preserved in south Western Europe. The spirit of nationalism began to terminate in men's minds which ultimately led to the emergence of nation. The Crusades seriously affected the future of the Military Orders. They fled to Malta and ruled the island under the name of Knights of Malta from 1530 15 1798. The Order was disbanded in 1798. The power and prestige of the Popes increased but they steadily declined because of the struggle between the Empires. The Church which had become enormously rich by the purchase of lands from the nobles during the Crusades provoked resentment from all quarters. The extensive travels undertaken during the Crusades provided the people with an opportunity to promote their knowledge of geography. It prepared the way for the discovery of new trade routes in which Portugal and Spain became pioneers It gave an added fillip to the ship-building industry which in turn paved the way for the use of Mariner's Compass, ere The military contacts simultaneously fostered commercial contacts. The Italian and French towns which were already engaged in prosperous trade with the east received added stimulus as a result of the Crusades.

The contact established by the Europeans the Muslims through Crusades was rewarded with many benefits. The interval between the wars enabled the Europeans to appreciate many civilised habits and comforts enjoyed by the Saracens. New habits in dress, food (particularly sugar and spice), etc, were cultivated by the Europeans. Translation of important Arab works into Latin continued to enrich the European intellectual vigour. In literature of the later medieval period the influence of Arabian Nights is visible in Squires Tale of Chaucer. Boccaccio must have taken much from Arabian accounts, material for his Decameron. In the military sector, the Europeans undoubtedly learnt a lot

from the Crusades "The use of the crossbow, the wearing of heavy mail by knight and horse and the use of cotton pads under the armour are of Crusading origin". It is in the use of even musical instruments that the Europeans adopted Arabic fashions. They also learnt the art of training pigeons for sending messages.

The Rise of Medieval Universities

The European university is a particular organization that emerged out of the conditions of medieval society. Students and teachers in Europe applied the medieval trend of guild organization to protect themselves from local laws, high prices, and prejudices. Wider needs within medieval society for people with skills and learning boosted student numbers, and universities grew to meet the demand. The collapse of the Roman Empire in the fourth century created a period of anarchy and economic crisis across Europe. The intellectual climate changed drastically, and large numbers of books and papers were lost or destroyed. The overall need for learned men fell in parallel with the decline of trade, economics, and local administration. Greek and Roman learning was preserved in Eastern Europe in the Byzantine Empire, and over time Islamic scholars absorbed and spread the ancient texts throughout the Middle East. In Western Europe the few surviving texts were scattered in monastery libraries. However, the early medieval monks were more interested in theological and philosophical texts than pagan mathematics or science, so few copies were made of such works. Over the centuries many surviving ancient texts decayed into dust, or were destroyed in wars and other disasters.

Latin was the language of the monks and the surviving texts were rewritten in abbreviated medieval style of Latin, often based on poor translations from Greek. Over time the curriculum of medieval learning became set, based on large compendiums of simplified Greek knowledge compiled by encyclopaedists such as Boethius (480-524). Medieval learning was based on the seven liberal arts. The quadrivium (four) were mathematically based, comprising arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy, but these were much less popular than the linguistic trivium (three) of grammar, rhetoric, and logic, which led to further study in theology, philosophy, medicine, and law. The main demand for higher education was within the church, and the majority of students were clergy, as

were their teachers. In the eleventh century new contact with the East, in the form of the Crusades, helped to recover lost ancient knowledge. While the Crusades were mainly destructive and religious-driven wars, there were some positive outcomes for European society. Western scholars came to realize that Islamic intellectuals had a storehouse of ancient learning wider than their own. The Arabic scholars had added new material to the classics, either on their own, or by absorbing the intellectual traditions of nearby cultures such as Hindus and Babylonians. There was also contact with the Muslim world in Spain, the southern half of which was an Islamic state. Many European scholars travelled to Spain to learn Arabic and other so-called oriental languages.

European economics and politics slowly began to develop, and the growth in trade and government administration saw an increased need for literate and numerate scholars. The survival of ancient texts in Western monasteries had made them the focal points of medieval learning. The cathedral schools, especially those in capital cities or at pivotal trade routes, began to grow with the slow rise of trade and economic stability. These became centres for copying the new texts recovered from the East. While originally intended for religious study, various reforms made these schools accept secular students as well. As student numbers climbed, these centres of learning gradually evolved into universities.

Impact

The word university originates from the term universities, which originally meant any collection of professionals in a guild or organization. The motivations behind these corporations were to provide their members with protection from rival groups, and enable price regulation and monopolies. Over time the term became narrowed to mean strictly a society of academics. There is some debate among scholars about which particular place can be called the first university. The medical school at Salerno, in southern Italy, is often cited as the first university, or at least one of the first universities. Salerno was well known as a health resort from the ninth century. It was also a meeting place of Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Jewish learning, being a port situated on important trade routes. It became universities sometime in the twelfth century, and obtained formal recognition in 1231, but remained solely a medical school and did not influence the style and organization of later universities.

The university that was to inspire the majority of other institutions in southern Europe was Bologna. The Italian town had a law school of great renown, which attracted students from all over Europe, often from wealthy backgrounds. Like many medieval towns, Bologna discriminated against foreign residents. They were taxed at higher rates, charged more for lodging and food, had harsh laws imposed upon them, and was liable for military service. Near the end of the twelfth century the foreign law students at Bologna formed a union to provide protection from these local customs and laws. The students had to fight for their rights, and it took a three-year strike before their absence caused the authorities to give in to their demands. Students, it was discovered, were a vital part of the local economy, and so they could demand better treatment, or take their money elsewhere. To keep the students at Bologna they were granted cheap rent, food, and taxes, as well as exception from military service and the right to set teaching fees.

In Paris, at around the same time, the teachers of that city formed themselves into a corporation, a universities magistorum. Students in Paris tended to be French, but their teachers were often foreign, and so organized themselves for protection and mutual benefit. Students were allowed to join the guild as junior members and, if they passed their examinations, could slowly advance up the corporate hierarchy. Paris was the model that later northern European universities followed.

Universities began to spread across Europe. Often disputes within a university led to migrations of teachers and students and the formation of new universities. Migrations from Bologna led to the founding of Padua (1222). Further moves from Padua led to the creation of a university at Vercelli (1228). Some historians claim that up to half the universities of medieval Europe originated from such disputes. Universities also sprung up seemingly on their own, although usually following the organizational principles of either Bologna or Paris. By 1500, there were 62 recognized universities in Europe.

The fortunes of universities were closely tied to the towns they existed within, or near. Many famous schools, such as Oxford and Cambridge, were founded at busy commercial centres. There was often conflict between the town

authorities and the academic guilds. Many riots occurred in the early history of universities, referred to as "town versus gown battles." One of the questions at stake was who had legal authority over academics. Over time it became accepted that scholars could not be arrested or tortured by town authorities, except for murder. In effect, universities became independent entities with their own code of conduct and discipline.

In the early universities, lectures were usually held in the master's room, or a hired hall, as these universities owned no buildings of their own. Classes consisted of a master reading aloud and commenting on an established text, while the students copied down the lecture word for word. This gave the students both the original text and a learned commentary on the work. Lecturers, who spoke too softly, or too quickly, were often shouted at by their students, and in some cases attacked. As the lecturers relied on the fees paid by their students, teachers could be boycotted, and driven by economic necessity to alter their teaching or leave. The use of Latin as the academic language meant that academics could study and teach in any European country. University students and teachers were very mobile, often travelling to several institutions in their careers, and helped create a European wide sense of learning.

Universities taught the seven liberal arts and at least some of the advanced topics of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. Many universities began to include practical courses in response to public demand. Courses in the art of letter writing trained the clerks, money-counters, and administrators of the flourishing economy.

However, the era of growth did not last, as the fourteenth century was beset with famines, disease, and war. The conflict that came to be called The Hundred Years' War disrupted trade, and the plague known as the Black Death killed approximately a third of Europe's population. The universities continued as well as they could, although many were forced to suspend classes for extended periods. These disruptions had wider social implications, for while the twelfth century had been a time of expanding intellectual horizons, particularly with the influx of Arabic and ancient knowledge, the university curriculum now became fixed and rigidly taught. By the sixteenth century many critics regarded the universities as places of backward, unimportant studies. University

academics were accused of following their ancient sources too closely, while ignoring the dramatic changes in European religion, politics, economics, and wider discoveries of the world. Yet the universities survived and even flourished, for social changes had once again increased the demand for educated men to fill positions in commerce and administration, and the universities held a monopoly on higher learning. Universities continue to evolve today, and yet still retain some of their earliest characteristics, as formed in the medieval period.

The Growth of Medieval Towns

In the ancient world, town life was well established, particularly in Greece and Rome. Ancient towns were busy trading centres. But after the fall of the Roman Empire in the west, trade with the east suffered, and town life declined. In the Early Middle Ages, most people in Western Europe lived in scattered communities in the countryside. By the High Middle Ages, towns were growing again. One reason for their growth was improvements in agriculture. Farmers were clearing forests and adopting better farming methods. As a result, they had a surplus of crops to sell in town markets. And because of these surpluses, not everyone had to farm to feed themselves. Another reason for the growth of towns was the revival of trade. Seaport towns, such as Venice and Genoa in Italy, Served as trading centres for goods from the Middle East and Asia. Within Europe, merchants often travelled by river, and many towns grew up near these waterways. Many merchants who sold their wares in towns became permanent residents. So did people practicing various trades. Some towns grew wealthier because local people specialized in making specific types of goods. For example, towns in Flanders (present-day Belgium and the Netherlands) were known for their fine woollen cloth. The Italian city of Venice was known for making glass. Other towns built their wealth on the banking industry that grew up to help people trade more easily. At the beginning of the middle Ages, towns were generally part of the domain of a feudal lord whether a monarch, a noble, or a high-ranking Church official. As towns grew wealthier, town dwellers began to resent the lord's feudal rights and his demands for taxes. They felt they no longer needed the lord's protection or his interference.

