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Hartje Paper:
The Personal History of Sgt. Robert E. Wilson:
Narrative of a WWII Infantryman

Bradley S. Wilson

Caught off guard in his foxhole, staring down the barrel of a deadly German submachine gun, Sgt. Robert E. Wilson must choose either being killed or becoming a prisoner of war. "It was an easy choice... I became a prisoner of war," said Wilson.¹ The 87 year old retired Army infantryman swivels the ice in his drink and stares off into the distance as he remembers the past.

Only three years before becoming a POW, Wilson had been in high school. He had envisioned his senior year being spent in the high school halls; instead he spent it on the frontlines of Europe during World War II. "I was a soldier at 18, saw my first combat at 19, and became a POW at 20," said the retired soldier.² Wilson was drafted into the Army in July of 1943, a time when the tide of the war was turning back against the Allied Forces. Instead of training for the usual 21 weeks in basic training, he only trained for 17 weeks before he was thrust into battle.

Wilson landed at Anzio Beach, in Southern Italy, in early 1944. "February 24, 1944—it was my birthday, I was 19 and it was my first time in combat," comments Wilson.³ He was sure that they were all going to be killed on that first day, with bullets raining down from the mountains and artillery shells exploding yards away. One of the giant artillery pieces that the Germans unleashed was nicknamed the "Anzio Express," which could shoot a projectile as large as a 500 pound bomb. "I can still hear that shell coming, even though it has been over 50 years ago" remembers Wilson.⁴

During his experience as the first scout, he was the first U.S. soldier to enter a town in southern France and see the people rejoice at the Americans' arrival. The town had been occupied by Germans for years. It appeared to be abandoned upon first inspection. He described an old man coming out of his house and into the deserted street. When he saw Wilson, he asked him if he was American. "I kiss first American I see," said the old man in broken English.⁵ He threw his arms around Wilson and kissed him on both cheeks, weeping like a baby. He will never forget the touching reaction of the liberated people. "I was a little embarrassed to have been kissed by that old man," states Wilson, "but also proud to have been the first American soldier these people had seen."⁶

The most difficult memory to deal with is the day his sergeant was killed. After receiving his third Purple Heart the sergeant had returned once again to action. While delivering rations between foxholes, the sergeant was killed by a direct hit from an artillery shell. Nothing was ever found of him. "This was a loss that even today brings tears to my eyes," said Wilson, "they never even found his dog tags or his shoes, there was literally nothing left."⁷

When he later found himself staring down the barrel of that German machine gun, Wilson felt lucky to survive even as a prisoner. "He could have cut me in half," remembers Wilson, "but he held his fire."⁸ The first POW camp was used to separate the Americans from the other nationalities. Wilson's final destination of the war was the Mooseberg Camp, near Munich. Wilson was forced to do hard labor and he constantly struggled to get food and to avoid the bombs of Allied air strikes. Working on the railroad tracks in Munich was dangerous because of constant bombing by the Americans during the day and the British during the night. The prisoners had to manually pump air into the German air raid shelters deep beneath Munich.

One day while working on the railroad tracks in Munich, Wilson saw prisoners with the Star of David on their thinly striped uniforms. They were in very poor health and the Americans tried to share bread with them. The German guards refused, saying that they were political prisoners. Wilson later learned that the Dachau concentration camp was near them, outside Munich. "All those men
were probably on their way to the gas chamber,” said Wilson.\(^9\)

By April 1945 the German guards had become friendly because they knew the war was winding down. They stopped making the prisoners work, placed them in a bomb shelter, and said they would supply them with rifles if the dreaded German S.S. Troops came to kill the Americans. On April 30, 1945 a vehicle approached and it was a jeep with a lone American driver. The Americans, laughing and crying, poured out of the bomb shelter that had been their most recent quarters. Wilson said this was the happiest day of his life. He had been a POW for seven months and 18 days. When Wilson reflects upon his war experience he feels blessed to have survived but bewildered by the fact that he got to come home. “I often wonder how anyone who served in the Infantry could have lived to talk about it,” said Wilson reflectively, “it must be plain good luck.”\(^10\) When he sleeps he still dreams of the war. “It’s like watching a movie you’ve seen many times before.”\(^11\)
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19th Century Cotton Cultivation: Russian Turkestan and the United States

Peter Jensen

Introduction

Throughout the 19th century, the Russian Empire struggled to industrialize and achieve economic parity with its European counterparts to the west. Many other states in Europe were well on their way to industrial, capitalist economies; Russia, however, lagged behind, burdened by the outdated institution of serfdom and a lack of industrial technology and investment. This is not to say that Russia had no industrial economy of its own; it was merely underdeveloped. By the mid-19th century, Russian light industry, particularly in textiles, was the exemplar of Russia’s potential for industrialized economic development. Textile production offered a stepping-stone, in theory, from the predominantly agricultural serf economy of Russia to an industrial manufacturing economy on par with the other nations of Europe. In the latter decades of the 19th century, the Russian Empire embarked on a series of conquests in Central Asia, spurred by the economic opportunism of accessing cotton fields in Central Asia. This need for cotton arose when, thousands of miles away, the American cotton trade with Europe was halted by the American Civil War, ultimately encouraging Russian military expeditions into Central Asia. Despite the boon of resources from what became Russian Turkestan, the attempt to depart from reliance on imports of foreign cotton constrained Russia’s textile industry in concert with protectionist policies and poor economic practices in the late 19th century. The rapid recovery of the American cotton economy after the Civil War and the limited production capacity of Turkestan for the Russian market in the late 19th century kept Russia reliant, to an extent, on imports from America. As a result, Turkestan cotton maintained a limited, though by no means insignificant, position in the Russian national economy, a role which persisted despite mercantilist tsarist policies practiced into the 20th century.

Methodology and Literature

The agricultural and pastoral territories of the Central Asian basin long served as a gateway from Europe to Asia, and vice-versa, reaching back to the campaigns of Alexander of Macedon. The vast, if somewhat arid, expanse of the Eurasian steppe served not only as an ideal route for trade caravans and conquering armies, but also for the cultivation of grass crops, herding livestock, and most importantly, the growth of cotton. Via traditional imperial-colonial relationship, cotton grown and harvested in Central Asia was shipped back to industrial centers in European Russia like Moscow, Ivanovo, and Nizhnii Novgorod to be manufactured into finished goods. Textile production represents the earliest and most advanced industrial development in the Russian national economy. This light industry allowed for gradual integration of traditional agricultural practice and the developing trend of cottage manufacture into the earliest manifestations of Russian industry. The nascent textile industry boomed in the 19th century with the addition of cotton to the resource pool, the import of advanced industrial technology from Western Europe – primarily England – and the rise of the first class of skilled industrial workers in Russia.

The case of Turkestan presents a fascinating narrative when observed alongside the growth of the cotton textile industry in Russia proper. Cotton had been grown in Turkestan for centuries, even millennia before the Russian conquest of the late 19th century. However, poor-quality raw materials and undeveloped agricultural techniques required significant attention after the Russian conquest before the region could be effectively integrated into the national economy. What is important to note is that the Russian textile industry of the 19th and early 20th centuries was not largely export-oriented, other than some exports to China and Persia. Russia at the time sought economic self-sufficiency, resulting in a degree of economic stagnation in an age of industrialization and capitalism in Western
Europe. By analyzing Russian and global data from the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries, one can extrapolate and draw conclusions regarding the economic agenda of the Russian empire and the significance of Turkestan to the national economy. In this analysis, the following factors will be addressed: the role of property rights and agricultural practices in Turkestan before and after the conquest; the impact of Turkestan on Russian domestic cotton production; the extent of the Russian textile industry's reliance on imports of American cotton; and the impact of the American Civil War on – and subsequent recovery of – the global cotton market as concerns Russian industrial growth.

A number of sources provide useful information and analyses on this otherwise elusive subject. Chief among these is Peter Lyashenko's exhaustive *History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution*, which provides invaluable data and narratives on all aspects of the Russian economy, and is widely cited by scholars in this field. Also invaluable are Richard Pierce's *Russian Central Asia 1867-1917*, Peter Gatrell's *The Tsarist Economy 1850-1917*, and Arcadius Kahan's *Russian Economic History*. Each of these texts offers figures and perspectives on all aspects of Russian economic history, not least the cotton industry. Additionally, Helene Carrere d'Encausse's work on the conquest of Turkestan, John Whitman's article on Turkestan cotton, and David MacKenzie's comprehensive analysis of Turkestan's role in the Russian empire fill in the analysis with historical accounts of developments, economic and otherwise, in 19th and 20th century Turkestan.

**Historical Review**

A complete understanding of the impact of Turkestan cotton on the Russian textile industry first requires an examination of the greater Russian textile industry in this historical period and the economic structure in place before and after the Russian conquest of the late 19th century. Textile manufacture was one of the earliest industrial developments in Russia, originally rooted in the institution of peasant serfdom. Woolen products and linen, spun from flax, constituted the "old" industry, spanning cottage-style peasant production – kustar in Russian – and larger, manorial enterprises employing mainly serf labor; these operations were particularly common in Moscow and the surrounding provinces. Merchants at this time had also begun to establish their own linen ventures, though these decreased steadily in number between 1800 and 1850. Peter Lyashenko explains this as resultant of intricate circumstances and issues in production, and both domestic and international markets. Wool, as another older institution of textile production, was long-rooted in the feudal serfdom that persisted in Russia well through the 19th century. Quite literally a homespun craft for much of history, Russian merchant enterprises eventually emerged alongside the dominant nobility-owned manufacturers, producing "a more valuable grade of goods and working largely for the open market." Both linen and wool manufacture began to decline by the mid-19th century as a result of both unskilled serf labor – more so in the noble enterprises, but in merchant ventures as well – and extreme technical backwardness resultant of the feudal structure of the economy and lack of technological innovation.

In the 19th century, cotton began to take hold as the dominant material for industrial production. Like linen and woolens, cotton spinning and weaving in this early period was heavily based around kustar manufacture, the only real alternative to the monopoly operations controlled by the English industrialists Chamberlain and Cozzens. At this point the Russian textile industry was still dependent on finished, imported yarn from England, and industrial weaving capital at this time was most heavily concentrated Ivanovo, Moscow, and Vladimir. Ivanovo in particular became extremely important in the Russian textile industry, eventually earning the moniker "the Russian Manchester." In the early 19th century, Russia's first domestic spinning mills were established, while from 1810-1850 imports of raw and spun cotton increased significantly.

Lyashenko makes specific note of the fact that cotton was the first industry to operate highly independent of serfdom. Kustar operations were central in the development of what he terms "the first cadres of technically trained workers not connected with serfdom, who were gradually changing into professional industrial workers." By 1825, roughly 97.4% of labor in the cotton industry was hired (non-serf) labor. These operations were true to the definition of cottage industry, as enterprise owners bought raw cotton or yarn wholesale and then distributed it to various workshops and homes for the different stages of processing. While cotton textile manufacturing was still highly dependent on unskilled manual labor, this did allow for the eventual development of
skilled labor, to which Lyashenko refers, to occur. Supplementing the critical growth of this skilled, albeit small, labor class, industrial capital played an important role in the early development of Russian cotton. While linen and woolen fabric manufacture was always limited by a simple lack of sufficiently advanced machinery, English technology was incorporated into the Russian system of production following the Act of 1842, which lifted the ban on export of English cotton machinery. This allowed Russian producers to purchase the advanced English machinery, and thus import raw cotton to spin themselves—mostly from America—rather than the more expensive spun yarn on which they had previously relied.

With the outbreak of the American Civil War and subsequent blockade of Southern ports, Russia's supply of cotton imports was almost completely cut off. This, in conjunction with British ambitions in India and Afghanistan, motivated the Russian government under Tsar Alexander II to pursue territorial ambitions in Central Asia in order to gain access to what had long been a cotton-producing region. The key dates associated with this process were: Gen. M.G. Chernyakov's capture of Tashkent in 1865, the combined effects of Gen. K.P. von Kaufman's M.D. Skobelev's subsequent 1876 conquest and reorganization of the territory into Fergana under his own governor-generalship. Note that the conquest was not completed until more than 20 years after the American Civil War ended and cotton shipments were able to continue. By the end of the 19th century, Russian Turkestan encompassed parts of modern-day Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Kazakhstan; it stretched from the Caspian Sea, west and north to the Bokhara and Khiva protectorates, and south to the border regions with Afghanistan and Persia. For thousands of years, the peoples of west Central Asia had maintained a blend of nomadic-pastoral and sedentary agricultural lives. The agricultural system encountered by the Russians upon conquest was based on, according to Lyashenko, two main factors: the system of land ownership already in place, and the irrigation techniques which had been employed there for hundreds, if not thousands, of years.