In some places, such as northern France and Italy, violence broke out as towns struggled to become independent. In other places, such as England and

parts of France, the change was more peaceful. Many towns became independent by purchasing a royal charter. A charter granted them the right to govern them, make laws, and raise taxes. Free towns were often governed by a mayor and a town council. Power gradually shifted from feudal lords to the rising class of merchants and craftspeople. At the beginning of the middle Ages, towns were generally part of the domain of a feudal lord whether a monarch, a noble, or a high-ranking Church official. As towns grew wealthier, town dwellers began to resent the lord's feudal rights and his demands for taxes. They felt they no longer needed the lord's protection or his interference. In some places, such as northern France and Italy, violence broke out as towns struggled to become independent. In other places, such as England and parts of France, the change was more peaceful. Many towns became independent by purchasing a royal charter. A charter granted them the right to govern them, make laws, and raise taxes.

Free towns were often governed by a mayor and a town council. Power gradually shifted from feudal lords to the rising class of merchants and craftspeople. The trade routes shown on this map carried a constant flow of goods among European cities and from distant Asia and Africa. Towns of the Hanseatic League cooperated to form a powerful trade group in northern Europe.

Guilds

Medieval towns began as centres for trade, but they soon became places where many goods were produced, as well. Both trade and the production of goods were overseen by organizations called guilds. There were two main kinds of guilds: merchant guilds and craft guilds. All types of craftspeople had their own guilds, from cloth makers to cobblers (who made shoes, belts, and other leather goods), to the stonemasons who built the great cathedrals. Guilds provided help and protection for the people doing a certain kind of work, and they maintained high standards. Guilds controlled the hours of work and set prices. They also dealt with complaints from the public. If, for example, a coal merchant cheated a customer, all coal merchants might look bad. The guilds therefore punished members who cheated. Guild members paid dues to their guild. Their dues paid for the construction of guildhalls and for guild fairs and festivals. Guilds also used the money to take care of members and their families who were sick and unable to work. It was not easy to become a member of a

guild. Starting around age 12, a boy, and sometimes a girl, became an apprentice. An apprentice's parents signed an agreement with a master of the trade. The master agreed to house, feed, and train the apprentice. Sometimes, but not always, the parents paid the master a sum of money. Apprentices rarely got paid for their work. At the end of seven years, apprentices had to prove to the guild that they had mastered their trade. To do this, an apprentice produced a piece of work called a "master piece." If the guild approved of the work, the apprentice was given the right to become a master and set up his or her own business. Setting up a business was expensive, however, and few people could afford to do it right away. Often they became journeymen instead. The word journeyman does not refer to a journey. It comes from the French word journey, for "day." A journeyman was a craftsperson who found work "by the day," instead of becoming a master who employed other workers.

Guilds System

Guilds of merchants and craft workers were formed in medieval Europe so that their members could benefit from mutual aid, production standards could be maintained and competition was reduced. In addition, by members acting collectively, they could achieve a certain political influence. There were two main types of guilds: merchant guilds for traders and craft guilds for skilled artisans. Entry requirements to guilds became stricter over time as those who controlled the guilds became part of a richer middle class and set a higher membership fee for outsiders. This new bourgeoisie successfully sought to maintain their position above workers without the means or skills needed to run their own small businesses.

The name 'guild' derives from the Saxon word gilden, meaning 'to pay' or 'yield', as members of the guild were expected to contribute to its collective finances. In the 11th century early guilds functioned in towns much like village communities did in rural areas with the additional factor that merchants required more extensive protection for themselves and their goods as they travelled along trade routes at home and abroad. From the 12th century guilds were organised according to types of merchants and professionals like doctors before the idea expanded to include skilled artisans. Accordingly, there were over 100 guilds in Britain, for example, representing first merchants and traders, and then any

skilled craft industry from weaving to metalworkers. Italy was another country where guilds were popular; the city of Florence alone boasted 21 guilds in the mid-14th century and the cloth maker's guild there controlled some 30,000 workers. Flanders, France (Paris alone had 120 guilds) and Germany were other places where guilds rose to prominence.

Merchant Guilds

Security was a great concern for medieval traders who worried that their goods could be stolen in transit or while in storage. Mutual protection and travelling in groups thus offered the best solution in a period when state intervention was sporadic or non-existent in certain regions. The right to form a guild in England was often given by the crown as part of a town's charter of freedom. A charter of freedom involved the sovereign selling the charter which, when given, waived the obligation of a town's inhabitants to pay feudal duties. Instead, they could apply their own taxes to the traffic of goods through the town. Merchant guilds did give back to their communities, too, prescribing from their member's charitable gifts of food, wine and money for the clergy and poor and needy. The political class of a town typically came from the merchant guilds and, with a charter also establishing local courts, a new and powerful middle class sprang up. A similar pattern of development had occurred and was ongoing in other European countries.

Craft Guilds

From the 12th century in France and Italy, 'craft' guilds began to form which were associations of master workers in craft industries. Cities like Milan, Florence and Toulouse had such guilds for food producers and leather workers. Some of the earliest craft guilds in England were guilds of weavers, especially in London and Oxford. Other craft guilds eventually included associations of cutlers (makers of cutlery), haberdashers (dealers in goods needed for sewing and weaving), dyers, bakers, saddlers, masons, specialists in metal goods such as blacksmiths, armourers, locksmiths and jewellers, and many others covering all aspects of daily life. Some guilds were based on the materials their members worked with rather than the end product so that, in France, for example, there were separate guilds for makers of buckles depending on whether they used brass or copper. So, too, guilds of the makers of prayer beads were distinguished

by which material they used to make their beads, whether it be bone, amber, jet or whatever. Each guild was managed by a small group of individuals known as guild masters who were assisted by a body of jurors whenever there were disputes amongst members.

As this class of skilled workers with their own businesses became ever richer so the entry into a guild became more difficult as those with privileges sought to keep out those without them. On the other hand, there was another reason to limit entry: to maintain the high standards of skill of a particular profession. For this reason, many guilds insisted on an entrance fee which went towards the apprenticeship of the new member but also paid for the maintenance of the meeting place of members, the Guildhall, administrative costs, and health services for members if and when required. In addition, the guilds could organise festivals and pay funeral costs for its members or give financial aid to the widows and orphans of deceased members.

Craft guilds were, as noted, particularly keen to make sure their members' products were of a high enough quality and the weights, dimensions and materials or ingredients of goods all met the current industry standards. Even such workers as bakers could face random checks on their bread by the guild masters and jurors, as this extract on Parisian bakers illustrates. If the master determines that the bread is not adequate, he can confiscate all the rest of it, even that which is in the oven and if there are several types of bread in a window, the master will have each one assessed. And those which are found to be too small, the master and jurors will have them donated to charity.

Quality was further maintained by regulating apprenticeships which had to be of a minimum duration and with a master who had proven skills at their craft. After several years of training apprentices then worked for a master. To become a master one had to present a 'masterpiece' to the guild's hierarchy which showed that the worker had acquired the necessary skills in their particular craft. There was also a financial burden as the title of master was only given to those able to fund their own workshop, tools and a celebratory banquet. The advantage to guild members of all these rules, besides maintaining public confidence in their products, was that they could control competition and be exempt from local taxes, although a producer could not undercut the prices of fellow guild

members. Additional rules that protected members from each other included not poaching a customer from another member's shop or criticising the produce of a fellow member (this was especially relevant to cooks), not working on religious holidays or, in some cases, not working after dark. Other parts of the industry that a guild controlled included wages and the conditions of sale of the product. In effect, then, a guild established a monopoly on all aspects of a particular craft and their control of wages was especially significant when labour became short under such conditions as plagues or famines. Under normal circumstances, a labour shortage would mean a rise in wages for labourers but the guilds often ensured this did not happen (and so make their goods more expensive to sell). Ordinary workers were even prohibited from forming their own associations and this sometimes led to riots and revolts, particularly violent ones breaking out repeatedly in Flanders and Florence, for example, in the 14th century.

Effect on Society & Women

Guilds, especially the merchant guilds, helped produce a rich middle class in medieval society as merchants prospered and began to buy what has always been regarded as a badge of the aristocratic elite: land and property. These nouveaux riches may not have been fully accepted into high society but they themselves began to carve out their own unique place in the social order by distancing themselves from everyone below them. Many guilds, even craft guilds, only accepted new members if they were the sons of existing ones or if one could gain the sponsorship of a master who would take them on as an apprentice. Masters were often biased towards relatives and membership fees were higher for those outside the community so that many guilds, in effect, produced hereditary professions. Further, by stipulating that masters owned their own means of production in the form of their workshop and tools, guilds thus created a permanent class divide between owners and labourers.

As guilds made the rules and decided the wages it became difficult for ordinary workers to protect their rights and own interests. Strikes by textile labourers in the city of Ghent in 1274, for example, resulted in business owners agreeing with those in neighbouring towns not to give work to strikers. However, it is important to remember that in medieval societies there was less of a conflict between wealth and labour than there was between rival industries and towns. In

this sense, guilds may well have actually helped make medieval society, at least in larger towns, more cohesive and stable. Finally, one aspect of society which sprang from educational guilds and helped, at least eventually, to allow some people a means to climb the social ladder, was the 22 universities of medieval Western Europe.

One section of society that was treated unequally by guilds was women. There were almost no specific guilds for women and the institutions were always dominated by men (there were a few exceptions such as the women's silk guilds in Paris and the gold spinners of Genoa). Even a profession dominated by women such as midwives did not have their own guild but belonged to that of the surgeons. Women, although they did frequently work alongside men in such industries as spinning, metal polishing and food preparation, only very rarely achieved master status and some guilds such as the pepperers, drapers and (eventually) brewers banned women from becoming apprentices. Legally, women were usually under a male relative's guardianship or their husband's. Only if a woman's fellow-guild member husband died could she enjoy some freedom. A widow could carry on a deceased master's business, for example, and have the full rights of guild membership if she had once worked alongside her husband and she did not remarry.