Lyashenko's overview of the status of Turkestan land ownership before the mid-19th century explains conditions as resulting from the lack of property rights under Shariyat—or Sharia—Islamic law. Debates of the interpretation of Sharia aside, property rights as Lyashenko explains them are based on the traditional model of property rights in Islamic societies, where land is divided into three categories: *land belonging to the state* (amlak [or amlak]) ... privately owned land (myulke [or mulke]) and ... land of the religious organizations (vakuf [or waqf]). Ian Murray Matley expands greatly on this basic framework, including different tax policies and inheritance practices. *Mulke* land constituted about 90% of irrigated land, leaving the remaining 10% for the ruler and religious organizations. *Mulke* land was further divided into different parcels for tax purposes: *mulke-i hurr* land paid no tax; *mulke ushri* paid 10% tax; and *mulke-i khiraj* paid 14-50% of the harvest in tax to the local *bek,* or regional governor. While in theory all land, including the *mulke,* belonged to the khan, emir, etc., land could be sold or inherited. Closely tied to land rights and perhaps more importantly, water management played a critical role in the arid Turkestan basin. Water, seen as a gift from God and therefore no man's possession, was distributed at the village level by a controller, who was in turn supervised by an
aqsaqal, or elder. Sophisticated irrigation systems had at one time existed and been utilized, but were destroyed in the 13th century by the Mongols, and never rebuilt; this was because the native population was adequately fed on the land with reduced levels of irrigation. At the turn of the 20th century, irrigated lands were still concentrated along the Amu Darya river, in the more temperate southwest region of Turkestan (modern Turkmenistan), and the Fergana and Zarafshan valleys around Tashkent, Andijan, and Samarkand (modern Uzbekistan).

The new Russian “agrarian order” in Turkestan estabished a legal precedent wherein the Russian government owned all uncultivated “nomadic” land, in a not-too-great change from the traditional practice, and an 1873 statute transferred title of all Turkestan lands to the government. The government then took further action by declaring that: all occupied or settled tracts belonged to the person who actually worked the land. This decree turned many tenant farmers and sharecroppers into hereditary owners, and has been regarded as a highly progressive step taken by the colonial regime. Whitman elaborates that previous tenants were granted the right of perpetual utilization and transference of property through heritance. The production pattern of Turkestan cotton was initially unchanged, as the Russian state had merely replaced the native aristocracy and clergy as rent collectors. Whitman identifies a separate decree in 1886 which established the right of private land ownership; this was more or less trivial, as legal and administrative hurdles combined with hostile credit practices to create a disincentive to transfer to private ownership. “In 1909 ... only 1 percent of the sown area of Fergana, Syr Daria [sic], and Samarkand oblasts was owned outright by individuals; the rest had either been left to church establishments on condition that they till it or was occupied by peasants enjoying perpetual and inheritable use of it” under the original 1873 decree.

Lyashenko identifies irrigation as “the second most important condition in the agricultural economy of the settled regions in Central Asia and Turkestan.” While irrigation systems had long played a vital role in the economy of the semi-arid Central Asian basin, the appropriation of water resources had long suffered from logistical difficulties and administrative inefficiency. While custom dictated that water was to be distributed equitably and not bought or sold, successful irrigation systems required massive amounts of labor and were not successful in all localities. After the Russian conquest, “customary rights” left the norms of administrative abuse and inefficient practice in force, while the government reserved the rights of supervision and all new installations. By the first decade of the 20th century, “the total area of irrigated land in Central Asia (including the vassal possessions of Khiva and Bokhara) amounted to 12,845,154 acres, of which the five provinces of Turkestan contained 7,580,746.5 acres, and Bokhara, 4,319,513.7.” Whitman explains that the high labor costs associated with irrigation projects “led to the parcelization of the land.” This, in turn, limited most native peasants to extremely small plots, very rarely more than 5-7 dessyatina – or 13.5-18.9 acres – a condition which remained so after the Russian conquest.

The Integration of Turkestan Cotton and the American Civil War

Cotton consumption in Russia was historically lower than in the rest of Europe; that is to say, Russian consumption by weight in 1904, after the addition of Turkestan supplies and considerable development of the industrial base, was still only 5.3 pounds per capita. This compared poorly to annual per capita consumption of 39 pounds in England, or 20.4 pounds in the United States. It is important to note, of course, that the population of the United States in 1900 was 82,166 million, while in 1897 the Russian population was already over 125.64 million. However, this still represents a significantly lower level of consumption than elsewhere, especially for a country which, according to some, was at this point industrialized. George Anderson posits that “under Nicholas II Turkestan was expected to fill a hiatus in a Russian economic system whose main motivation was the principle of self-sufficiency.”
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From Lyashenko, p. 334.
Before Russia’s conquest of Central Asia even commenced, however, two events significantly affected the availability of raw cotton to the Russian textile industry. The outbreak of the Crimean War in 1854 alienated much of Western Europe from Russia and cut off supplies of raw cotton from growers in the American south.\textsuperscript{34} This conflict first motivated the tsarist government to consider Central Asia as a source of cotton for the burgeoning textile industry. Between 1850 and 1860, Russian imports of Asiatic cotton grew to a total of 270,000 pooods – or about 4,876 tons\textsuperscript{35} – from just over 1,800 tons in the previous decade.\textsuperscript{35} Unfortunately, Pierce’s citation of A.E. Alektorov for these numbers conflicts with Lyashenko’s account: where Alektorov posits the above figures for the period 1850-1860, Lyashenko claims they fit the period 1850-1855. This discrepancy between the data of these two ethnographers and historians is all but impossible to rectify. For that reason, we will simply assume validity for Lyashenko’s numbers, as he offers more data for analysis.

Again, beginning in 1862, the global market for cotton was dealt a severe blow by the outbreak of the American Civil War and the Union blockade of Confederate ports. As the United States was the primary supplier of the world’s cotton supply, prices were pushed much higher as a result of the cut in supply. David Surdam’s work on raw cotton markets prior to and during the American Civil War evaluates the changes in demand for raw cotton from American growers and from all growers as well as total supplies on the world market. According to Surdam, *Before the Civil War, American-grown cotton accounted for 85 percent of the world’s consumption of cotton.*\textsuperscript{36} Presumably including Russia; from 1850-55 (by Lyashenko’s figures), Russia imported a total of about 4,876 tons of raw cotton from Turkestan,\textsuperscript{37} while 33,786 tons were imported from various other sources – mainly the United States – for the period 1851-60.\textsuperscript{38} As a result of the Civil War and the increased costs associated with shipping American cotton, Russian imports from the west dwindled to 10,601.5 tons by 1863, down from 44,988.7 tons in 1861. Meanwhile imports from Central Asia grew from 2,745.2 tons in 1861 to 12,714.6 tons in 1864. An important side note is that this analysis focuses primarily on trade in raw cotton – and occasionally ginned cotton lint – rather than spun cotton yarn. Lyashenko points out that beginning in the 1850s, imports of raw cotton began to outstrip imports of yarn with the development of the whole cycle of cotton production in Russia (cotton, yarn, fabrics, and calico-printing production).\textsuperscript{39}

The precise effect of the American Civil War on Russian cotton supplies is difficult to determine, though trends in global data bear example to the severity of the impact. An examination of David Surdam’s work on American cotton in global markets before and during the civil war reveals both the complexity of the issue, and Surdam’s contention with previous evaluations of war era cotton markets. He addresses the question of changes in demand for cotton provided by American and non-American producers during and after the American Civil War. Contrary to previous theses, Surdam argues that King Cotton of the American South was not on the decline or in danger of being usurped as the world’s cotton supplier on the eve of the Civil War. In fact, Surdam validates previous arguments that demand for American-grown cotton during the Civil War could have stagnated or decreased, while total world demand for cotton from all growers increased.\textsuperscript{41} This conclusion, among others from Surdam’s work, affirms John Hanson’s conclusion that total world demand for cotton continued to grow during the 1860s, despite the significant impediment to supply brought on by the Union blockade of the South.\textsuperscript{42} Meanwhile, American cotton growers regained prominence as soon as 1871, as demand for American cotton achieved pre-war levels of over 5\textsuperscript{43}
million bales at prices similar to those in 1861 and preceding years.

Fig. 3, Consumption of Cotton in Russia
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As alluded to previously, the interruption of shipments of American cotton to the east left the Russian textile industry wanting, and so the government turned to Central Asia. Beginning in the 1860's, government officials instituted a series of protectionist policies in order to promote domestic industrial development. Chief among these were protectionist tariffs: in 1861, raw cotton could be imported duty free, while yarn carried a duty of 325 kopeks/pood; in 1891, a tariff of 120-135 kopeks/pood was levied on raw cotton, while the duty on yarn was raised to 420-540 kopeks/pood. However, as Gatrell points out, tariffs may not have been purely protectionist policies. Indeed, the tsarist government may have levied duties on imports as an easy form of income. A more rational policy offered by Gatrell is lifting tariffs on imports of primary or raw goods, in order to make available cheap inputs for manufacturing. Political Economists identify the policy enacted by the government as import substitution industrialization: or the promotion of domestic primary and secondary sectors of the economy to lessen dependence on imports and build the domestic economic base. Even into the turn of the century, tsarist policy taxed imports of raw and manufactured materials; when falling prices threatened Russian textiles from 1900-1903, progressive Minister of Finance Sergei Witte refused to lower the tariff on imported cotton, the price of which had fallen more quickly than that of finished goods, and instead subsidized cotton exports. Even if the tariffs were instituted as sources of revenue, they nonetheless hampered Russian economic development, particularly as fledgling Russian industries hungered for imported raw materials and industrial capital.

Once Russia consolidated rule over the territory of Turkestan, significant growth of cotton could be pursued. For the first decade or so of significant imports from Central Asia, native Asian varieties of cotton were grown which were coarse, short-fibered, grey, and had to be processed slowly by hand. After some experimentation, it was discovered in the 1880s that the American upland variety provided a higher quality product and was more suitable to the drier climate of Central Asia than some other foreign varieties. The gradual adoption of the Gossypium hirsutum plant throughout the 1880s increased yields significantly, as well as the ease of processing and the quality of the end product. As the graph below shows, despite a slow start, growth of cotton proliferated greatly into the 20th century, particularly in the fertile Fergana Valley. The completion of the Tashkent-Orenburg Railroad

Fig. 4, Acreage Under Cotton in Turkestan
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From Lyashenko, p. 611

significantly increased the level of Turkestan's integration into the Russian national economy. Its opening "touched off a cotton boom in Fergana which attracted much Russian private capital." Both domestic production and imports of cotton suffered beginning in 1914, as World War I strained resources across the globe, and Russia would not attain peak
cotton production levels again until the mid-20s as a result of the post-revolution economic slump.

For a more thorough understanding of the concentration of cotton growth in the Central Asian region, see the attached map. The darkly shaded area comprises Syr-Darya, Transcaspian, and Sasmankand Provinces, while the lightly shaded area constitutes the Fergana— as well as the Zarafshan— valley, and the protectorates of Khiva and Bukhara. As the graph from Lyashenko indicates, the latter three territories produced a disproportionate share of the cotton grown in Turkestan in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The obvious explanation for the fall of production before 1915 is the onset of World War I. Most likely, the fertile lands of Fergana and other parts of Turkestan were redirected to grain production in order to feed troops as part of the war effort. Despite the predominant concentration of cotton production in the Fergana and Zarafshan valleys, in 1913-14, 82% of arable land in Turkestan and 89% in Bukhara was devoted to grain. The rest of Central Asia did not increase productivity in cotton until the implementation of guided Soviet economic policies in the 1920's and 30's.

Conclusion

Data gathered on the imports and domestic raw cotton in Russia in the late 19th and early 20th centuries shed light on the economic agenda of the tsarist government, while an understanding of the history of this period puts that data into context. While the Russian Empire in this period is often considered insular and something of a pariah, the impact of the American Civil War, in addition to other conflicts, indicates that the Russian economy was integrated to a significant extent with the global market. Beginning in the 1850s, the Russian interest in Turkestan and Central Asia can be explained in large part by the pursuit of economic interests, though these were by no means the only motivators in a period characterized by imperial colonialism on a huge scale. Russia, despite its relative successes in Central Asia, still lagged behind the rest of the world; despite Lenin's claim that Russia became a full-fledged capitalist economy with the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, capitalist industrial development in this period remained pathetically behind that of Russia's western counterparts. However textiles did undeniably flourish more than most other industries, thanks in no small part to the growth of cotton spinning, weaving, and the significant agricultural contributions of Turkestan.

As the data have shown, growth of cotton in Central Asia provided a significant boon to the Russian economy. In 1912, Minister of Agriculture A.V. Krivoshein argued that Russia could become completely independent of American cotton if incredibly ambitious irrigation projects were undertaken and the regional economy became based almost solely on cotton. As indicated by trends in figure 3 on p. 13, this may have been possible, as more cotton was produced domestically around the turn of the 20th century than was imported. However, while entirely characteristic of the colonial status of Russian Turkestan and whether plausible or not, in hindsight this would likely have yielded catastrophic consequences for the region, as grain growers—the European Russians feeding the population of Turkestan—suffered from periodic bad harvests, crop diseases, and interruptions from war throughout the early 20th century. Nonetheless, the American Civil War was something of a silver-lined storm cloud for Russian cotton manufacturers; the Union blockade of the cotton-growing south cut off Russia's most valuable supplier of raw cotton, and yet provided the final impetus for the conquest of Turkestan and integration of the cotton growers there into the greater national economic interest. This ultimately demonstrated how tied Russia was to global trade, simultaneously laying the foundation for major political and economic events in years to come.
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Consolidating French Monarchial Power through Theocratic Kingship

Kristin Wright

When studying western Medieval Europe, one finds rather complicated political structures resulting from the feudal society which developed. The strong uniform state structures of the later Middle Ages were nonexistent, and lords and princes wielded a majority of the political power. The medieval rulers of modern nations such as France, England, and Germany all reacted uniquely to this complex environment resulting in different political arrangements within each region. The Capetian kings of France came to power around 997 C.E. They inherited minimal amounts of land, hardly any authority, and a continuous struggle to retain their title. A strong relationship with the Christian church along with the practice of theocratic kingship was one way that the Capetians slowly began to increase their power and control. The increasing supremacy of the French monarchy from the eleventh century though the thirteenth century was intricately tied to the ideas of theocratic kingship. This theocratic kingship allowed for a close relationship between the king and the church creating the opportunity to augment monarchial power through religious associations. Unfortunately this connection also created a struggle over superiority between church and state resulting in numerous conflicts and fractures.

Historical Background

The Capetians were struggling to consolidate power and grow their territory at the beginning of the 11th century. For this reason, they depended on their relations with the church to help them consolidate power: “when Hugh Capet became king, he and his successors had to develop feudal monarchy from a royal demesne that had dwindled in size to less than the province of the Ile-de-France.”¹ This means that the king of France held little land outside the areas surrounding Paris. Not only were they struggling to keep this small amount of land, but they also faced issues of political legitimacy, political authority, and very powerful princes and counts. All of these issues conflicted with their main goal of creating a government in which the king was the central supreme power.

While early Capetians continually attempted to reach this goal, the first significant improvements came under Louis VI and his close friend Abbot Suger.² This relationship represented the king’s increasingly close connection with the church. The Capetians had already begun to rely heavily on bishops for economic and military support in attempts to establish sovereignty and supremacy. These church officials supported the kings because many preferred monarchical influence over the dominance of numerous different powerful lords.³ These relationships, like Suger’s and Louis VI’s, also benefited from the fact that the Capetian rulers tended to take both religion and their religious roles seriously. This is made evident in their theocratic rule.

This paper will not discuss all the Capetian rulers, but will focus mainly on Philip I (1060-1081), Louis VI (1108-1137), Louis VII (1137-1180), and Philip Augustus (1180-1223). It is important to realize that these Capetian rulers were not solely theocratic rulers. Many historians note the importance of these religious aspects of their rule, but some of the kings did not always take religion as seriously as others. There were many secular roles and other governmental duties that did not pertain to or benefit from theocratic kingship; however, the theocratic kingship in France during this period inherently increased the power of the French monarchy by allowing the kings to participate in the ecclesiastical realm as an important figurehead of religious power and importance. Nevertheless it should be remembered that even though their power increases through this religious relationship, by the end of Philip Augustus’ reign the French monarchy
still does not have complete control of all French lands and it is in no means an absolute monarchy.

Theocratic Kingship in Medieval France

Before delving into examples of how religion and the church helped increase monarchical power, one needs an understanding of what defined theocratic kingship, what religious responsibilities and roles the king held as a result, and also how coronations played a part in this theory of divine rule. In theory, those who enacted a theocratic kingship claimed that the right to rule came from a concession of power by God to the chosen monarch. It was by the grace of God that a king ruled and this grace alone determined a ruler’s success or failure. This is why a king was considered God’s vicariate on earth. This concept provided the basis for the French kings to claim that their power was derived directly from God. This meant that the king assumed numerous religious roles which affected both his private life and political decisions.

Roles and Responsibilities

Since the king’s power flowed from God, the question of who the king was in relation to God became prevalent. Many explained this connection through the concept of the king being the royal vicariate, or the person authorized to rule in God’s name on earth. As royal vicariate, the king’s subjects included both clergy and laity which, allowed for the monarchs to rule over both secular and religious issues and ultimately allowed for the connections between monarch and church to develop further. Manegold of Lautenbach, a Benedictine monk from southern Germany wrote a piece on tyrannical kings around 1085 which suggested that it was acceptable to deny a king power if he acted against this divine power. While his goal was to elevate the pope’s eminence, Manegold’s piece still exemplify ideas concerning the divine nature of a king’s power; “just as the royal dignity and power surpasses all earthly powers, so too the man appointed to exercise it should not be base and infamous but should excel others in wisdom, justice, and piety.” Manegold’s writings depict how being God’s vicar meant the king had the ability and duty to act in a manner mimicking God’s greatness and power since he was the embodiment of God’s power on earth.

However, this role as vicariate did not make a king divine; “no one portrayed medieval Christian kings then or later as divine personages wielding any miraculous power of their own. It was instead the belief that they could tap holy power more readily than others through prayer and the invocation of the divine name which distinguished them.” This is important because these kings were not deities or divine, but still high above the average person when it came to spiritual connections. The monk Guibert of Nogent wrote around 1125; his writings created the idea that since a king’s power came from God, kings had the power to perform miracles. He then discusses healing miracles performed by Louis VI. Kings alone had God on their side, and they could prove it through these “miracles.” Guibert was a cleric like Manegold, yet despite their differences in opinion over the positive nature of the King’s divine power, both acknowledge its importance and prevalence. This power from God is what set kings apart from the rest.

The power of royal vicariate also led kings to take on responsibilities beyond the secular realm. They were supposed to act as models of Christ and Christian living as well as take on the unique role of defender and supporter of the church, “very naturally this Christ-imitating king was pictured and expounded also as the mediator between heaven and earth...” He was a mediator between God and man, government and the people, as well as between the clergy and the people. Abbot Suger, Louis VI’s close friend and confidant, was a huge proponent of the king as a Christian figurehead. He claimed that the French king was supposed to bring to life the image and spirit of God. As such, the French king also had the sacred duty to forcibly put down any persons who attempted to subvert his power or the churches power. This is clearly supported in The Deeds of Louis the Fat, in which Suger depicts the good deeds of Louis VI during his reign. Suger wrote: “kings put down insolent tyrants whenever they see them inciting wars, taking pleasure in endless plunder, persecuting poor, and destroying churches.” He also continually refers to Louis VI’s piety and his generous gifts and good Christian deeds. Suger shows Louis VI as modeling a Christian lifestyle and practicing his role as vicar by defending God’s churches, protecting the poor, and even putting down tyrants who ruled against God’s people and power.

Coronations

Another key aspect of this donation of divine power is how the power transferred to the king. For French kings, the transference of divine power
was a mixture of inheritance and their coronation rights. Their divine capacity acquired through birth was strengthened by the divine endowment acquired through royal coronations and allowed for the idea of theocratic kingship to flourish. Royal coronations or consecrations gradually became less secular, and more associated with sacred ideas and notions. Even the liturgy of the coronations became less secular as it created the king as a figure who was above his subjects, yet understood both worlds. This emphasized the king’s religious role as mediator between the clergy and the people. This is especially true for early Capetian rule when royal power was weakest and relied heavily on the coronation right to solidify and legitimize their monarchical power.

_The Coronations Rite of Reims_ offers insight which supports the above claims. The source discusses the numerous ecclesiastical dignitaries who needed to be present at the coronation, the important symbols such as oil and the crown, and also the importance of the location being a Cathedral. The presence of ecclesiastics shows how important the church and clergy were to validating coronations. Their importance of these dignitaries is also reflected in the description of Philip Augustus’ coronation. Philip Augustus’ father asked for the blessing of the bishops and archbishops to allow his son to become his heir. Next, Philip Augustus “assembled the archbishops, bishops and all the barons of his land and was crowned at Rheims by the reverend William, archbishop of Rheims, cardinal priest of St. Sabina and legate of the apostolic see, the king’s uncle.” Here Philip’s coronation lends support to the necessity of bishops and archbishops discussed in _Coronations Rite of Reims_. In addition to the significant religious dignitaries, coronations were taking place in buildings often referred to as the house of God. Cathedrals offered a great visual of the greatness and power of God which, was being passed down to the king. These primary source examples show how the increase of religious importance in kings’ coronations allowed for the church and monarch to strengthen their relationship in a way that almost made the two interdependent on one another. The interdependence of the two is a result of the monarchy’s theocratic kingship which ultimately tied them to the church. The king’s reliance on the relationship resulting from their theocratic rule allowed the French kings to increase their royal power.

**Increased French Monarchial Power through Theocratic Rule**

The early Capetians, Hugh Capet, Robert the Pious, and Philip I, laid the foundations for their successors to rule through the above mentioned theocratic kingship; however they failed to take full advantage of the opportunities it offered their own reigns. It was not until Louis VI and Abbot Suger in the early twelfth century that the French monarchy truly began to realize the potential of their close relationship to the church. From Louis VI through Philip Augustus, the French kings began to utilize their role as supporter, defender, and mediator for the church more effectively. By participating more actively in these roles, the kings gained even more importance in the church. Just as Suger hoped, the power of the king became intricately linked to the power of the church. As one increased in prestige, the other also benefited.

**Visual Representations**

One manner in which the Capetians were able to increase their prestige was through religious symbolism and art. Artists and craftsmen were valuable assets to kings on multiple levels. These persons were able to create gifts and donations, which would be appropriate for the king to give, but also they created visual representations of the king which represented his power and his closeness to God. These images became vital to advancing a king’s power and legitimacy. These displays took many forms; some, such as the king’s seal, served practical purposes and others, such as the cathedrals, a more artistic eminence.

A king’s seal was an important indicator of his power and importance. The symbolism and iconography of a seal were a concrete image of the king and his government. For example, “because of the seal’s iconographic significance, it put forth, in a fashion similar to coinage, a representative image of the royal power, with its symbols evoking the particular nature of that power.” Any message sent by the king or commissioned by the king would bare his seal; in essence he could reveal his power to lords outside of his control or rulers of other territories. Louis VII altered his seal, most likely with the assistance of Suger, in a style that increased his political power and religious significance (fig. 1a). The throne was altered to resemble the throne of Dagobert in an attempt to strengthen the connection between the monarchy and monastery of St. Denis and ultimately the monarchy and the church. On
was still to increase the king’s power. The fact that he left half as treasure would benefit his successor by strengthening the relationship between his descendants and the church. One also sees Philip relinquishing lands to churches in Rigord’s chronicle. After defending the churches against the duke of Burgundy, he granted the lands back to the churches instead of a lord so that they would have more control, and so would he.30 Both Louis VI and Philip Augustus showed the king as a supporter of the church, meaning they were performing their religious responsibilities associated with their theocratic rule, and as a result increasing their favor within the church.