Evolution - Local Government

In London, the wealthiest craft guilds, known as the livery companies, became very powerful political players in the city. Indeed, in many towns across medieval Europe, it became almost impossible to build a political career if one was not a member of a guild. The livery companies of London eventually morphed into major financial institutions. Across the waters in Paris, water merchants monopolised trade on the River Seine and had authority over such matters as petty crimes and the city's quotas of salt and grain. In 1260, four of the jurors of the water merchant’s guild were appointed as city magistrates. In 13th-century Germany several guilds, including ones from different towns, got together and formed an organisation known as the Hanse. This Hanse would then join and form the Hanseatic League of almost 200 trading cities by the middle of the next century. In contemporary Florence, the main guilds were permanently represented on the city council.

Eventually, then, and across Europe, many guilds and functions of local government became inseparable as the wealthier middle class began to take some political power from the ruling aristocracy. Lower down the social ladder, the craft guilds permitted skilled craft workers to protect their own industry and provide mutual social aid while at the bottom, the unskilled workers continued, as always, their fight for uncertain and seasonal employment which often involved moving to wherever such work could be found.

The Hundred Years' War was fought intermittently between England and France from 1337 to 1453 CE and the conflict had many consequences, both immediate and long-lasting. Besides the obvious death and destruction that many of the battles visited upon soldiers and civilians alike, the war made England virtually bankrupt and left the victorious French Crown in total control of all of France except Calais. Kings would come and go but for many of them, one significant measure of the success of their reign was their performance in the Hundred Years' War. Divisions were created within the nobilities of both countries which had repercussions for who became the next ruling monarch. Trade was badly affected and peasants were incessantly taxed, which caused several major rebellions, but there were more positive developments such as the creation of more competent and regularised tax offices and the trend towards more professional diplomacy in international relations. The war also produced enduring and iconic national heroes, notably Henry V of England (1413-1422 CE) and Joan of Arc (1412-1431 CE) in France. Finally, such a long conflict against a clearly identifiable enemy resulted in both participants forging a much greater sense of nationhood. Even today, a rivalry still continues between these two neighbouring countries, now, fortunately, largely expressed within the confines of international sporting events. The consequences and effects of the Hundred Years' War may be summarised as: A great wave of taxes to pay for the war which contributed to social unrest in both countries, Innovations in forms of tax collection, The development of a stronger Parliament in England, The almost total bankruptcy of the English treasury at the war's end. The disagreement over the conduct of the war and its failure fuelled the dynastic conflict in England known as the Wars of the Roses (1455-1487 CE). The devastation of French towns and villages by mercenary soldiers between battles. Developments in

weapons technology such as cannons. The consolidation of the French monarch's control over all of France. A greater use of international diplomacy and specialised diplomats. A greater feeling of nationalism amongst the populations of both countries, the creation of national heroes, notably Henry V in England and Joan of Arc in France. A tangible rivalry between the two nations which still continues today, seen particularly in sports such as football and rugby.

The Economics of Failure

Beyond the immediate consequences of England's failures in the war such as the loss of all territory except Calais and France's defeats in the large-scale battles which saw a huge number of nobles killed, there were many more, deeper and subtler effects of this 116-year conflict. There were also consequences which occurred long before the war had even ended as successive monarchs on either side struggled with the problems created by their predecessors. Finally, the conflict had an impact which lasted for decades and centuries after it had long finished. In England, many barons had become extremely rich as their power increased at local level and the king became correspondingly weaker and poorer as the barons kept local revenues to themselves. The king could not tax his people without the permission of Parliament and so this body had to be called each time a monarch required more cash for his campaigns in France or elsewhere. As a result of Parliament frequently meeting, it did not necessarily gain any new powers but it did create for itself an identity and, by being involved in diplomatic policy discussions and the ratification of peace treaties, the institution was starting to become a part of English political life. The 'Long Parliament' of 1406 CE, for example, sat an unusually long time from March until December as it deliberated over the ever-prickly issue of state finances, and there was very much a feeling that the king, although still an absolute monarchy, was perhaps just a little less absolute than before the war.

In France, the opposite was true as the monarchy's position was strengthened because of the success of the war while that of the nobility and the Estates General (the legislative assembly) weakened. This was because the king did not need to consult anyone else regarding taxation policies which could be levied at will to pay for the war. The conflict also saw the introduction of long-lasting indirect taxes such as the salt tax (gabelle) that was not abolished until the

French Revolution of the late 18th century CE. The French monarch was thus able to triple his income through taxes from the start to the end of the war. Further, such taxes required a whole new state apparatus of tax collectors, keepers of public records, and assessors for payment disputes, ensuring the sustained enrichment of the Crown.

In England, there was often disagreement amongst the nobles of England as to how to best conduct the war against France, indeed evens whether to conduct it at all. This became more serious in times of failure but the final loss in 1453 CE was one of the reasons Henry VI of England (r. 1422-61 & 1470-71 CE) became so unpopular and it was probably a contributory factor to the king's episodes of madness. This dissatisfaction with the monarch, his obvious aversion to warfare and the inevitable search for scapegoats for the loss of the war ultimately led to the dynastic conflict known to history as the Wars of the Roses (1455-1487 CE). In addition, now that the war with France was over, English nobles dissatisfied with the current regime could better use their own private armies as a tool to increase their own wealth and influence. Another consequence was the sheer number of nobles as monarchs often created more aristocrats - two new ranks in England were (e) squire and gentlemen - as they sought to increase their tax base. Indeed, during the war, the nobility of England tripled in size as new members qualified via property ownership rather than just hereditary titles (although it was still fewer than 2% of the total population in the mid-15th century CE).

At a lower level in society, the slump in trade caused by the war brought economic hardship for many. English wool was a major export to the cloth makers in the Low Countries, and this trade was disrupted. In the other direction, the quantity of wine imported from Gascony crashed (from 74,000 tons/barrels in 1336 CE to 6,000 tons in 1349 CE), a trade which never really recovered. Sailing vessels were frequently commandeered by the state to ferry armies across to France; herring fishermen were particularly susceptible to this state interference in their livelihoods. Piracy was another blow to merchants, as were such direct raids as the French attack on Southampton in 1338 CE, not to mention the random pillaging of armies throughout the war, both in France where the battles were fought but also in southeast England where armies were

stationed prior to embarkation to the Continent. The poor economic situation of many communities was only worsened by taxes - Edward III of England (r. 1327-1377 CE), for example, had called for taxes 27 times during his reign. The Peasants' Revolt of June 1381 CE was the most infamous popular uprising of the middle Ages as ordinary folk protested at the huge problems caused by the Black Death plague and, above all, the never-ending taxes which, since 1377 CE, included indiscriminate poll taxes. The rebellion of 1450 CE led by Jack Cade again saw commoners protest at high taxes, perceived corruption at court, and an absence of justice at local level. The commoners might not have had any direct influence on government but the discord did perhaps give those nobles keen to overthrow the regime another excuse to do so beyond merely extending their own interests.

In France, too, the general population was, as we have seen, subject to taxes to pay for the war but they had to endure the additional problem of marauding armies. Although, highly localised to battle areas and main roads, some towns and villages were ravaged by bands of mercenary soldiers (routiers) before and after battles. Soldiers brought diseases, took away grain, cattle and produce, and left behind only despair. The problem was particularly prevalent in Brittany, Périgord, and Poitou. In addition, Edward III had deliberately employed the strategy of chevauchées - striking terror into local populations by burning crops, raiding stocks and permitting general looting prior to his battles in the hope of drawing the French king into open battle. Finally, the civil war between the French nobility which involved the two rival groups of Burgundians and Armagnacs fighting for who should control and then succeed the mad Charles VI of France (r. 1380-1422 CE) brought further distress to local populations. Even those who avoided a direct loss of property often suffered from a crash in rent values, down by up to 40% in places like Anjou, or a hike in food prices, which went up by 50% during the siege of Reims, for example, in 1359 CE.

The Church

The medieval Church as an institution on either side tended to support the war, giving patriotic services, saying prayers, and ringing out bells whenever there was a victory. The Christian faith, though, did receive some challenges on

a pan-European scale. The Great Schism of 1378 CE (aka Western Schism) in the Catholic Church ultimately saw three popes all in office at the same time. The situation was not resolved until 1417 CE as the rival camps jockeyed for the support of French and English kings. Further, the Church in Rome was weakened as the kings of England and France sought to limit taxes going to anywhere else except their own military campaigns. A consequence of this policy was the creation of 'national churches' in each country. Local churches also became the hubs of community news with news of the wars' events being posted on their notice boards and official communications being read out in the preacher's pulpit.

As each side strived to better the other, weapons, armour, fortifications, and strategies of warfare developed during the war, and armies became more and more professional. By the wars' end, Charles VII created France's first permanent royal army. Notably, the use of archers armed with powerful longbows by English armies brought great success as the importance of heavy cavalry diminished and there was a tendency for medieval knights on both sides to fight on foot. Gunpowder weapons were first used at the Battle of Crecy in 1346 CE but, still crude in design; they had no great influence on the English victory. The French did use small handheld cannons to great effect at the battles of Formigny (1450 CE) and Castillon (1453 CE). From around 1380 CE, there were also giant cannons known as 'bombards' which could fire massive stone balls weighing up to 100 kilos (220 lbs). Such guns were too heavy and cumbersome to use in field engagements but they were especially useful in siege warfare such as at Harfleur in September 1415 CE.

Finally, an oft-neglected weapon developed over the period of the war was diplomacy. On both sides, but first to a higher degree in England, monarchs relied on a team of specialised diplomats and archive-keepers who could use their skills in language, law, and cultural awareness to forge useful alliances, persuade defections from the enemy, arrange the payment of ransoms, and negotiate the best terms for treaties. The international politics of the Hundred Years War, which involved several states (France, England, Spain, the Low Countries, Scotland and others), consequently saw the regular participation of experienced diplomats, forming what would soon become a formal body of

ambassadors and embassies which we recognise today as an essential part of international relations.

The Birth of Nations

The war, boosted by stirring medieval literature, poems and popular songs, fostered a greater feeling of nationalism on both sides. Kings appealed to their armies prior to battles to fight for their king and country. The French monarchy was ultimately seen as the saviour of the country which went on to absorb such regions as Brittany, Provence, Burgundy, Artois, and Roussillon, thus the state largely took the form we know today. On the other side of the Channel, England's great battlefield victories were celebrated with popular processions welcoming back heroic kings such as Edward III and Henry V and those monarchs who failed on the battlefield suffered seriously in the popularity stakes back home. The same was true in France, as the historian G. Holmes puts it: "The war with England was to some extent the anvil upon which the identity of early modern France was forged".