Defenders of the Church

Defending the Church was another key role assumed by the Capetian kings. Louis VI took his role as defender of the church seriously. He not only protected churches which fell under his jurisdiction, but also protected churches beyond Lesser France which gained him pockets of political support outside his very limited territory. On numerous occasions Louis VI fought secular forces threatening churches.31 This fierce protection of the church and its believers is supported, yet exaggerated, in Abbot Suger’s works. His Deeds of Louis the Fat especially focuses on creating the image of Louis VI as a defender of the church: “a renowned and spirited defender of his father’s kingdom,” Louis VI made sure the churches prospered and searched for peace for the ecclesiastics, the workers, and the poor of society.32 In fact, numerous times throughout the work, Suger portrays Louis VI defending churches. One instance is when he protects the church at Orleans from the Lord Leo.33 This notion of the king as defender of the church gave him more power by creating him as a military force that would be able to protect and defend his people. Also it showed him as a martial leader with morals; a leader who would defend the pious, poor, and helpless of society, emphasizing his Christ-like nature.

Louis VII also made sure to emphasize the role of defender of the church: “when French churches needed protection against local lords, Louis VII was their first choice – and he usually responded, often with positive results. A number of lay lords in regions where royal power had previously been ineffective also now preferred to seek protection from the king.”34 The royal power was becoming more consolidated and strong. The role of defender of the church showed the kings’ strength and ability, and also drew the interest of certain secular rulers. Louis VII also continued the interdependence of French monarchs and Popes by remaining the main sanctuary or retreat for the Pope during problems with the emperor or the Romans.35 This relationship with the papacy is not unique to Louis VII, but is a significant indicator of the increasing power and importance of the French monarchs. Not only were they protecting French churches, but also the Pope, the figurehead for the Christian world. This does not mean that French monarchs did not have conflicts with the church or pope; however, the reliance of the pope on French kings created a unique situation in France.

This increase in strength is especially evident under Philip Augustus: “the role of protector of churches against lay threats was probably more effectively executed under Philip than any of his predecessors, since his power was considerably greater and wider. Philip now operated, for examples, in Cahors, Limoges, and Clermont.”36 According to the deeds of Philip Augustus’ life, Philip enacted this role of defender of the church numerous times in his first year against Hèbes VI of Charenton, Humbert III of Beaujeu, and the count of Chalon who were mistreating the churches in their areas. The chronicle explains that, “as soon as the king heard the plaint of the religious men; he lit with Gods zeal for the defense of the churches and the liberty of the clergy.”37 In another instance in the fifth year of his rule, Philip Augustus also defended the churches against the Duke of Burgundy who was unjustly burdening the churches.38 Under Philip Augustus, one sees more territory protected by the king and more churches relying on the king for protection. Lords are losing power to the French monarch as he consolidated his power, in large part through these expeditions to protect the church from lay threats. The role of defender of the church clearly increased not only consolidation of land, but also support from the church which, would encourage support from certain laity in those lands.

Royal Sees and Ecclesiastical Chroniclers

Certain churches and monasteries were considered ‘royal’ indicating a close relationship with the king, though “in theory all churches were royal but in practice various princes and lords held secular authority over a see.”39 Because of this issue royal churches were ones where the king’s power was effective and able to exercise control. Under Louis VII numerous southern churches become royal
the seal the throne seems to be X shaped, resembling Dagobert’s throne that was renovated by Suger (fig. 1b). Suger explains that St. Denis possessed the throne of Dagobert which was used by all French kings when their nobles swore homage. It holds importance because Dagobert was a Christian King who founded St. Denis. Showing a connection to Dagobert’s seal exemplified Louis VII’s Christian role and secular power to anyone who saw his seal.

Despite this change, Louis VII’s seal retained the scepter, crown, and throne which not only exalted the king as a strong secular power but also “radiated the authority of a divinely chosen ruler.” These symbols were acknowledged as sacred, and their continuing presence on the seal is important to establishing Louis VII as a legitimate religious ruler. The seal ultimately represented his power over his territory and his subjects. It also emphasized the fact that he was chosen by God to rule. All of these would be revealed to any person handling the royal seal.

Cathedrals offered another way for kings to visually express and solidify their power. “Since in the king’s own person the sacred and the secular were closely intertwined, and the temporal and nontemporal miraculously came together, that joy was not only of this world. The art of Cathedrals culminated in the celebration of a God incarnate.” The Royal Portal of Chartres Cathedral was completed around 1145 and offers a good example of this relationship. The middle section of Chartres’ Royal Portal is the most important to increasing and depicting the royal power. The middle tympanum shows Christ in Majesty (Fig. 2). Christ in majesty was important since the theologians who created Gothic art pictured Christ not as an infant but a king, the sovereign of the world. Christ is sitting on a throne surrounded by the four evangelists that emphasizes his royal position but also that his power was connected to God, just as a kings’ power was from God. This also supports the idea that a king should be acting ‘Christ-like’, emulating the supreme ruler from which he derives power.

Another key visual representation of the power flowing from God is the two angels holding the crown over Christ’s head. Jesus’ power is from heaven and is divine, just like the king’s power. In addition, in the early 1100s the crown had become a solid imperishable representation of the king’s power in France. His rule was not temporary but a timeless symbol of the beginnings of a real kingdom.

are statues of the kings and queens of the Old Testament. The importance of this is that these kings and queens stand as supports and protection for the Christ above them. This visualizes the concept of kings as protectors and supporters of the church, and also portrays monarchs as the foundation on which the church rests. All of these are important roles that a king derives from his theocratic kingship became important tools used to increase power and recognition.

Supporters of the Church

Along with the seal and portal, political actions and decisions were also vital to supporting the king depicted in the images. Gifts and donations by kings were one way to strengthen the relationship between the king and church, and also a way to increase a king’s influence and power within the church. By offering gifts and money kings fulfilled their role as supporter of the church and were able to connect their names and reigns to important events such as the building of cathedrals or improvement and renovations of abbeys and monasteries. Both Louis VI and Philip Augustus offer helpful examples on the relevance of these gifts and donations to increasing kingly prestige.

Louis VI and Abbot Suger had a close relationship that allowed them to mutually grow power for one another. For example, “one sign of its [St. Denis’] close tie to the monarchy is that the abbey became the repository of various pieces of regalia that symbolized the king’s authority.” This elevated St. Denis to the status of royal abbey and linked the fate of the monarchy to the abbey’s religious success. Abbot Suger explains how along with these royal gifts of kingship, Louis VI also gave other goods to help fund the building of St. Denis: “the illustrious King himself offering of his own accord emeralds....invited us to complete the work in glorious fashion.” While Suger may have exaggerated the greatness of Louis VI, there is fact underneath the flattery. Similar to donations today, the king gained influence in the church and his name became linked to a powerful abbey as a person who supported and sustained the abbey.

Philip Augustus also presented gifts to the church. Before going on crusade, Philip drew up a will that left “half his treasure to the poor and the churches.” He also left an annual pension for La Victorie to allow for immediate building of the church. While some criticize that his will only benefitted the church after his death, the intention
affiliates. In 1031 only sixteen sees were royal; by Louis VII’s rule the number had risen to twenty-six sees. The king’s role as defender of the church ultimately helped him to acquire more political secular footholds as he defended them against lay forces. As he protected these churches, he was able to expand his political power and consolidate more power in their sees. Royal churches became vital to expressing the monarchy’s increasing power. The authority of the King became not only effective in these areas, but also the power and prestige of the specific see became intertwined in the king’s prominence and elevating his status in these areas through the individual churches power. Otto Von Simson references this idea when he talks about Chartres Cathedral in the mid-twelfth century. Chartres was seen as a royal capital and residence: “the munificence of the Capetian kings toward Notre Dame Chartres was designed to underscore and enhance the importance of the basilica as a royal cathedral.” Chartres was the wealthiest and largest province at this time. The king’s connection to and influence within such a powerful area and Church greatly increased his prestige and eminence surrounding lands. When merchants or pilgrims came to Chartres they would see this royal cathedral and great city associated with French monarchy and they could carry home the news about the French king’s wealthy and grand cathedral city.

The close connections kings formed due to their divine power and religious roles allowed them access to well-educated, literate clerics who could write about their lives. These writings ultimately had the ability to increase a king’s reputation, legitimacy, and legacy. During Louis VI’s rule, monarchical power desperately needed solidified and Suger’s writings reflect this need. He explains that his goal was to recount “with our pen his zealous care for the churches of God and his wonderful valor in administering affairs of the kingdom.” He clearly states that he is attempting to explain the good deeds of Louis which is why there are very few failures or mistakes recorded by Suger. Suger’s writings allowed St. Denis to become the “cornerstone of royal policy” and source “of that idea of the Christian monarch.” These are both vital concepts about the king which became intricately tied to the church through a Christian recording of Louis VI’s deeds. Philip Augustus also employed the use of these religious scholars when he commissioned Rigord de St. Denis and Guillaume le Breton to write about his deeds which glorified the French monarchy. As a result ideology and bias are rampant in the works. While they are biased, the works still reflect how these religious scholars were at the disposal of the French monarchs because of their relationship. Also it shows how these works could increase the monarchies power and importance.

**Influence over Church Appointments**

Influence over church appointments was another way in which French kings were able to consolidate more power over lands and within the church. Issues over investiture were not clear in France during the times of the Capetians and problems arose from time to time but they appear miniscule compared to the investiture problems of England and Germany. The issue over investiture was lessened by the fact that French kings, around the time of Louis VII’s rule, began to allow free elections to bishoprics and abbeys as long as they informed the king and waited for approval before taking their appointment. This eased some tensions over investiture, and also allowed a king’s influence in elections to grow as the monarchy’s power grew. The kings’ right to nominate and confirm the bishops to royal sees was a major aid to his increasing power since those bishops would swear loyalty to him. Yet, “detailed analysis of the witness lists to royal charters shows that bishops and lay magnates were gradually replaced by the king’s relatives and knights.” For example, in the *Deeds of Philip Augustus*, the archbishop of Rheims is Philip Augustus’ uncle. While there may not have always been direct appointments, the king’s support and consent of appointments increased the likelihood of him getting his candidates elected. This is supported by the fact that a minimum of six of fourteen bishops elected to royal sees from 1191-1200 had obvious connections to Philip Augustus. While these positions are not directly appointed by the king, the king’s influence and confirmations seem to have considerable impact on who was elected.

**Conflicts between King and Church**

Up to this point the relationship between the Capetian kings and the church seems quite amicable, a symbiotic relationship which benefited everyone; however, while the Capetians held religion in great esteem and benefited greatly from their theocratic rule and close relationship to the church, they were not immune to quarreling with the church. In fact, most of them had numerous disagreements with the
church over a multitude of issues; "the seamy side of this theocratic function was that it was always more or less exposed to ecclesiastical and especially papal attacks. Greatly strengthened by the monarchical measures, the uncomfortable fact remains that because of their largely ecclesiastical background they opened up the field to the intervention by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves."52 This idea explains why, despite interdependent relations controversy still developed. The King was able to use the church to increase his power, and in many cases, the church was willing to help, until the church or king wished to demonstrate control or disagreed with the other.

Issues over ecclesiastical appointments

Gregory VII in his "Dictate of the Pope" asserted "a right to nullify the obligations of subjects' fealty to "wicked men," an exclusive right to depose and reinstate bishops, and a right to go well beyond even the radical measure of excommunicating rulers by deposing emperors from their worldly station."53 Then in a letter from he wrote to Hermann of Metz in 1081, he explains the legitimacy of his harsh measures: "if any king... shall disregard this decree of ours and act contrary to it, he shall be deprived of his power and his office and shall learn that he stands condemned at the bar of God for the wrong that he has done."54 His ideas about increasing church supremacy would continue to grow and would lead to many controversies with monarchs and ecclesiastics grappling for ultimate power.

Examples of controversy can be drawn from almost every reign during the Capetians' time in power. Louis VI disagreed with the appointment of the archbishop of Reims by the Pope and refused to have his coronations at Reims as a result. He also forced the Bishop Stephen of Senlis to seek refuge with Cistercian monks, because Louis VI so vehemently disapproved of him.55 Louis VII clashed twice early on with the pope over elections. His first was a refusal to acknowledge the election to Langres. His second conflict over the Peter de la Chartre resulted in a papal interdict over all lands where the king resided.56 These examples from Louis VI and Louis VII show that these controversies were not always the pope rejecting royal actions, but sometimes the king rejecting the elected bishops. These rejections by the king show the monarchy's growing power. While they may not be supreme in the land, they felt secure enough to dismiss certain church actions. This shows how controversies in any respect to the church led to problems in all areas of the monarch–church relationship. These predicaments show how personal opinions and actions impacted the power kings were growing in religious areas such as ecclesiastical appointments.

Issues over Marriage

French kings seemed to suffer more from their personal issues than other problems. One of the recurring personal issues which negatively impacted the monarchical power was the abuse of marriage by Capetian kings, especially Philip I and Philip Augustus. Philip I was one of the early Capetian rulers who for many historians seemed to explicitly abuse the king's relationship to the church to the detriment of his rule, legacy, and memory. While some not that his impius character may be exaggerated, Philip did conflict with the church, most prominently in regard to what many believed to be a bigamous and incestuous marriage.57 The issue of Philip's marriage was that he repudiated his wife Bertha and took Bertrade, the wife of Fulk le Rechin, who was also his cousin. Philip's marriage debacle resulted in him being excommunicated in 1095, 1096, and 1099. The territories under Philip's control were also placed under interdict in 1097.58 This example reveals how relations between the church and monarch were not always easy and that conflicts easily arose when the church believed a king had overstepped his boundaries as monarch. His actions and personal life negatively affected the religious life throughout his realm and significantly decreased his Christ image and religious importance and influence.

Philip I's marriage issue already placed him in bad favor with the Pope, and this reputation carries over in many writings about Philip. Abbot Suger writes about the end of Philip I's reign in his Deeds of Louis the Fat. Partially to increase Louis VI's pious nature, Suger writes harshly regarding Philip saying, "He indulged himself too much and did not take care of either his kingdom or the health of his body..."59 He also calls him a criminal impious ruler, clearly showing how badly Suger believed Philip's actions fractured the church-monarch relationship. This may have been one of the reasons Suger and Louis Vitried to work so hard to reestablish the church-monarch relationship, and why they felt it was so important. Above one sees how this theocratic rule could help the French kings consolidate and grow their power, yet Philip I's predicament shows that
they risked these advancements by upsetting the balance of the relationship.

Philip Augustus reigned almost 100 years after Philip I; however he also disturbed the relationship between the monarchy and king with his marital issues during the late twelfth early thirteenth centuries. Philip Augustus was extremely concerned about having an heir and because of this he placed great significance on his marriages. His first wife died leaving him a sick son. Philip Augustus married Ingeborg, a Danish princess, yet he repudiated her the day after their wedding night. Ingeborg refused to leave, but this did not stop Philip from marrying again after receiving an annulment from a church council of his supporters. This complicated marriage issue created quite a rift in the French church and resulted in the Interdict of 1200 from Pope Innocent III stating: “Let all the churches be closed; let no one be admitted to them, except to baptize infants... We permit Mass to be celebrated once a week, on Friday, early in the morning, to consecrate the host for the use of the sick, but only one clerk is to be admitted to assist the priest.” The interdict also forbade burials in holy ground by the people. This interdict affected all peoples under Philip Augustus’ control, and John Baldwin explains that according to numerous French chronicles it caused a lot of suffering and displeasure. These Capetian rulers were consolidating land and establishing supremacy over more people, and their personal issues and decisions began to have more of an impact on those that they ruled.

Yet Philip Augustus’ dilemma shows another issue regarding church relations with the king. Discussed above is how the king was able to confirm elections, rally support for candidates, and also increase the number of supporters he had in ecclesiastical positions. This led to fracturing within the French church as certain bishops followed the interdict but others ignored it. Thirteen bishops remained loyal to the king despite the danger of suspension. Most of these were bishops with the closest ties to the king, such as familial relations, or those who occupied royal sees. In addition to these bishops, two monasteries, one of which was St. Denis, denied the papal interdict. This support from these ecclesiastics shows how Suger’s desire to create a strong king with close ties within the church was becoming more of a reality. Philip Augustus’ marriage issue showed how the king could conflict with the pope, yet not completely lose religious support or prestige. Philip Augustus had more centralized and concrete power than Philip I which allowed him not to be as tainted by his marriage issue. It also showed how conflicts hurt not only the relationship between church and state, but also within the church itself as ecclesiastical persons became more involved in politics through the king.

Conclusion

The French kings’ employment and belief in theocratic kingship allowed for close connections to form between the kings and the church. The fact that kings received power directly from God gave them special roles that ultimately stretched their political power into the religious realm. Most of the Capetian rulers took their religious roles seriously; they did not just use their connection to the church for political advancement but truly believed it was their responsibility and right to influence and rule within the church and to benefit from the power and influence of the church. However, these kings did not act on their own. Religious clergy members, such as Suger, realized how the church could help these kings and also benefit from the relationship. This connection unfortunately was also easily tested through controversies such as ecclesiastical appointments and irreligious marriages. These problems not only caused fractures between the king and church, but also within the church as certain ecclesiastics were more loyal to the theocratic king than the pope. Yet despite these controversies, the Capetian’s theocratic rule was truly a beneficial belief and practice. Their generally amicable relations with certain ecclesiastics and churches created the chance to gain territory, consolidate power, as well as increase their prominence and recognition in the secular realm.
Appendix

Figure 1a: Louis VII Royal Seal

Figure 1b: Louis VII Royal Seal "X"

Figure 2: (Royal Portal, Chartres Cathedral)
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STAGING RELIGION: 
LITURGICAL DRAMA IN THE CENTRAL MIDDLE AGES

Laura Kay

From our modern context, the word "drama" has a very different definition than it did in Medieval Europe. In an age of drastic social and religious development, the drama of the Medieval Church was immensely important. Developed from the liturgy itself, these music-dramas depicted important Biblical events and created another way in which the public could connect with the Divine. While some historians argue that Liturgical Drama arose out of ancient pagan traditions and customs, it is clear that this dramatic form was born in the Central Middle Ages as a direct response to the changing cultural and religious conditions. Staged in cathedrals, which were important urban centers of religion, these Liturgical Dramas provided medieval people with a visual representation and explanation of their faith and served as a model for the religious dramas that became popular in the Late Middle Ages.

At the center of these drastic changes of the Central Middle Ages was the Commercial Revolution, which, according to Lester Little, "had reverberations in virtually every institution, social group, geographical area, and nexus of ideas in Latin Christendom." As a direct result of these economic changes, notions of popular piety changed. André Vauchez describes the impact of intellectual change in his book, The Laity in the Middle Ages: "God is presented as the creator from whom everything originated but who has in some way moved away from his work, entrusting it to the laws which he had established to guide his operation." Essentially, these Christian intellectuals saw God as the object of knowledge and began to seek ways in which they could rediscover Christ's humanity and understand the history of salvation. As the laity sought to understand salvation, the clergy, in light of the profit economy, found it increasingly important to "return to the common people" in order to ensure their salvation. During this time, the lay people began to involve themselves more in the Christian religion, and as this urban religious life developed, the clergy began to seek new ways in which they could reach the common people.

Several themes were central to the Christian faith in the Middle Ages: salvation, redemption, the importance of sacraments, and the notion of an omnipotent God. According to Eamon Duffy, Christian ideals were heavily embedded in everyday life:

The Christian calendar determined the pattern of work and rest, fasting and feasting, and influenced even the privacies of the bedchamber, deciding the times of the year when men and women might or might not marry, when husbands and wives might sleep together or must abstain. Everyone, in principle at least, subscribed to the Christian creed. This taught that the world was not a random heap of blind circumstances, a cosmic accident, but that it was a meaningful whole, which had been created out of nothing by a good God.

In a time of increased intellectual activity and urban growth, Vauchez points out that "a new sensibility developed in the laity, making them more sensitive to the contradictions between the way of life of God's representatives—the clerics and monks—and the injunctions of the Gospels." Given these cultural developments, the Church began to seek new ways in which they could connect with the laity. In her book, Medieval English Drama, Katie Normington asserts that the Church began to use "public means to strengthen its position and promote locally based devotion," and central to this was the ceremony of the liturgy.

In order to understand Liturgical Drama, we must first understand the Christian Roman Liturgy itself. The Liturgy, the plan of public worship, was standardized in Rome and utilized in churches across Europe. The Mass itself was divided into five sections: The Preparation, The Oblation, The Consecration, The Communion, and The Dismissal. Each portion of the mass had specific movements,
words, and music. According to Karl Young, the Mass was essential because it came directly from Jesus’ teachings: the first Mass was performed by Christ at the Last Supper, and the Roman Liturgy followed Christ’s example. As the Liturgy became standardized throughout Europe, Normington asserts that it was essential in “promoting and reflecting the central belief systems of the Church.”

According to Young in his multi-volume work, *The Drama of the Medieval Church*, there are several aspects of the Roman Liturgy that are inherently theatrical. A large portion of the liturgy was dialogue-based, often times placing the congregation (or audience) as the second speaker. This is also apparent in the antiphonal singing of the two semichoruses. Additionally, many of the movement patterns and gestures made by the clergy were very presentational and performance-like. While the liturgy was not drama, its very nature served as the basis for the Liturgical Dramas that developed. Young asserts that the Mass had a celebratory, enthusiastic nature that naturally gave rise to more structured drama: “...in the Mass the celebrant as genuinely impersonates Christ as the tragic actor does the persons represented in the profane theatre.” Young is referring specifically to two liturgical ceremonies, the *Depositio* (The Burial of Christ), and the *Elevatio* (The Resurrection), which become very important in the development of Liturgical Drama.

Some historians contend that these dramas were simply an extension of pagan rituals, drawing connections between the festivals of the Medieval Church and ancient pagan rituals. For example, Rainer Warnecke asserts that the crucifixion draws specifically from a pagan model of the scapegoat ritual, and that medieval religious drama was “placed in non-clerical rituals that can be found in many different cultures.” However, despite a few outliers, most historians seem to agree that these dramas were something entirely separate from pagan rituals. Young is adamant in his assertion that Liturgical Drama was born in the Middle Ages, stating in his introduction, “The dramatic manifestations to be considered in these volumes were the independent creation and possession of the medieval Church in Western Europe.” Liturgical Drama, then, developed out of the Roman Liturgy, and it specifically intended to provide medieval people with a living, breathing representation of their faith. According to Pascal in his article, “The Origins of the Liturgical Drama of the Middle Ages,” these dramas were developed “from the desire to fortify and clarify the faith of the believers, by representing in a show what was otherwise abstract and remote.” Pascal builds upon Young’s ideas, explaining that these dramas developed out of the Canonical Office as “embellishments.” Therefore, these dramas could not possibly be anything but a “spontaneous new birth” that took place within the confines of the Church.

As emphasized by both Young and Pascal, the most important events depicted in Liturgical Drama had to do with either Christmas or Easter. Most dramas avoided depictions of the Passion because they were wary of portraying Christ’s suffering. By examining three dramatic texts, *The Shepherds*, *The Visit to the Sepulcher*, and *The Lament of Mary*, we can see how the clergy sought to depict Biblical events pertaining to the Nativity and the Resurrection, and how each play had a specific message that became apparent through its performance. In his work, *Medieval Church Music-Dramas*, Fletcher Collins compiles a complete repertory of Liturgical Drama, drawing from a variety of texts of each play to present the best possible version. Collins also provides English translations of the original Latin texts, along with a modern transcription of the music to which the play would have been set. Despite some of the woes associated with transcribing medieval music, Collins’ presentation of these plays provides an accurate depiction of the important themes present in each dramatic episode.

*The Shepherds*, a drama associated with the Nativity, was traditionally performed at the “beginning of Lauds, early Christmas morning,” and depicts an Archangel visiting the Shepherds, who then travel to the manger to see the Christ-Child. Collins presents the text from a Rouen Cathedral Manuscript, dating from the thirteenth century. The play begins with the Archangel appearing to the Shepherds, proclaiming, “Do not fear! For behold I bring you great joy which shall be to all people, for there is born to you today the Savior of the world, in the City of David, and this to you is a sign: shall find the child in swaddling clothes wrapped, and lying in a manger.” From this point, the joy and elation of the Shepherds is apparent as they look upon their new-born savior, and offer thanks to the Virgin Mary: “Praise to the birth by the Virgin!” Young describes the impact of this drama: “The action inevitably choses was the visit of the shepherds, the description of which forms the most conspicuous part of the only circumstantial account of Christ’s
birth given in the Gospels, that in the second chapter of St. Luke. Through this specific drama, the congregation is able to experience the excitement of Christ's birth and celebrate His glory by watching the Shepherds learn of His arrival.