Another consequence of the military successes was the revival of medieval chivalry, especially by Edward III who, along with his son Edward the Black Prince (1330-1376 CE), founded the exclusive chivalric Order of the Garter c. 1348 CE which still survives today. Saint George, the patron of the order, was now firmly established as a national saint of a confident country finally on equal military terms with the French. By the end of the war, England became wholly separated from the affairs of the Continent and was already moving towards a more 'English' cultural identity where the English language was spoken at court and used in official documents, and where customs and the view of the world were now firmly part of an island outlook. France, meanwhile, was richer and more powerful than ever before and ready to expand its interests on the Continent, notably in Italy.

Finally, the war created enduring national heroes who continue to be celebrated today in popular culture. In England, Henry V became a legend in his own lifetime after his stunning victory at the 1415 CE Battle of Agincourt against enormous odds and, thanks to writers such as William Shakespeare (1564-1616 CE), his star has risen only ever higher as Henry V continues to be performed, filmed, and quoted. In France, Joan of Arc became the great figure of

the conflict as her heavenly visions inspired her to lift the siege of Orleans in 1429 CE, turning the tide of the war. Joan was burnt at the stake as a witch but, made a saint in 1920 CE, she still today symbolises defiance against the odds and French patriotism. Both countries, then, have created a mythology of the Hundred Years' War, a now long-past time where the enemy was clear, the heroes were virtuous and the victories golden.

Hundred Years' War, (1337–1453

Hundred Years' War, (1337–1453) Intermittent armed conflict between England and France over territorial rights and the issue of succession to the French throne. It began when Edward III invaded Flanders in 1337 in order to assert his claim to the French crown. Edward won a major victory at the Battle of Crecy (1346); after his son Edward the Black Prince managed to capture John II at the Battle of Poitiers (1356), the French were obliged to surrender extensive lands under the treaties of Bretigny and Calais (1360). When John II died in captivity, his son Charles V refused to respect the treaties and reopened the conflict, putting the English on the defensive. After Charles V's death in 1380 both countries were preoccupied with internal power struggles, and the war lapsed into uncertain peace.

In 1415, however, Henry V decided to take advantage of civil war in France to press English claims to the French throne. By 1422, the English and their Burgundian allies controlled Aquitaine and all France north of the Loire, including Paris. A turning point came in 1429, when Joan of Arc raised the English siege of Orleans. The French king Charles VII conquered Normandy and then retook Aquitaine in 1453, leaving the English in possession only of Calais. The war laid waste to much of France and caused enormous suffering; it virtually destroyed the feudal nobility and thereby brought about a new social order. By ending England's status as a power on the continent, it led the English to expand their reach and power at sea.

The Hundred Years' War was an intermittent struggle between England and France in the 14th–15th century. At the time, France was the richest, largest, and most populous kingdom of Western Europe, and England was the best organized and most closely integrated western European state. They came into

conflict over a series of issues, including disputes over English territorial possessions in France and the legitimate succession to the French throne.

The Church in the later middle Ages

Religious practice in medieval Europe (c. 476-1500) was dominated and informed by the Catholic Church. The majority of the population was Christian, and "Christian" at this time meant "Catholic" as there was initially no other form of that religion. The rampant corruption of the medieval Church, however, gave rise to reformers such as John Wycliffe (l. 1330-1384) and Jan Hus (l. c. 1369-1415) and religious sects, condemned as heresies by the Church, such as the Bogomils and Cathars, among many others. Even so, the Church maintained its power and exercised enormous influence over people's daily lives from the king on his throne to the peasant in the field. The Church regulated and defined an individual's life, literally, from birth to death and was thought to continue its hold over the person's soul in the afterlife. The Church was the manifestation of God's will and presence on earth, and its dictates were not to be questioned, even when it was apparent that many of the clergy were working far more steadily toward their own interests than those of their god.

A dramatic blow to the power of the Church came in the form of the Black Death pandemic of 1347-1352 during which people began to doubt the power of the clergy who could do nothing to stop people from dying or the plague from spreading. Even so, the Church repeatedly crushed dissent, silenced reformers, and massacred heretical sects until the Protestant Reformation (1517-1648) which broke the Church's power and allowed for greater freedom of thought and religious expression.

Church Beliefs

The Church claimed authority from God through Jesus Christ who, according to the Bible, designated his apostle Peter as "the rock upon which my church will be built" to whom he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 16:18-19). Peter was therefore regarded as the first Pope, the head of the church, and all others as his successors endowed with the same divine authority.

The Church maintained the belief that Jesus Christ was the only begotten son of the one true God as revealed in the Hebrew Scriptures and that those

works (which would become the Christian Old Testament) prophesied Christ's coming. The date of the earth and history of humanity was all revealed through the scriptures which made up the Christian Bible – considered the word of God and the oldest book in the world – which was consulted as a handbook on how to live according to divine will and gain everlasting life in heaven upon one's death. Interpretation of the Bible, however, was too great a responsibility for the average person, and so the clergy was a spiritual necessity. In order to talk to God or understand the Bible correctly, one relied on one's priest as that priest was ordained by his superior who was, in turn, ordained by another, all under the authority of the Pope, God's representative on earth. The Church hierarchy maintained the social hierarchy. One was born into a certain class, followed the profession of one's parents, and died as they had. Social mobility was extremely rare to nonexistent since the Church taught that it was God's will one had been born into a certain set of circumstances and attempting to improve one's lot was tantamount to claiming God had made a mistake. People, therefore, accepted their lot and made the best of it.

Church in Daily Life

The lives of the people of the middle Ages revolved around the Church. People, especially women, were known to attend church three to five times daily for prayer and at least once a week for services, confession, and acts of contrition for repentance. The Church paid no taxes and was supported by the people of a town or city. Citizens were responsible for supporting the parish priest and Church overall through a tithe of ten percent of their income. Tithes paid for baptism ceremonies, confirmations, and funerals as well as saint's day festivals and holy day festivals such as Easter celebrations.

The centre of a congregation's life in a small-town church or city cathedral was not the altar but the baptismal font. This was a free-standing stone receptacle/basin used for infant or adult baptism – often quite large and deep – which also served to determine a person's guilt or innocence when one was charged with a crime. To clear one's name, a person would submit to an ordeal in which one was bound and dropped into the font. If the accused floated, it was a clear indication of guilt; if the accused sank, it meant innocence but the accused would often drown.

Under the reign of the English king Athelstan (r. 924-939), the procedure for the ordeal was codified as law: If anyone pledges to undergo the ordeal, he is then to come three days before to the mass-priest whose duty it is to consecrate it [the ordeal], and live off bread and water and salt and vegetables until he shall go to it, and be present at mass on each of those three days, and make his offering and go to communion on the day on which he shall go to the ordeal, and swear then the oath that he is guiltless of that charge according to the common law, before he goes to the ordeal. (Brooke, 107)

There was also the ordeal of iron in which the accused was forced to hold or carry a hot poker. If the person could hold the red-hot iron without burning and blistering their hands, they were innocent; there are no records of anyone being found innocent. The ordeal of water was also carried out by streams, rivers, and lakes. Women accused of witchcraft, for example, were often tied in a sack with their cat (thought to be their demonic familiar) and thrown into a body of water. If they managed to escape and come to the surface, they were found guilty and then executed, but they most often drowned. Ordeals, like executions, were a form of public entertainment and, as with festivals, marriages, and other events in community life, were paid for by the people's tithe to the Church. The lower class, as usual, bore the brunt of the Church's expenses but the nobility was also required to donate large sums to the Church to ensure a place for them in heaven or to lessen their time in purgatory.

The Church's teachings on purgatory – an afterlife realm between heaven and hell where souls remained trapped until they had paid for their sins – generated enormous wealth for various clergy who sold writs known as indulgences, promising a shorter stay in purgatory for a price. Relics were another source of income, and it was common for unscrupulous clerics to sell fake splinters of Christ's cross, a saint's finger or toe, a vial of water from the Holy Land, or any number of objects, which would allegedly bring luck or ward off misfortune.

The teachings of the Church were a certainty to the people of the middle Ages. There was no room for doubt, and questions were not tolerated. One was either in the Church or out of it, and if out, one's interactions with the rest of the

community were limited. Jews, for example, lived in their own neighbourhoods surrounded by Christians and were regularly treated quite poorly. The French king Charles Martel (718-741), defeated the Muslim invasion of Europe at the Battle of Tours (also known as the Battle of Poitiers, 732), and so Muslims in Europe were rare at this time outside of Spain and the travelling merchants conducting trade. A citizen of Europe, therefore – who did not belong to either of these faiths – had to adhere to the orthodox vision of the Church in order to interact with family, community, and make a living. If one found one could not do so (or at least appear to do so), the only option was a so-called heretical sect.

Corruption

The heretical sects of the middle Ages were uniformly responses to the clear corruption and greed of the Church. The immense wealth of the Church, accrued through tithes and lavish gifts, only inspired a desire for even greater wealth which translated as power. An archbishop could, and frequently did, threaten a noble, a town, or even a monastery with excommunication – by which one was exiled from the Church and so from the grace of God and commerce with fellow citizens – for any reason. Even well-known and devout religious figures – such as Hildegard of Bingen (l. 1098-1179) – were subject to 'discipline' along these lines for disagreeing with an ecclesiastical superior.

The priests were notoriously corrupt and, in many cases, illiterate parasites who only held their position due to family influence and favour. Scholar G. G. Coulton cites a letter of 1281 in which the writer warns how "the ignorance of the priests precipitates the people into the ditch of error" (259) and later cites the correspondence of one Bishop Guillaume le Maire from Angers, who writes: The Priesthood includes innumerable contemptible persons of abject life, utterly unworthy in learning and morals, from whose execrable lives and pernicious ignorance infinite scandals arise, the Church sacraments are despised by the laity, and in very many districts the lay folk hold the priests as vile. The medieval mystic Margery Kempe (1342-1438) challenged the wealthy clerics to reform their corruption while, almost 200 years before, Hildegard of Bingen had done the same as had men like John Wycliffe and Jan Hus. The Church was not interested in reform, however, because it had the last word on any subject as God's voice on earth.