Perhaps the most famous Liturgical Drama, *The Visit to the Sepulcher*, has a vast amount of adaptations. Collins has transcribed the St. Quentin version, which originated from the Abbey of Origny-Sainte-Benoite. In this drama, the Three Marys (Mary Magdalene and the Virgin Mary among them) visit the tomb of Christ, only to find it empty. Christ, disguised as a gardener, appears to Mary Magdalene and tells her to spread the news of His resurrection. The tone of this play is significantly different from *The Shepherds*: rather than beginning with a triumphant, angelic announcement, this drama begins with much lamenting: "Now slain, alas! O Shepherd, the sheep wander in misery! And the master having gone, confused are the disciples. And so we, in His absence, make moan very much." Here, similar to *The Shepherds*, travel becomes important as the three Marys travel to the sepulcher. What is interesting in this drama is the description of Jesus. He is described as "seemly, fair, and full of kindness," and "our true savior and dear love." The Marys encounter a merchant near the sepulcher, who sells them ointments to anoint Christ's body. His appearance seems to be particularly significant as he represents a large majority of the urban population in Medieval Europe. At first, the merchant is depicted as a greedy man, obsessed with money: "This fine ointment that you do cherish, five golden coins will make it all for you. Otherwise I just can't let it go, no, I can't." However, upon further interaction with the Marys, the merchant sees the importance of following Jesus Christ, and says in parting, "He has given to freely of His love. He has saved us from the torment of death in Hell." To an audience of merchants, this play would have been particularly significant, as it demonstrates the importance of following Jesus Christ rather than becoming obsessed with money. The next portion of the play focuses on Mary Magdalene and her personal suffering. Devastated by the loss of her Lord, Mary laments: "Woe is me! Your death plants grief deeply in my heart." At this moment, Christ appears to her as a gardener, telling her to rejoice, for he has risen. The rest of the drama takes on a more triumphant, joyful tone, much like in *The Shepherds*. Angels, Apostles, the Three Marys, and Christ rejoice in the resurrection, their words underscored by the Chorus singing joyfully "Alleluia!"

*The Lament of Mary*, a play associated with the Passion, precedes the events of *Visit to the Sepulcher*, though this drama is less famous. Translated from the Cividale Basilica version, this drama takes place at the cross on Good Friday. It is significant because it is less presentational and features a predominantly female cast. The play opens with Mary Magdalene turning to the congregation, crying "O brothers and sisters, where is my hope?" From the very beginning, the audience is invited to lament with Mary over the loss of Jesus Christ. As the drama progresses, Mary Magdalene, Mary Major, Mary Jacob (the Three Marys featured in *Visit to the Sepulcher*) and John comfort each other as they cope with the loss of their Lord. They consistently address either Christ on the cross or the congregation, making the spectators part of the lamentation. What is significant in this play is Mary Magdalene's role as a reformed sinner. Beating herself before the crucifix, she begs, "On this sinner, cast a glance, You who me have redeemed." Mary Major (The Virgin Mary) then says to her, "Who for all your sinning, he forgave you." This emphasis on sin remains the focal point throughout the rest of the drama. The play ends with a condemnation of the congregation, which solidifies this theme. Rather than depict Christ's personal suffering, the drama instead focuses on the suffering of those who loved Christ, and blatantly reminds the congregation that sinners who do not repent are responsible for Christ's death and deserve punishment. Mary Major turns on the congregation, the crucifix behind her, and proclaims, "O minds pernicious, and double-talkers, O witnesses sly, and false judges, old and young alike usually, though of greater crimes guilty, they require payment by hanging for sins!"

The manner in which these plays were performed was drastically different from our modern understanding of theatrical conventions. As previously mentioned, the term "theatre" cannot apply to Liturgical Drama. Thus, our modern perception of actors, costumes, and performance space are drastically different from what these words entailed in the Middle Ages. Today, an actor is someone who can effectively and convincingly become a character, an identity separate from his own personal self. In Liturgical Dramas, the roles were played by members of the clergy, and no attempt was made to delve into the psyches of the characters they were portraying. According to
Pascal, "the priests re-enact the central event of their religion; but acting meant for them something very different from its modern significance." Ogden explains in his book, *The Staging of Drama in the Medieval Church*, the difficulties associated with trying to understand the art of acting in the Middle Ages, claiming that "it is the least possible for the historian to capture." Despite these difficulties, Ogden, as well as other historians, have uncovered the basics: all roles in Liturgical Drama were sung by the male clergy, including female roles. The only exception was when a Cathedral had a chapter of canonesses, and even then, *Visit to the Sepulcher* was usually the only drama to be performed with women playing the three Marys. This indicates that these dramas were not meant to be forthright imitations of life, rather they were representations of dramatic episodes that were presentationally in nature. Pascal solidifies this idea, claiming, "Their aim was not mimicry and they did not employ realistic methods, for the function of ritual drama is not imitation, but the reawakening of belief and energy."

In Liturgical Dramas, costumes played an important function, though not the same function that modern costumes tend to do. In the modern concept of theatre, costumes are used to create characters; however, in these medieval Church dramas, costumes were used more symbolically. According to Ogden, there were three specific types of costumes: sacred and royal figures wore ecclesiastical vestments, other characters wore the clothing of daily life (for example, Christ dressed as the gardener in *Visit to the Sepulcher*), and special characters wore exotic costumes (such as angels, who were often equipped with wings). Ogden points out the importance of costumes: "If the production took place in a cathedral, we can be sure of a display of silks, satins, brocades, and the precious embroidery that constituted one of the finest crafts of the medieval world." This seems particularly significant, as the performers of these holy dramas incorporated the material culture that arose due to the societal changes of the Commercial Revolution. Collins, in a companion text to his translations of Liturgical Dramas, discusses the costumes in *Visit to the Sepulcher*, noting that the costumes in this particular drama tended to be more realistic than in other plays. He describes these costumes as contemporary to the time in which the drama was performed, with the only exception being Christ's costume. Rather than wear the clothes of a medieval gardener, he dressed in a long robe and bare feet, a more symbolic costume so that he may be readily identified as Christ.

Cathedrals as a performance space were pivotal to Liturgical Drama. According to Pascal, "the setting of these plays, or rather the various loci at which the different parts of the more developed plays were sung, were not constructed like a modern stage, with the object of showing an action to the people." The architecture of the cathedral made it an ideal space for these dramas, and the absence of fixed pews made it possible for the congregation to travel with the actors rather than act as a passive audience. Nomington discusses the importance of the cathedral in drama, explaining that as urban centers of religion, these churches represented the positive values of medieval society and created a vast amount of opportunities for liturgical drama to develop: "The complexity of the medieval Church space provided a vast arena in which dramatic celebrations and ritual could be enacted, and it appears as if the multi-faceted architectural space of the church influenced the types of dramas that were produced within medieval Churches." Moreover, the cruciform pattern of the Cathedral suggests an intertwining of Christ and the human body, which was an important concept in Liturgical Drama, as it sought to solidify and strengthen people's faith.

In his book, Ogden provides an in-depth analysis of the Cathedral as a performance space, using *Visit to the Sepulcher* as his primary example. He explains that the placement of the most important set piece, the tomb itself, dictated how the cathedral would be used for this particular drama. Though the placement varied, "as of the late eleventh or early twelfth century, we also find the placement of the action in the nave, and in several works...the whole interior is incorporated in the play, just as the entirety of the church was used in the processions and stations of worship." Another important aspect of the cathedral as a performance space, was the availability of material wealth and visual reinforcement. Stained glass windows and sculptures depicting important religious events and figures could have reinforced the dramas being acted in the cathedral, and the presence of Holy Relics added yet another layer of connection to the Divine.

Liturgical Drama served a very important function in Medieval Europe: according to Theresa Mason, these dramas "transformed existing worship and art forms from their culture and traditions to bring a fresh, vital interpretation to
worship. Essentially, these dramas created a new way in which the urban laity could connect with their faith. By bringing to life these important Biblical events, the Church was able to strengthen the common people's connection to God. Most importantly, these dramas "contemporized" themes of salvation, redemption, and faith, making it easier for the laity to understand their importance. In her book Sacred Players, Heather Hill-Vásquez claims that medieval religious dramas were immensely influential in "making contemporary the events of salvation history enacted throughout the pageant and implicating its audience as participants in those events." However, it is important to note that these dramas were still very presentational and formal. Pascal notes that it was not until after the twelfth century that "humorous, realistic elements enter." Because these dramas created another opportunity for the expression of the Christian faith, they eventually became secularized, which marks an important societal shift.

E.K. Chambers describes this secularization of Liturgical Drama in his book, The Medieval Stage: "From ecclesiastical the drama had become popular. Out of the hands of the clergy in their naves and choirs, it had passed to those of the laity in their market-places and guild-halls." As Liturgical Drama began to pass into the hands of the laity, Easter became increasingly important, and Passion Plays began to develop. This, according to Chambers, marks an important transition, due to the fact that Liturgical Drama abstained from dramatic representations of the Passion. One of the most important developments was the York Mystery Cycle, which in many ways solidified these cultural changes. As these Mystery Plays gained popularity in the Late Middle Ages, the clergy had a negative reaction, which is the major reason that these plays were no longer performed in Churches:

The writers upon Mystery Plays agree with great unanimity that the plays were driven out of churches by the disapproval of the higher clergy. It is stated that the introduction of lay actors, of the vernacular speech, and above all, of burlesque and comic episodes, scandalized the devout and provoked the prohibitions of popes and councils.

Additionally, as commercial interests grew, Mystery Plays, generally performed on portable stages in urban areas, became closely associated with religious festivals and feast days. For these reasons, the subject matter of the York Mystery Cycle, while still focused on Biblical episodes, became drastically different from Liturgical Drama.

Each play in the York Mystery Cycle is named for a profession, such as The Cardmakers, The Fullers, The Masons, The Goldsmiths, and so on. Where Liturgical Drama strove to recreate important Biblical events, the Mystery Plays adapted these events into modern cultural contexts. Rather than representing the mindset of the clergy, these plays represented the mindset of the common people, and did not possess the formality of Liturgical Drama. In The Wymedrawers, the same Biblical event is depicted as in Visit to the Sepulcher. Mary Magdalene, sick with woe, is met by Jesus Christ, who is disguised as a commoner. In this text, the language is much less formal, and seems far less presentational. When Christ appears to Mary Magdalene, they are alone, making the scene much more intimate. He says to her, "Come near me not, my love; let be, Mary, my daughter sweet, to my Father in Trinity because I rise not yet." What is also important to note in this text is the talk of Christ's suffering. In the plays preceding this one, the entire Passion is presented, including a confrontation between Christ and Satan, as well as plays featuring Judas Iscariot and Pontius Pilate. In The Wymedrawers, Mary notices how "thy wounds have made thy body wet with blood," which is drastically different from Visit to the Sepulcher, which makes no mention of physical harm to Christ's body.

In order to adapt to the ever-evolving social, political, and religious climate of the Central Middle Ages, the Church developed a new means in which they could guide the common people toward salvation. Liturgical Drama provided the public with a tangible way to access their faith: with the cathedral as a backdrop, the laity was able to connect on a more personal level to different Biblical events. The development of these dramas indicates an important change in the Church and its practices, and demonstrates one of the many ways the clergy sought to maintain the people's faith in the period following the Commercial Revolution. It is clear that these religious plays arose from Liturgical practices, and eventually paved the way for different types of religious drama that became popular in the Late Middle Ages. As popular piety changed these Liturgical Dramas gave birth to more secularized forms of drama, ones that were controlled and performed by the common people, rather than the clergy.
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Intertwined Secular and Ecclesiastic Kings: Abbot Suger and His Connection to the French Royal Family as seen through the Artwork of Saint-Denis.

Kelsey Mazur

Abbot Suger was an important figure in medieval France. As well as being an abbot for the prominent French church of Saint-Denis, Suger was intimately connected to the ruling Capetian family. He served as regent for the future King Louis VII during the crusades and had a political relationship with the Capetian King Louis VI. It was this political relationship with the Capetians that Suger used to accomplish his ecclesiastical goals, particularly the reconstruction of the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis. Saint-Denis was reconstructed in the mid-twelfth century, 1135-1144, and became one of the first examples of Gothic art and architecture in the medieval world. While it was reconstructed mainly for the purpose of veneration God through the anagogical concept of light as well as for the ease of viewing the relics housed in Saint-Denis, many examples of kingship and power are just as prevalent in the structure. These examples of Kingship demonstrate the mutual relationship between the ecclesiastical world and the secular spheres. Not only are there multiple examples of Christ in Majesty and religious depictions of power, there are also many examples of power and kingship in connection to the growing power of the Capetian monarchy in France. Through examining Suger’s relationship with the Capets, as well as the crusading windows found in the chevet, king statues from the portals, and the tombs of Saint-Denis basilica, the theme of secular kingship can be explained in accordance to Christ’s images of kingship in the Abbey-Church of Saint-Denis.

While it is evident from Suger’s writing that his primary goal was “not to incorporate the philosophy of Pseudo-Dionysius into religious art, but to maintain claims of contemporaneity amid controversy over monastic life while at the same time pursuing a program of artistic luxury,” it seems Suger sought to incorporate his own experiences and ideas regarding secular and spiritual kingship into the architecture and artwork of Saint-Denis. In doing so, Suger created a new type of art that intertwined the two images of power, secular and ecclesiastic, into one coherent entity, much like the new gothic architecture that was pioneered at the church of Saint-Denis. Although it is impossible to separate Suger from his ecclesiastical roles, it is still possible to examine Saint-Denis from another perspective.

Abbot Suger was first and foremost an ecclesiastic clergyman. Suger was ten years old when he was given to the Abbey Church of Saint-Denis as a child-oblate in the late-eleventh century. While he was raised and schooled in the abbey, it was not until 1122 that he became the abbot. Prior to this accomplishment, Suger portrayed himself as a strong administrator and military leader “who defended with success his king's and his monastery’s possessions against some rapacious feudatories of the land.” Suger wrote a great deal, most notably on the deeds of Louis VI and on the reconstruction of Saint-Denis. As far as Saint-Denis is concerned, Suger recorded the plans for reconstruction, both administratively and religiously. For example, Suger mentioned in his De Administratione that the increase in revenue prompted “the memorable construction of buildings, so that by this thanks might be given to Almighty God by us as well as our successors.” In this one sentence, Suger recognized both the economic side of the reconstruction of the church, yet also identified the main purpose as being for the veneration of God and not economic benefit. In this sense, Suger exemplifies both religious importance as well as a secular understanding in one excerpt of his writing. He successfully represents himself as an ecclesiastic dabbling in the political realm.

As a political figure, not an ecclesiastic power,
Suger oversaw the events and activities of the abbey. There are quite a few correspondences between Suger and others, such as charters and personal letters. When he was elected abbot in 1122, "Suger brought to his office not only a boyhood friendship with King Louis VI and substantial adult experience as a royal emissary to Rome but a tireless energy in promoting both Saint-Denis and the Capetian house." Apart from his writings on Saint-Denis, Suger also wrote a glorified account of The Deeds of Louis the Fat, which again reinforced his relationship with the monarchy. It should be noted that Louis VI was "Suger's friend and lived on good terms with the clergy." Therefore, Suger glorified and justified the king's actions due to Louis' positive relationship with the church. Moreover, most of Suger's experience in the secular and political world revolved around the Capetians. His relationship with the ruling family influenced and helped to create Suger's views about power and kingship, which will be discussed and demonstrated later in association with the church of Saint-Denis.

As a secular and political entity, Suger also functioned as a military leader while the king was away on crusade. This was not a responsibility of an abbot, but was a responsibility he took quite seriously. Suger's first interaction with the French monarchy was in 1118 and his position was solidified when he became a member of the familia regis, or royal entourage in 1124. From then on, Suger was an important part of the monarchy, serving as advisor to the kings, that some modern historians even note that: "because he served both Louis VI and Louis VII, Suger represents an element of continuity... He was directly involved in the transformation of royal government from an undisciplined and informal system of rule...to one based on structures and well-defined principles." Because of his continuous presence, Suger became an important ecclesiastic facet of the monarchy. It was this presence and continuous influence that lead to the incorporation of kingship in the reconstruction of Saint-Denis.

An example of his military role came in 1147 when there was talk of crusade. Although Suger found the crusade to be unwise, he still supported it because of its importance to the power of the king and "accepted its inevitability, and worked hard for its success." Suger supported the monarchy no matter what. When Louis VII left on crusade, he left the monarchy in the hands of Suger who ruled in both the "spiritual and temporal spheres." Although this is after the consecration of the renovated Saint-Denis, it demonstrates a consistency of loyalty to the monarchy as well Sugers' placement of the secular power and that of the ecclesiastical power of the Pope on equal footing indicating their mutual dependency and importance. There is also evidence of this interconnected relationship between the secular and ecclesiastical worlds in his record on The Deeds of Louis the Fat. Although Suger records Louis's deeds and accomplishments, he does so carefully and purposefully, recording everything in the best possible light. For example, when Louis laid siege on a church in which a rogue nobleman took refuge, Suger records the events as Louis protecting the church from evildoers. Suger even ends the entry with a positive nod towards Louis, who sent these naughty rebels to "[carry] off their miserable souls in sorrow to hell." Through doing so, it is arguable that Suger sought to justify the actions of the king, perhaps for his own benefit in the eyes of the Capetians, or for the benefit of the monarchy in the eyes of those who read these records. Either way, it clearly demonstrates the relationship between Suger's ecclesiastical world and Louis' secular world.

This theme of a king ruling over both spheres in society is also reflected through the glorified account of Louis VI in The Deeds of Louis the Fat as well as Suger's other works. Scholars have also noted this intertwining of the secular and ecclesiastical through the three aspects of kingship in Suger's Deeds: (1) the king as administrator of the kingdom; (2) the king as a figure with special religious associations or attributes; and (3) the king as protector of the churches and of the 'poor.' Perhaps it is these three aspects that are best represented in Saint-Denis since this is how Suger depicts the ideal ruler. These different aspects of kingship are integral to understanding the expectations of kings of the time and how they were represented in society. Medieval Kings were expected to exemplify these qualities, as seen in The Deeds and the way in which Suger portrays the king. This can be taken a step further to explain what Suger expected from God and other rulers. This is all seen in the reconstruction of Saint-Denis, discussed later.

In connection to the monarchy, Suger paints Louis VI or Louis the Fat as a ruler of both the secular and ecclesiastical worlds. When he was crowned king, Louis was not simply the king of the physical land; he became king reigning over
all aspects of his realm. Suger writes: "He took from him the sword of secular knighthood, girded him the ecclesiastical sword for the punishment of evildoers, and joyfully crowned him with the diadem of the kingdom."¹⁷ This represents the king as having power over all spheres as well as the clear relationship between the secular and ecclesiastic realms and therefore demonstrates the importance Suger sees in the growing monarchy. The idea of an ideal 'king' is reflected both secularly and religiously through the iconography of kings in Saint-Denis.

Suger did not miss the chance to depict the king as a defender of the state either in addition to his role as defender of the church. Though not in icons of artistic depictions, Suger's writing still aids in understanding the role of kings in the mid-twelfth century. Suger wrote, "with Homeric flourish, calls the rolls of the 'battles' which King Louis VI mustered in the plains of Rheims in 1124, when the Emperor Henry V was threatening to invade France."¹⁸ King Louis VI was quick to defend Rheims when the country was in danger. This is similar to the crusading mindset of the time, as well as reflects the different aspects Suger expects a king to possess. Not only does he protect the kingdom, he protects the churches and is given a special place within the church, as could be seen with Louis VI's coronation as king,¹⁹ in which he is given power over the land and the ecclesiastic sphere. In accordance with the three facets of kingship exemplified by Louis VI in The Deeds of Louis the Fat, the depictions of kings in the Church of Saint-Denis follow the same formulaic structure.

Through the interplay of secular and sacred, Suger, and ultimately Saint-Denis, "became the cornerstone of royal policy and the fountainhead of that idea of the Christian monarchy which established Capetian ascendancy throughout France."²⁰ It is not only through The Deeds of Louis the Fat that Suger's connections to the monarchy can be seen. It is also important to examine the connection of Suger to the secular world as abbot as well as other ecclesiastics of the time and their own connection to the secular world.

Suger was not the only one writing in the twelfth century, and certainly not the only one writing on the topics he covered. Other contemporary authors, mainly Hugh of Saint-Victor, confronted similar issues of kingship and power in his Didascalicon and various writings on love.²¹ Both of these examples dealt with the idea of a secular world outside the ecclesiastical sphere in which he wrote. This separation between the two spheres is markedly different from that of Suger, who clearly finds the two interdependent and inseparable. Hugh still represents another mind contemplating the same issues, and should therefore be studied in accordance with kingship and Suger.

Hugh of Saint-Victor was a contemporary of Abbot Suger, writing during the early twelfth century. Very little is known about Hugh. There are few glimpses into his life that can be found in the Didascalicon; he references living abroad, a love of learning, and a connection to a particular Augustinian priory.²² Other than that, his life is open to interpretation. Due to the fact that he was writing and because of the topic he writes about, he was obviously an ecclesiastic clergyman, much like Suger, since the only literate and educated people were typically ecclesiastics.

Also similar to Abbot Suger, Hugh of Saint-Victor wrote on art. Suger saw art as a way to venerate God. In Suger's De Administratione, he writes that "we applied to the perfection of so sacred an ornament [the Golden Crucifix] not only these [hyacinths, sapphires, rubies, emeralds, topazes] but also a great and expensive supply of other gems and large pearls."²³ To Suger, art was meant to embellish and enhance the veneration of God. This view contrasted Hugh of Saint-Victor. In his view, art came to represent something else in its entirety. He writes that when an image is imprinted upon another material, "which itself is one thing, begins to represent a different thing, not just on the outside, but from its own power and natural aptitude to do so."²⁴ Through this statement, Hugh discusses the importance of art and images. He did not view art as important or even necessary in churches. To Hugh, art was an extravagant luxury that did not belong in a church. This perspective can be applied to the idea of images in churches. Much like the images of kingship in Saint-Denis' art, they can become representations of an idea which is communicable to the viewers—the worshippers and pilgrims. Hugh's musing on art supports the images that promote kingship found in Saint-Denis.

Although Suger and Hugh of Saint-Victor disagreed on the role art should play within a church, their perspectives on kingship and power were quite similar. Hugh of Saint-Victor discusses how man is like God: "Now there are two things which restore the divine likeness in man, namely the contemplation of truth and the practice of virtue."²⁵ This mirrors man's identification with the divine
in Suger's *Deeds of Louis the Fat*. Louis is like God in that he protects the church and the poor as well as his kingdom. In this sense, Louis is acting in divine likeness to God because he is practicing virtuous deeds. Suger was obviously not the only person contemplating the idea of kingship and power therein. The mere fact that Hugh was also discussing these topics in his work demonstrates that the idea of kingship and power were important topics even in other ecclesiastical communities. In addition, even though Hugh of Saint-Victor described these two spheres separately, that the two worlds of secular and ecclesiastical were very much intertwined when portrayed in Suger's work.

Much like Bernard of Clairvaux, who disagreed with the elaborate decadence of the reconstructed Saint-Denis, Hugh of Saint-Victor's *The Praise of the Bridegroom* addresses the idea of physical things demonstrating a deeper meaning. For example, the desire for physical things is not necessary; this desire can be dealt with through sufficiency and, in some cases, austerity. Hugh states, "Desire runs from the world, when having seen the work of God outwardly changes itself inwardly through wonder and praise to be more ardent toward him." Although Hugh and Bernard disagreed with the art Suger chose to include in the church of Saint-Denis, they all view kingship in the same way, as seen through their writing. The difference in opinion may perhaps stem from the differences in the monastic orders. The disagreement over the role of art in a church does not change the fact that the iconography of kingship, such as a crown or a throne, appear in churches alongside Christ in Majesty or other religious images of power.

Since Suger held both secular and monastic roles in his lifetime, this is consequently mirrored in the artistic depictions he helped design for Saint-Denis. Although it functioned primarily as a prominent church on a pilgrimage route, the church of Saint-Denis was still a place for secular images of kingship to be intentionally displayed and incorporated. Much like Suger's ideas of kingship, protecting the church, perhaps the images of kingship and power on the church helped communicate this idea of protection. The images of kings may also have been used to communicate their power alongside the power of Christ, as Suger viewed them. Whatever the reason, images of kings still appear repeatedly around the Church of Saint-Denis. It is difficult to identify the exact motives and Suger's intentions behind each image, leaving the modern viewer to speculate, in an attempt to understand the images through the remaining context of Suger's writing. In this sense, the written word and the image must be reconciled, much like the relationship between the church and the state.