Those who found the abuses of the Church too intolerable and were seeking an honest spiritual experience instead of an unending pay-to-pray scheme, which not even death could halt, joined religious sects outside the Church and attempted to live peacefully in their own communities. The best-known of these were the Cathars of Southern France who, while they interacted with the Catholic communities they lived near or in, had their own services, rituals, and belief system. These kinds of communities were routinely condemned by the Church and destroyed, their members massacred, and whatever lands they had confiscated as Church property. Even an orthodox community which adhered to Catholic teachings – such as the Beguines – was condemned because it was begun spontaneously as a response to the needs of the people and was not initiated by the Church. The Beguines were laywomen who lived as nuns and served their community, holding all possessions in common and living a life of poverty and service to others, but they were not approved by the Church and were therefore condemned; they were disbanded along with their male counterparts, the Beghards, in the 14th century.

These groups, and others like them, attempted to assert spiritual autonomy based on the scriptural authority of the Bible, without any of the Church's trappings or elaborate ritual. The Cathars believed that Christ never died on the cross and was therefore never resurrected but that, instead, the son of God had been spiritually offered for the sins of humanity on a higher plane. The gospel stories, they claimed, should be understood as allegories using symbolic language rather than static histories of a past event. They further advocated for the feminine principle in the divine, revering a goddess of wisdom known as Sophia, to whom they devoted their lives.

Living simply and serving the surrounding community, the Cathars amassed no wealth, their priests owned nothing and were highly respected as holy men even by Catholics, and Cathar communities offered worthwhile goods and services. The Beguines, while never claiming any beliefs outside of orthodoxy, were equally devout and selfless in their efforts to help the poor and, especially, poor single mothers and their children. Both of these movements, however, offered people an alternative to the Church, and the medieval Church found that intolerable. Any change in people's attitudes toward religion

threatened the power of the Church, and the Church had enough power to crush such movements even in cases where sects such as the Cathars had significant support and protection.

Reformation

John Wycliffe and his followers (known as Lollards) had been calling for reformation since the 14th century, and it might be difficult for a modern-day reader to fully understand why no serious attempts were made at reform, but this is simply because the modern era offers so many different legitimate avenues for religious expression. In the middle Ages, it was inconceivable that there could be any valid belief system other than the Church. Heaven, hell, and purgatory were all very real places to the people of the middle Ages, and one could not risk offending God by criticizing his Church and damning one's self to an eternity of torment in a lake of fire surrounded by demons. The wonder is not so much why more people did not call for reform as that anyone was brave enough to try. The Protestant Reformation did not arise as an attempt to overthrow the power of the Church but began simply as yet another effort at reforming ecclesiastical abuse and corruption. Martin Luther (l. 1483-1546) was a highly-educated German priest and monk who moved from concern to outrage over the abuses of the Church. Martin Luther's 95 Theses (1517) famously criticized the sale of indulgences as a money-making scheme having no biblical authority and no spiritual worth and opposed the Church's teachings on a number of other matters.

Martin Luther

Luther was condemned by Pope Leo X in 1520 who demanded he renounce his criticism or face excommunication. When Luther refused to recant, Pope Leo moved ahead with the excommunication in 1521, and Luther became an outlaw. Like Wycliffe, Hus, and others before him, Luther was only stating the obvious in calling for an end to rampant abuse and corruption. Like Wycliffe, he translated the Bible from Latin into the vernacular (Wycliffe from Latin to Middle English and Luther from Latin to German), opposed the concept of sacerdotalism whereby a priest is necessary as an intermediary between a believer and God, and maintained that the Bible and prayer were all one needed to commune directly with God. In making these claims, of course, he not only undermined the authority of the Pope but rendered that position – as well as

those of the cardinals, bishops, archbishops, priests, and others – ineffectual and obsolete. According to Luther, salvation was granted by the grace of God, not by the good deeds of human beings, and so all of the works the Church required of people were of no eternal use and only served to fill the Church's treasury and build their grand cathedrals. Owing to the political climate in Germany, and Luther's own charisma and intelligence, his effort at reform became the movement which would break the power of the Church. Other reformers such as Huldrych Zwingli (l. 1484-1531) and John Calvin (l. 1509-1564) broke new ground in their own regions and many others followed suit.

The monopoly the Church held on religious belief and practice was broken, and a new era of greater spiritual freedom was begun, but it was not without cost. In their zeal to throw off the oppression of the medieval Church, the newly liberated protestors destroyed monasteries, libraries, and cathedrals, the ruins of which still dot the European landscape in the present day.

The Church had certainly become increasingly corrupt and oppressive and its clergy was frequently characterized far more by a love of worldly goods and pleasures than spiritual pursuits but, at the same time, the Church had initiated hospitals, colleges and universities, social systems for the care of the poor and the sick, and maintained religious orders which allowed women an outlet for their spirituality, imagination, and ambitions. These institutions became especially important during the Black Death pandemic of 1347-1352 which killed millions of people in Europe and significantly impacted people's faith in the vision of the Church.

The Protestant Reformation, unfortunately, destroyed much of the good the Church had done in reacting to the corruption it had fallen into and its perceived failure to meet the challenge of the plague outbreak. Eventually, the different movements would organize into the Christian Protestant sects recognizable today – Lutherans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and so on – and set up their own institutes of higher learning, hospitals, and social programs. When the Reformation began, there was only the Church, the monolithic powerhouse of the middle Ages, which afterwards became only one option for religious expression among many.

The Renaissance and Enlightenment

The Renaissance was a cultural and intellectual movement that peaked during the 15th and 16th centuries, though most historians would agree that it really began in the 14th, with antecedents reaching back into the 12th, and really didn't end until the 17th. Its chief feature was a heightened interest, to near obsession, with classical (that is, Greco-Roman) learning and culture, much of which had gone into eclipse, at least in Western Europe, during the early Middle Ages.

The Renaissance, which flowered first in Italy and spread to much of Western Europe east of the Pyrenees, saw a continuation of interest in the classical philosophy, mathematics, and natural sciences that late medieval scholars had begun to revive in the 12th century. The Renaissance added to this an interest in the aesthetics of the classical world, including architecture and letters. The revival of interest in all things classical, beginning in the 12th-century focus on philosophy and natural philosophy, owed much to the transmission of Greek and Roman culture through Byzantium (the Eastern Roman Empire) and through Islamic culture, and to the preservation of especially Greek philosophy (to include natural philosophy) in the Middle East and especially Central Asia. The reconquest of Sicily from Arab control in the early 11th century, and contact (both peaceful and bellicose) with the Umayyad caliphate in Spain, which had been captured by Islam in the 8th century and was eventually reconquered in 1492, were crucial to this.

The Renaissance is associated with great figures like the father of the Latin revival Petrarch, the humanist philosopher Pico della Mirandola, the great artist and inventor Leonardo da Vinci, the poet Dante Alighieri, the artist Michelangelo, the political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli and many other names doubtless familiar to most educated Europeans. Humanism and the keen interest in reason common to many of those smitten with Aristotelean philosophy during these centuries brought about profound challenges to the authority of the Roman Catholic Church during this time. The church itself was beset by many internal problems: Long-standing tensions between ecclesiastical and secular authority—supporters of the Holy Roman emperor versus partisans of the pope—broke out into open warfare during the early Renaissance. The Western Schism took place, in which there were actually three rival claimants to the

papacy. And practices like the sale of indulgences (which would, for the right amount of money, supposedly reduce the time a sinner spent in purgatory before ascending to heaven), as well as concubinage, simony (sale of religious offices), and many other abuses of power would eventually create violent demand for reform. This would culminate in the Protestant Reformation**.**

The Enlightenment came much later, but it wouldn't really have been possible without the Renaissance and the Reformation. Most historians will slip a mainly 17th-century "Age of Reason" into outline chronologies of intellectual history, and this makes a great deal of sense; the great thinkers of the 17th century didn't have quite the fervour for empiricism and hadn't quite embraced the political liberalism that would characterize the European Enlightenment. But they had pretty much abandoned the project of Scholasticism—that is, trying to prove God and revealed truth through pure reason, a very late medieval and Renaissance kind of obsession—and they instead "changed the subject," as the historian Mark Lilla so aptly put it. This was the political philosopher Thomas Hobbes' great contribution in Leviathan: He really began the divorce of political thought from theology by simply no longer speaking of God in matters of statecraft.

The Enlightenment began, most historians would probably concur, in mid-17th century, and peaked in the 18th century, when its real centre of gravity France, not (as in the Renaissance) Italy. It was only really conscious of itself as an epochal movement from the early to mid-18th century on, though, and the word Enlightenment didn't really come into vogue until much later in that century. It was very much a reaction to the Catholic counter-revolution and really flowered after the end of the Thirty Years' War, when the great powers of Europe fought along (roughly) confessional lines France of course was an exception, and fought mainly on the side of the Protestant powers despite being Catholic.

The Enlightenment was the age of the triumph of science (Newton, Leibniz, Bacon) and of philosophy (Descartes, Locke, Spinoza, Kant, Voltaire, Diderot, Montesquieu). Unlike the Renaissance philosophers, they no longer sought validation in the texts of the Greco-Roman philosophers, but were predicated more solidly on rationalism and empiricism. There were atheists

among them, and devout Christians, but if there was a common belief about the divine among Enlightenment philosophers, it was probably deism.

The political philosophy of the Enlightenment is the unambiguous antecedent of modern Western liberalism: secular, pluralistic, rule-of-law-based, with an emphasis on individual rights and freedoms. Note that none of this was really present in the Renaissance, when it was still widely assumed that kings were essentially ordained by God, that monarchy was the natural order of things and that monarchs were not subject to the laws of ordinary men, and that the ruled were not citizens but subjects. It was the Enlightenment, and thinkers who embodied its ideas, like Voltaire and Benjamin Franklin, who were the intellectual force behind the American Revolution and the French Revolution, and who really inspired the ideas behind the great political documents of the age like the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen.

Origins of the plague outbreak

The bacterium that causes the bubonic plague is called yersinia pestis. It can survive in rodent populations and is spread to other mammals, including humans, through flea bites. The point of origin for the Black Death was most likely a population of marmots small, prairie-dog like rodents in Central Asia. Marmots generally avoid contact with humans, but rats will readily come in contact with both marmot and human populations. Rats also carry fleas, making them an ideal vehicle from the perspective of the plague, at least for spreading the bubonic plague. The plague caused an epidemic in China in the 1330s, and again in the 1350s, causing tens of millions of deaths. The 1330s outbreak also spread west across Central Asia via traders using the Silk Road. Historian William McNeill argued that caravanserai - rest stops for traders - facilitated the spread of the disease as traders and their animals interacted in close quarters. That proximity provided new hosts for the disease, who then carried it to new locations, repeating the process of introducing and spreading the plague along overland trade routes.

The plague spreads

By the 1300s, several Italian city-states had established trade relationships throughout the Mediterranean and Black Seas. The Genoese had a successful

colony at the city of Kaffa on the Crimean Peninsula, which they held with the permission of the Mongol rulers of the region. In 1344, disagreements between the Genoese and the Mongols led to conflict. Note how much of Europe was linked via trade routes. Compare the map below showing the spread of plague to the routes shown here to see how the plague spread north from the Mediterranean ports. In 1346, the plague reached the Mongol soldiers who were besieging the city of Kaffa. Stories from the period tell us that the plague devastated the Mongol army, forcing it to give up the siege. Some of these stories also include a more gruesome detail: the Mongols catapulted the dead bodies of the soldiers who died of the plague into the city. Whether the Mongols intended to spread the disease, and whether the story is even true, is not clear. What is clear is that some residents of Kaffa were infected with plague. The plague continued to travel through Asia, eventually hitting major cities such as Baghdad and Constantinople. From there, it travelled to Alexandria in Egypt, Damascus in Syria, and down the Red Sea to Mecca. From there it almost certainly entered the Indian Ocean trade networks. The plague also travelled with Genoese merchants back to Italy, first to the port of Messina in 1347, and then north through Europe over the next several years. The first cases of plague in Europe were spread by Genoese traders returning from Kaffa. Note that the earliest areas of plague were around Constantinople and in the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and also the port of Marseille. All of these would have been stops for Genoese ships on their way from Crimea to Genoa.

Effects of the plague

Most in-depth studies of the Black Death focus on Europe, but this is a result of the available source material and what historians have chosen to study, rather than any major differences in its severity or impact between Europe and Asia. After all, Europe had a smaller population than China. In terms of deaths, it is likely the plague did more damage in China. Given the large volume of trade in the Indian Ocean, it is not surprising to find accounts that hint at the plague spreading throughout the Middle East and South Asia at this time as well.

Although the lack of clear records makes it hard to be precise, historians generally estimate the Black Death killed between 30% and 60% of Europe's population between 1347 and 1351. However, death rates varied from place to

place. Some areas saw mortality of 80% or higher, while other places remained almost untouched by the disease. Whatever the actual numbers, the massive loss of population - both human and animal - had major economic consequences. Those cities hit with the plague shrank, leading to a decrease in demand for goods and services and reduced productive capacity. As laborers became more scarce, they were able to demand higher wages.

This had several major effects: Serfdom began to disappear as peasants had better opportunities to sell their labour. High labour costs caused landowners to look for more efficient and profitable ways to use their land and resources, such as increasing livestock production and payments of rent in money, rather than labour. High labour costs also caused governments to impose price controls on wages, but these efforts were often unsuccessful and sometimes met with rebellion. The fear and confusion caused by the plague sometimes led to violence, in part because of a lack of medical knowledge regarding how the plague spread. Jews, Romani, lepers, and other religious and cultural minorities were sometimes blamed for causing or spreading the plague and became targets of attacks. It should be noted that the plague did not cause these social tensions, but rather created a context that made these tensions stronger and more likely to lead to violence.

Although today we understand the medical aspects of the plague in ways that fourteenth century people could not, as historians we consider how the people who lived through it understood the plague and what impact it had on their actions.

From the broader perspective of world history, the real take away from the Black Death is how the vast, interconnected trading networks that existed at this time made the spread of a disease like plague possible in the first place, and how it dramatically altered the local communities it infected. The expansion of trade brought many benefits, increasing access to material goods and technology, as well as spreading knowledge. However, the plague illustrates how increased cross-cultural contacts along denser trade networks increased the potential damage that could be caused by disease. It was not a coincidence that the plague outbreak in the mid-fourteenth century did more damage than the outbreak in the mid-sixth century. Rather, the greater devastation occurred because the world of

the mid-fourteenth century was more connected through trade and commerce in the medieval world developed to such an extent that even relatively small communities had access to weekly markets and, perhaps a day's travel away, larger but less frequent fairs, where the full range of consumer goods of the period was set out to tempt the shopper and small retailer. Markets and fairs were organised by large estate owners, town councils, and some churches and monasteries, who, granted a license to do so by their sovereign, hoped to gain revenue from stall holder fees and boost the local economy as shoppers used peripheral services. International trade had been present since Roman times but improvements in transportation and banking, as well as the economic development of northern Europe, caused a boom from the 9th century CE. English wool, for example, was sent in huge quantities to manufacturers in Flanders; the Venetians, thanks to the Crusades, expanded their trade interests to the Byzantine Empire and the Levant, and new financial instruments evolved which allowed even small investors to fund the trade expeditions which criss-crossed Europe by sea and land.

In villages, towns, and large cities which had been granted the privilege of a license to do so by their monarch, markets were regularly held in public squares (or sometimes triangles), in wide streets or even in purpose-built halls. Markets were also organised just outside many castles and monasteries. Typically held once or twice a week, larger towns might have a daily market which moved around different parts of the city depending on the day or have markets for specific goods like meat, fish, or bread. Sellers of particular goods, who paid an estate owner, the town, or borough council a fee for the privilege to have a stall, were typically set next to each other in areas so that competition was kept high. Sellers of meat and bread tended to be men, but women stallholders were often the majority, and they sold such staples as eggs, dairy products, poultry, and ale. There were middlemen and women known as regrators who bought goods from producers and sold them on to the market stallholders or producers might pay a vendor to sell their goods for them. Besides markets, sellers of wares also went knocking on the doors of private homes, and these were known as hucksters.

Trade of common, low-value goods remained a largely local affair because of the costs of transportation. Merchants had to pay tolls at certain points along the road and at key points like bridges or mountain passes so that only luxury goods were worth transportation over long distances. Moving goods by boat or ship was cheaper and safer than by land but then there were potential losses to bad weather and pirates to consider. Consequently, local markets were supplied by the farmed estates that surrounded them and those who wanted non-everyday items like clothing, cloth, or wine had to be prepared to walk half a day or more to the nearest town.

In towns, the consumer had, besides markets, the additional option of shops. Trades people usually lived above their shop which presented a large window onto the street with a stall projecting out from under a wooden canopy. In cities, shops selling the same type of goods were often clustered together in the same neighbourhoods, again to increase competition and make the life of city and guild inspectors easier. Sometimes location was directly related to the goods on sale such as horse sellers typically being near the city gates so as to tempt the passing traveller or booksellers near a cathedral and its associated schools of learning. Those trades which involved goods whose quality was absolutely vital such as goldsmiths and armourers were usually located near a town council's administration buildings where they could be kept a close eye on by regulators. Towns also had banks and money-lenders, many of which were Jews as usury was forbidden to Christians by the Church.

As a consequence of this clustering of trades, many streets acquired a name which described the trade most represented in them, names which in many cases still survive today. Between 1000 and 1400, the kingdoms of the Franks, divided among many leaders, become the kingdom of France, which emerges under the Capetian dynasty as one of the most prosperous, powerful, and prestigious in Christendom. Three kings stand out: Philip II (Philip Augustus, r. 1180–1223), Louis IX (Saint Louis, r. 1226–70), and Philip IV (Philip the Fair, r. 1285–1314). Each expands his political and territorial authority well beyond the capital at Paris, wresting lands from the English and attaching southern territories to his domain. Each establishes a centralized administration, a hierarchical judicial system, and an efficient system of taxation. The Capetians

earn much prestige on the religious front: they surround themselves with clerics as advisors and in return confer privileges and gifts on churches and abbeys. The most famous of these "ministers" is Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis, counsellor to Louis VI and Louis VII, and regent during the Second Crusade until his death in 1151. Participation in the Crusades and pilgrimages, and, especially, the concept that the king's authority derives from God (monarchie de droit divin), give the Capetians the title of "very Christian kings" (rois très chrétiens). The Crusades waged in the East, alongside constant battles with the English, generate a sense of French identity.

The expansion of royal authority is halted in the fourteenth century by an economic crisis, the loss of a third of the population to the plague, and, from 1337, constant military conflict with the English, who hold large territories in France. The fourteenth century also sees the establishment of the papacy in Avignon, under pontiffs who are natives of the Limousin region of central France.

Medieval Germany (circa 481 – 1350 CE)

The German state covered a large geographic area but for most of its early history it was subdivided into various tribal territories that eventually formed into competing principalities of feudal lords who were all under one ruler. Various dialects of the German language helped to form a German culture and forged ethnic connections with Slavic and Baltic groups as well as imperial alliances with Italy and the Germanic-speaking areas of modern Austria and Poland. Northern European and pre-Roman Iron Age Celtic influences also played a role in the formation of modern Germany. The transformation from tribal to monarchical and feudal rule in Germany led to an increased emphasis on the importance of property, natural resources, and political alliances but the significance of familial ties and internal allegiances remained important factors in medieval Germany and helped to foster the culture that defined the territory. Continual territorial and political changes on the regional and imperial levels greatly impacted medieval Germans, with endemic conflict and warfare due to conflicts between outside ethnic groups as well as between German polities.

Some areas of the original German territories, known collectively as Germania, were officially under Roman rule beginning in the first century BCE.

The Romans occupied the area up to the Rhine and Danube rivers militarily but their political hold over the northern and eastern frontiers was weak so some Germanic tribes were able to assume and keep independent political and social communities. The Romans were pushed out partly due to Germanic tribal movement over the Rhine in the 3rd century C.E.. The Migration Period, 300 to 700 C.E., was characterized by various tribes moving into west-central Europe as and becoming consolidated as part of the evolving Germanic dynastic state, beginning with the Merovingians and the Carolingians. The Merovingians rose to become a Christian empire under Clovis I. They are best known for creating individual tribal legal codes, combining tribal and imperial law. Beginning in 481 C.E., a Merovingian dynasty ruled Gaul, which included most of modern day Germany. Individual tribes either paid tribute or were added by force into the empire at this time. In 751 C.E. the Frankish kingdom under the Carolingian dynasty came to power, expanding into all of Germany as well as farther east and south into Italy. Beginning with Charlemagne (crowned Holy Roman Emperor by Pope Leo III in 800 CE) the Franks ruled the largest European empire of the time until its breakdown created three kingdoms in 840 C.E.: East Francia, West Francia and the Middle Kingdom.

Merovingian Empire: (481 - 751 C.E.)

The kingdom of East Francia was the main source of later German culture and politics. East Francia and much of the Kingdom of Lothair, also called the Middle Kingdom, would make up the modern German state, established in 880 C.E as a newly unified empire. Successive German leaders inherited the title of emperor, ruling what was known as the Holy Roman Empire until 1806 C.E. The various principalities were under the protection of the emperor but could make decisions independently within their own regions. Although separated into tribes, ethnicities and linguistic regions, Germans developed into a cohesive ethnic and cultural group by the time of Otto I, crowned in 962 CE, the first official Holy Roman Emperor, ushering in the Ottonian or Saxon dynasty. Geographically at this time Germany had recognizable boundaries apart from the addition of most of Italy but continued to fluctuate over time to include parts of the kingdoms of France, Poland, and Hungary. Modern day Germany does not include Austria, Bohemia, Switzerland or Italy, all of which were part of the early German

empire. Medieval Germany was dominated and defined by these constantly changing political boundaries, which shaped the complex history of the German people. Trade fairs were large-scale sales events typically held annually in large towns where people could find a greater range of goods than they might find in their more local market and traders could buy goods wholesale. Prices also tended to be cheaper because there was more competition between sellers of specific items. Fairs boomed in France, England, Flanders, and Germany in the 12th and 13th centuries CE, with one of the most famous areas for them being the Champagne region of France.

The fairs which were held in June and October in Troyes, May and September in Saint Ayoul, at Lent in Bar-sur-Aube, and in January at Lagny were encouraged by the Counts of Champagne who also provided policing services and paid the salaries of the army of officials who supervised the fairs. Traders of wool, cloth, spices, wine, and all manner of other goods gathered from across France and even came from abroad, notably from Flanders, Spain, England, and Italy. Some of these fairs lasted up to 49 days and brought in a healthy revenue to the Counts; such was their importance, French kings even guaranteed to protect merchants travelling to and from the fairs. Not only did the fairs of Champagne become famed across Europe but they were a great boost to the international reputation of Champagne wine (at that time still not the sparkling drink that Dom Pérignon would pioneer in the 17th century CE). For many ordinary people, fairs anywhere were a great highlight of the year. People usually had to travel more than a day to reach their nearest fair and so they would stay one or two days in the many taverns and inns which developed around them. There were public entertainments such as the dancing girls of Champagne and all kinds of performing street artists as well as a few more unsavoury aspects such as gambling and prostitution that gave the fairs a poor reputation with the Church. By the 15th century CE trade fairs had gone into decline as the possibilities for people to buy goods everywhere and at any time had greatly increased.

The Expansion of International Trade

Trade in Europe in the early Middle Ages continued to some degree as it had under the Romans, with shipping being fundamental to the movement of

goods from one end of the Mediterranean to the other and via rivers and waterways from south to north and vice versa. However, the extent of international trade in this early period is disputed among historians. There was a movement of goods, especially luxury goods (precious metals, horses, and slaves to name a few), but in what quantities and whether transactions involved money, barter, or gift-exchange is unclear. Jewish and Syrian merchants may have filled the gap left by the demise of the Romans up to the 7th century CE while the Levant also traded with North Africa and the Moors in Spain. It is probable that international trade still remained the affair of only the elite aristocracy and it supported economies rather than drove them.

Into the 9th century CE, a clearer picture of international trade begins to emerge. The Italian city-states, under the nominal ruler ship of the Byzantine Empire, began to take over the trade networks of the Mediterranean, particularly Venice and Amalfi who would later be joined by Pisa and Genoa and suitable ports in southern Italy. Goods traded between the Arab world and Europe included slaves, spices, perfumes, gold, jewels, leather goods, animal skins, and luxury textiles, especially silk. Italian cities specialised in the exports of cloths like linen, unspun cotton, and salt (goods which originally came from Spain, Germany, northern Italy, and the Adriatic). There developed important inland trading centres like Milan which then passed on goods to the coastal cities for further export or more northern cities. The trade connections across the Mediterranean are evidenced in descriptions of European ports in the works of Arab geographers and the high numbers of Arab gold coinage found in, for example, parts of southern Italy.

In the 10th and 11th centuries CE, Northern Europe also exported internationally, the Vikings amassing large numbers of slaves from their raids and then selling them on. Silver was exported from the mines in Saxony, grain from England was exported to Norway, and Scandinavian timber and fish were imported in the other direction. After the Norman Conquest of Britain in 1066 CE, England switched trade to France and the Low countries, importing cloth and wine and exporting cereals and wool from which Flemish weavers produced textiles. As the Italian trio of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa gained more and more wealth, so they spread their trading tentacles further, establishing trading posts in

North Africa, also gaining trade monopolies in parts of the Byzantine Empire and, in return for providing transport, men and fighting ships for the Crusaders, a permanent presence in cities conquered by Christian armies in the Levant from the 12th century CE. In the same century, the Northern Crusades provided southern Europe with yet more slaves. Also travelling south were such precious metals as iron, copper, and tin. The 13th century CE witnessed more long-distance trade in less valuable, everyday goods as traders benefitted from better roads, canals, and especially more technologically advanced ships; factors which combined to cut down transportation time, increase capacity, reduce losses and make costs more attractive. In addition, when the goods arrived at their point of sale, more people now had surplus wealth thanks to a growing urban population who worked in manufacturing or were traders themselves.

International business was now booming as many city-ports established international trading posts where foreign merchants were allowed to live temporarily and trade their goods. In the early 13th century CE Genoa, for example, had 198 resident merchants of which 95 were Flemish and 51 French. There were German traders on the famous (and still standing) Rialto bridge of Venice, in the Steelyard area of London, and the Tyske brygge quarter of Bergen in Norway. Traders from Marseille and Barcelona permanently camped in the ports of North Africa. Economic migration reached such numbers that these ports developed their own consulates to protect the rights of their nationals and shops and services sprang up to meet their particular tastes in food, clothing, and religion.

With this growth, trade relations became more complex between states and rulers, with middlemen and agents added to the mix. Trading expeditions were financed by rich investors who, if they put up all the initial capital, often got 75% of the profits, the rest going to the merchants who amassed the goods and then shipped them to wherever they were in demand. This arrangement, used for example by the Genoese, was called a commenda. An alternative setup, the societas maris, was for the investor to provide two-thirds of the capital and the merchant the rest. The profits would then be split 50-50. Behind these major investors, there developed consortiums of smaller investors who put up their money for a future return but who could not afford to pay for a whole expedition.

Thus, there developed sophisticated mechanisms of borrowing and lending, which involved a very large number of families in the Italian cities, in particular. There were more and more financial instruments to tempt investors and extend credit such as credit notes, bills of exchange, maritime insurance, and shares in companies.

Trade was now assuming the guise we would recognise today with well-established businesses run by generations of merchants from the same family (for example, the Medici of Florence). There were increased efforts at standardisation in product quality and helpful treatises on how to compare weights, measurements, and coins across different cultures. State control increased with a codification of customary trade laws and regulations and, so too, the now all-too-familiar imposition of taxes, duties, and protectionist quotas. Finally, there was, as well, advice on how to best get around these regulations, as mentioned in this extract on Constantinople's trade officials, taken from the 14th-century.

By the mid-14th century CE, the Italian city-states were even trading with as distant partners as the Mongols, although this increase in global contact brought unwanted side effects such as the Black Death (peaked 1347-52 CE) that entered Europe via the rats which infested Italian trading ships. Undeterred, European pioneers - both religious and commercial - would head off into the other direction, and so the Cape Verde Islands were discovered by the Portuguese in 1462 CE and three decades later Christopher Columbus would open up the way to the New World. Next, in 1497 CE, Vasco da Gama boldly sailed around the Cape of Good Hope to reach India so that by the end of the Middle Ages, the world was suddenly a much more connected place, one which would bring riches for a few and despair for many.

The Ottoman Empire was founded in 1299 and rather quickly expanded from its origins as one of many Turkish states that rose to power after the decline of the Seljuk Turks in Anatolia (modern-day Turkey). But it really began to expand and consolidate power in the fifteenth century, especially after the conquest of Constantinople. Much of this success was a result of the Ottoman military and an elite fighting force called the Janissaries. The Janissaries were composed of young male, Christian slaves taken from wars in the Balkans

(modern-day Albania, Macedonia, Serbia, and Slovenia, among others). They were raised in the Islamic faith and either became administrators for the sultan or members of the sultan's personal bodyguard and military. It was these troops that used new weapons, called harquebus, to make the Ottomans one of the first gunpowder empires.

The Ottoman Empire reached its greatest size in the late seventeenth century but lasted until 1922. It was one of the largest and most long-lasting empires in world history. At its greatest extent, the empire extended to three continents -- stretching from the Balkans in south-eastern Europe across Anatolia, Central Asia, Arabia, and North Africa, thanks in large part to the Ottoman military and its use of gunpowder.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the Ottomans lost (and gained back) some important territories. Some historians say that this was partly to blame for the beginning of Ottoman decline. But it might be more accurate to consider this a period of transformation. For a few centuries the empire had grown under strong central authority. But now it was shifting and undergoing important changes. It's true that the Ottomans gained little territory after the seventeenth century. However, the Empire continued to exist into the twentieth century, just functioning differently than it had in the early centuries.

As the Empire stopped expanding, Ottoman leaders began to focus on consolidating territories that they already ruled. The borders of the Ottoman Empire became less fuzzy. The same was true of neighbouring European and Asian states. The political structure started to shift around this time, too. For the first few centuries of its existence, the Ottoman Empire had been controlled by a chain of powerful warrior-sultans. They ruled and led military campaigns. But by the middle of the seventeenth century, this stable chain of sultans was interrupted. Many sultans were overthrown after only ruling for a short period of time. These short reigns were the result of political rivalries, military revolts, and resistance from elites.

At this time, European monarchies were becoming more centralized, meaning most European monarchs had absolute power over their territories and subjects. But Ottoman power was shifting mostly in the opposite direction. A civilian bureaucracy (an organized system of state officials) was becoming

stronger as the sultans themselves gave up some power. At the top of this bureaucracy, powerful officials called viziers had a lot of authority, but power was also becoming less concentrated in the capital. Instead, provincial officials gained more political control.

Central authority still mattered but the balance had shifted. Local leaders and imperial officials worked with the sultan to manage the vast empire. Provincial leaders sent taxes to the capital. They also recruited soldiers for imperial wars. The capital and the provinces relied on each other for legitimacy. This was also the case with sultans and the powerful officials who controlled the political life of the empire.

Since this one massive empire held territories across three continents, it's hard to imagine a single identity unifying all the peoples. In fact, there was no such single identity. Like the Qing dynasty in China and the Russian Empire, the Ottoman Empire was multi-ethnic and multi-religious. Islam did play a big part in the empire, however. The Ottoman state based its authority on religion. The first warrior-sultans expanded the empire in the name of Islam. Sultans claimed the title of caliph, or successor to the Islamic Prophet Muhammad. Alongside the sultans, religious scholars, called ulama, played a significant role in running the state. This was particularly true in the courts.

The millet system shows that clear boundaries between different social groups were important for Ottoman political control. There were even Ottoman laws that specified the kinds of clothing that people in different communities could wear, much like those that existed in the Qing dynasty. Despite this, it's hard to simplify a set of rules governing Ottoman society. It was incredibly diverse. Generally, bureaucrats, religious scholars, and military officials had the greatest social power. Warrior-aristocrats, who were mostly Muslim, benefited from tax exemptions and the timar system of land grants. Under this system, in return for military service, warriors were given land. The rest of society made up the lowest class. It included merchants, farmers, herdsman, manufacturers, and seafarers. Though they had the least official power, they powered the engine of the empire. They were the main producers of goods and revenues (through taxes). They supported the military, bureaucracy, and religious establishment. Hierarchy was important, but it wasn't totally rigid. Religious, gender, and

economic differences put people into different groups. But there were a lot of overlaps. Commoners could be wealthy or poor. They could be peasants, townspeople, or nomadic pastoralists. People also were able to move across groups or gain social power. Merit was often rewarded regardless of wealth, lineage, or social status. In fact, enslaved or common people in the Ottoman military or bureaucracy, such as the Janissaries, often rose through the ranks. They ended up in some of the highest positions in society.

Throughout the Ottoman Empire's history, women were dependent on the men in their families for money and social position. This was the case in many medieval societies. Generally, older women or women with children had relatively more power in a household. Women's lives were relatively stable over the centuries. This is largely because religious ideas ruled gender relations. Islamic law granted women certain rights, like divorce and inheritance. It also allowed them to use their property and wealth to start and maintain institutions like schools and mosques. But religion was also used to limit women's power. For example, women had different rights in the courts. Also, some interpretations of Islam were used to justify keeping women at home.

The Ottomans and the world

With the empire extending across continents, its borders touched numerous states and other empires. But it also had tense relationships with some of them. For example, it was involved in conflict with the Safavid Empire to its east for centuries. The Safavids also had a Muslim leadership and claimed religious legitimacy, but it was based on a rival Islamic school of thought. The Ottomans also had a strained relationship with its European neighbours. This was particularly true of the Russians and Austrians.

At the same time, the Ottoman state often collaborated with other European powers. They also wanted to imitate European models. For example, Ottomans enlisted European military advisors; because some leaders felt that recent military defeats were due to their less technically advanced militaries. Western nations could afford these new technologies partly because of New World wealth.

Ottoman elites also became more connected to global cultural movements, particularly the Enlightenment. Translations became more widely

available with the Ottoman adoption of the printing press in the 1720s. Together, these trends of military and technological innovation and cultural worldliness gave rise to a series of reforms of education, the military, and finance beginning in the 1830s. Called the Tanzimat, these reforms were also a response to the diversity of the empire. They gave civil rights to minorities, including the guarantee for Armenian and Syrian Christians, Jews, and other millets (communities of different religious and ethnic minorities) to practice their religion. However, religious conservatives challenged these trends, insisting that the rise of secular education and other reforms were harming Ottoman society.

In a parallel development, Ottoman elites also began buying many global products and following trends from abroad. They collected foreign art, luxury goods, and foods. Personal spending likely rose across the different social classes. Foreign goods became more common. As it had done in the past, the Ottoman state played a crucial role in this circulation of goods. Many of those living in the empire continued to be engaged in the production and distribution of food, raw materials, and other goods, in much the same way as Arabs had for centuries. The state did its best to ensure that state officials, military employees, and people living in the capital had access to what they needed. Silk Road trade networks had enriched the Ottomans for centuries. But new sea routes that bypassed Ottoman trade routes shifted the power away. This is not to say that regional trade networks ended during the eighteenth century, but the global sea networks that strengthened after the sixteenth century transformed the prestige and position of the Ottoman Empire. With a reduction in overland trade in favor of trade along global networks and with newly established colonies in Asia, European power grew as Ottoman power faded.

Social Structure

The middle ages, spanning from the 5th to the 16th centuries, is traditionally separated into three distinct periods, the Early Middle Ages, from about 500 to 1000, the High Middle Ages, from 1000 to 1300, and the Low Middle Ages, from 1300 to 1500. Medieval social classes developed slowly in the first period of the middle ages, but by the time of the High Middle Ages, feudalism became the main social structure that defined the roles of every person during the medieval period. Feudalism is defined as a social structure by which

those on the top of the social hierarchy own land and in turn allow those beneath them to live on the land in exchange for work and support during wartime. This gift of land from an elite was known as a fief, while those who lived on the land were known as vassals. This structure created a basic hierarchy where people were born into different stations of life and lived in those stations with little potential for upward growth. While the upper classes certainly had more benefits than others, even the lower classes had certain benefits and protections to make their lives less unpleasant.

Medieval Class System

Social classes in the middle ages can be understood as part of broader definitions of upper, middle, and lower classes, though these terms do not equate with modern definitions of class. This is because, in the Middle Ages, upward movement in class status was virtually impossible, even with money and/or talent. The feudal system meant that ownership of land was the basic measure of status in the medieval social hierarchy. However, within the broader definitions of upper, middle, and lower classes, further distinctions existed that gave certain individuals more power within their classes.

The Upper Class

The upper class of medieval European society consisted of royals, nobles, knights, and clergy. Although these groups collectively held power in the middle ages, they also fought with each other for greater control within their own class structure. An especially tense relationship existed between the royals and nobles, the secular authority, and the clergy, the religious authority because each side tried to gain control of the other throughout the middle ages.

Royalty (Monarch)

The majority of rulers during the medieval period were male, as the dominating law of primogeniture meant that a king would pass his throne to his next oldest son. Because sons often grew up knowing they would one day be king, they received both schoolroom and practical education in ruling a kingdom and leading their country's army. However, some of the most powerful kings of their day, such as Charlemagne, the first Holy Roman Emperor, did not even know how to read. Thus, the education of royals often depended on what their parents and teachers thought they needed to know to run their kingdoms.

In theory, monarchs were at the top of the feudal hierarchy and held the largest amount of land and power of any group in the middle ages, but the reality was that they had to constantly fight to keep that power. Both the nobility and the clergy frequently tried to wrest control of land and vassals away from the monarch. Moreover, the social structure of feudalism often created problems for rulers. For example, in 1066, William the Conqueror, the duke of the French province of Normandy, crossed the English Channel and made himself King of England. His descendants thereafter became the Kings of England for centuries, however, they also still held the title Duke of Normandy, which was a fief under the control of the king of France. The King of England, therefore, was both the lord of England and a vassal, i.e. servant, to the King of France. The constant tension from this rocky relationship would eventually spark the Hundred Years' War.

Although kings and queens could clearly create lots of problems in medieval society, many also did their best to improve their societies through social and economic programs. For instance, despite his own illiteracy, Charlemagne attempted to establish schools throughout his kingdom for the betterment of society. Ultimately, rulers understood themselves as having been given their right to leadership by God himself. Therefore, they were responsible for caring for their people, lest they should earn God's wrath. If a king consistently violated the people's trust through tyranny, the people were fully capable of rejecting his rule in favour of another noble.

Lords (Nobles)

The nobility of medieval Europe were vassals of the king, that is, he gifted them land in exchange for the promise that they would support him with men and supplies in case he went to war against a troublesome noble or another monarch. Nobles had various titles depending on the country they were from, including baron, duke, count, Comte, earl, or squire. These titles represented how close they were to the king and therefore how much power they had over others. The education of nobles could vary, although they typically received decent schooling because of their upper class status. Ultimately, the nobles focused on

controlling their own land and gaining more power from the king whenever possible.

Knights

While technically part of the nobility, knights represented the lowest group of the upper class, as they frequently had no vassals of their own. They could have their own piece of land and serfs to work it, but this was through the generosity of their lord. Knights have also been traditionally associated with courtly chivalry and romance, especially in tales told by bards such as Geoffrey Chaucer and the Pearl Poet. Such tales recounted glorious quests and dragon slaying, but in reality, these opportunities for courtly displays came largely during tournaments and festivals, where knights could joust in honour of ladies of their choice. These festivals represented an important opportunity for fun and morale-boosting in an otherwise grueling and violent society.