Because of the prominence of illiteracy in the medieval population, visual iconography and images played a vital role in societal comprehension of ideas, especially those of the ecclesiastical world and Christianity. There was a simple reason for all of the artwork that appeared in the church: to communicate the lessons and stories to the illiterate members of the community. As Hugh of Saint-Victor writes: "In the same way that an illiterate who may look at an open book see figures [but] does not understand the letters, so the foolish and carnal man who does not perceive those things which are of God..." This identification and purpose of artwork in the church to act as a visual narrative to the illiterate populace, was deliberately thought out by Suger in his intricate stained glass windows. Suger's main concern with the windows "was saturating the church with imagery and the visual effect of the imagery." By introducing the crusading windows in tandem with the physical tombs of past powerful kings and other images of kings alongside biblical stories and lessons found in the stained glass, he communicates the importance of both the secular and ecclesiastical worlds to the illiterate viewer.

Since the artist or architect creates an image "not by reproducing what he sees in the visible world, but rather by producing what he intuitively 'knows' about the transcendental realm." Then, intuitively, the artist is rendering how he views kings, kingship, and power. The artist is recording this in the stained glass and other mediums to communicate this idea to the illiterate populous viewing the art.

Because "the primary doctrinal justification of art within the church was to teach the illiterate," these elements of kingship Suger wrote about are visually communicated to a larger audience in Saint-Denis. The aspects of kingship that Suger focuses on grew out of his political relationship with the Capets, mainly Louis VI, since Suger portrayed him as exemplifying all of them. Suger and the reconstruction of Saint-Denis, and therefore, conveys a message of kingship to the illiterate worshippers and pilgrims visiting the church.

The three elements of kingship—as administrator, association with the church, and protector of people and church—can all be seen through the artwork and architecture of Saint-Denis,
not just through the writing of Abbot Suger. All of the ideals and interpretations of kingship can be found in the countless sculptures of kings on the portal, as well as stained glass windows in the chevet, such as the Crusading Window, the tombs of Merovingian, Carolingian, and Capetian kings in the basilica of Saint-Denis, and even the depictions of Christ in Majesty in stained glass windows.

Kingship is an idea that was actively discussed and considered in both ecclesiastical and secular settings. One place where these ideas were most identifiable is in the portals, the windows, and the tombs of the church of Saint-Denis. "During a period beginning in 1771 and lasting through the French Revolution, there was considerable damage done to the sculptural monuments at the Abbey." Because these sculptures on the portals of Saint-Denis represented kings and a strong sense of kingship stemming from the middle ages, they were destroyed during the revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century because of the populace's frustration with the monarchy. The remaining images of kings that were saved and salvaged obviously represented kingship in a strong way. While churches conveyed a strong message for the viewer of ecclesiastic persuasion and religiousness, messages and symbols of kingship are additionally emphasized and present (see figure 1). Images of kingship are not only found on these decapitated statues, but in the Crusading windows and tombs as well.

Most of the original glass in the Crusading Window from the radiating chapels is no longer extant. However, there are sources referring to stained glass windows depicting Charlemagne's pilgrimage East as well as the First Crusade. Since churches were a main focal point of the community, the depictions of Charlemagne and the First Crusade on a church would communicate the idea of secular power alongside the spiritual power of God to the illiterate populous. These panels, or the Pitcairn Windows, show the cause and effect of the Crusade and perhaps the Chanson de Roland's expedition to Spain (see figure 2). Though no longer extant, these windows can be discovered through other sources and nineteenth century drawings. The fourteen supposed stained glass windows were originally in pairs. It is suggested that these medallions followed "a logical historical sequence in ascending fashion and portrayed, in progression from left to right, effort and its reward." This is only necessary because; the reward is usually depicted by a crown or other form of veneration.

The crown and palms signified martyrs, or people who died fighting for God. Therefore, these martyrs represented a Christian ideal as well as a person who had fervently fought under their king for God. In this way, the Crusading Windows at Saint-Denis represent Suger's secular and religious ideas of kingship and the interconnected relationship between the two worlds. Martyrdom and ascension to heaven is depicted as a kingly crown in the case of these martyrs (see figure 5). For the medieval viewer, perhaps this connection could have been made; a king was akin to a martyr. These windows show the influence the king had on Saint-Denis and the connection to power Suger wished to garner with the people.

Another way in which Suger connected kingship to the church of Saint-Denis was continuing the tradition of 'Necropolis of France' in the basilica of the church. Since the first church was built on the original site of the Dagobert I's Merovingian church, Suger and future abbots continued the already established tradition of burying the kings, queens, and important nobility in the church. Currently, forty-three kings, thirty-two queens, sixty-three princes and princesses, as well as other servants to the kingdom of France are buried throughout the basilica and crypt. An image of the deceased was carved on top of the tomb, signifying who was buried there. This also served as a visual reminder of the king in accordance with the visual images of Christ throughout the church (see figure 4). By burying these physical symbols of the French monarchy so close to the visual symbols of God's power, kingship and faith became even more interrelated. Although Suger did not add this feature to the church, he certainly continued it. Even in the mid-thirteenth century during the next set of renovations to the church, several tombs were moved to reinforce the genealogies of the Carolingians and Capetians. Through the movement to reinforce genealogies, the church exemplifies the importance of the monarchy to the people and even to the church itself. There would not have been a need to move these tombs if the kings did not matter to the worshippers of Saint-Denis.

In the religious side of the stained glass, there are quite a few depictions of Christ as king. These images portray similar traits to the other images of secular kings that are found in Saint-Denis. In the so-called Anagogical Window or the Saint-
Paul Window, Christ is seen between Ecclesia and Synagoga and wearing a crown that is similar to the crowns worn by the aforementioned French kings on the tombs and the statue heads from the portals (see figure 5). Christ is also seen depicted similarly to kings and associated with kingship in other various parts of the cathedral. In the infancy window of the chevet, Christ is depicted sitting on a throne with attendants around him in the "Boy Jesus in the Temple" panel (see figure 6). It is significant to note that although Christ is in a temple, he is still depicted similar to a king. This parallels nicely to kingship having a place within the church, as seen with Saint-Denis. Abbot Suger would have felt comfortable showing Christ as a king due to his association with the Capetians and the way in which he depicts the secular kings within Saint-Denis.

The depictions of kingship in the secular world, as seen through the statues, the tombs, and the Crusading window, when compared to the images of Christ enthroned with the iconography of a king, can be understood as a popular theme in the twelfth century and especially in the reconstruction of Saint-Denis. Due to all the different examples of kingship found therein, it is clear to see the connection the church, and more specifically, Abbot Suger, had with the monarchy. This influence can be attributed to Abbot Suger due to his influence and dual role within the Capetian ruling family and the ecclesiastical role at Saint-Denis. His interplay between the secular and the spiritual spheres allowed for the renovations of Saint-Denis in the 1140s to reflect the influence of secular powers on the iconography and depictions of kings in the church.
Figure 1: Head of so-called “Childebert” as representation of a king at Saint-Denis from the west portals. Source: Data from Marvin Chauncey Ross, “Monumental Sculptures from St.-Denis: An Identification of Fragments from the Portal” in The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery, Vol. 3, (1940), 92. Found at http://www.jstor.org/stable/20168744.


Figure 4: The north transept where many tombs are placed. Source: Data from Mary Ann Sullivan, "Introduction to the Basilica or Cathedral of St. Denis, environs of Paris," Bluffton University, http://www.bluffton.edu/~sullivanm/france/paris/stdenis/stdenistombs.html (accessed 25 November 2011).

Figure 5: Christ as King in the Anagogical Window of Saint-Denis. Source: Data from Alison Stones, "Images of Medieval Art and Architecture: France: Benedictine Abbey Church of Saint-Denis," University of Pittsburgh, http://www.medart.pitt.edu/image/france/st-denis/windows/Anagogical/StDenAnag.html (accessed 24 November 2011).
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Effa Manley: A Portrait of Gender and Racial Equality

Meghan McLaughlin

As the first woman inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame, Effa Manley undoubtedly made significant contributions to organized baseball during her career. These are not, however, the only contributions to society for which Effa is responsible. Throughout her adult life, Effa fought for civil rights while also standing as a symbol of female empowerment and gender equality. As the general manager of the Newark Eagles, Effa is remembered for her actions and words as she fought against color and gender barriers of the 1930s and 1940s. An outspoken woman in a “gentlemen’s game,” Effa did not go unnoticed. The waves that she made as a woman and as a representative for the black community were revolutionary for the time period. Her belief in equality was demonstrated through her actions with the players she managed as she attempted to uplift black baseball through their success. She further demonstrated this belief through her actions with the Newark community as a prominent activist for the progress of African-Americans in this New Jersey city. Finally, Effa also demonstrated her belief in equality through her relationship with the overall organization of baseball as she struggled against Branch Rickey’s unfair practices. These actions that were meant to further racial progress were accompanied by Effa’s overarching ability to be a symbol of female empowerment. Throughout her life and career as the general manager of the Newark Eagles, Effa contributed to the progress for gender equality and women’s empowerment in a male-dominated society; these contributions were an important addition to the progress Effa made as she aspired for racial equality and civil rights, which she demonstrated through her actions with the Eagles players, the Newark community, and the entirety of organized baseball.

As Effa worked toward full equality for blacks and whites, she also constantly supported the progress toward equality for men and women by fulfilling a role that was typically held by men. As a general manager and partner with her husband, Effa was alone as a woman in her ground-breaking job as an executive in baseball. Despite the fact that Effa was incredibly outnumbered in her position as a female baseball team official, she still made significant strides towards her goals and did not face many strong challenges from her fellow Negro League executives. Effa attended meetings and helped her husband in the decision-making process for the Eagles. She was responsible for the day-to-day business of the Newark team, which meant that she “was responsible for the schedule, travel, publicity, advertising, purchasing, concessions, negotiating player contracts, ballpark operations, marketing and ticket sales, as well as the... community relations programs.” In every way, she was as effective a leader as her husband, and to some people, even more effective. Her success as a female executive did bring about resentment among the other Negro League owners; they were not accustomed to a female in such a male-dominated business. Manley was the “No. 1 thorn in the vulnerable sides of the other owners, simply because she [was] a woman with ideas and aggressiveness.” Effa faced complaints from other owners at first, as they claimed that baseball was not the place for a woman to be operating, as made public by Dan Burley in a 1942 Amsterdam New York Star-News article. The owners resented Manley because of her skill as a woman and her lack of fear for speaking up for something that she wanted.

This resentment from the other Negro League owners because of Effa’s gender did not bring about much of a challenge for her as she represented the Eagles. The other owners may have been annoyed at her presence, but they did recognize her ability as an executive and knew that she had the capacity to run a baseball team, as indicated by the Eagles’ success in Newark. In 1943, Manley was afforded the responsibility of overseeing the charity games played for the Army and the Navy relief funds. The fact that this difficult and important task was placed in Effa’s “capable, feminine hands” shows that the other owners felt that she could handle
it. It was proof that they were ready to trust her with an important job for the entire league. Her ability as a baseball executive prevented any gender discrimination from the other league owners. Effa herself did not feel that she was prejudiced against as a woman and that her biggest problem was the uneasiness at the first meetings. In an interview with John Holway, Effa commented directly on her relationship with the other owners:

Were the other owners prejudiced against a woman? Oh no. In fact, Abe took me to all the meetings, of course. The first one or two meetings they felt a little bit annoyed. One day the phone rang and it was Cum Posey of the Grays apologizing for using profane words at one of the meetings... Anyway, they finally opened up and were just wonderful to me.7

Because of the effectiveness and skill that Effa possessed as a baseball official, she was able to overcome resentment from the other owners. She worked toward her goals despite any feelings of prejudice that she may have faced because of her gender. In this way, she stood as a symbol of female empowerment for women across the nation.

Effa also contributed to equal gender relations because of her partnership with her husband in a completely male-dominated field. In the 1930s and 1940s, the common place for a woman was in the home, to take care of the children and keep the house clean for her husband. According to journalist Connie Woodward, Effa was "a good role model because she was successful at her business and she inspired young women to go into a business of being affiliated with a business that was male-oriented... A woman's place was in the home."8 Effa broke the gender stereotype through her career choice and through her success in that career. She was inspiration for women as she defied gender norms and worked as an equal partner with her husband. Effa's relationship with her husband, Abe, served as an example of her belief in equal rights for all; their partnership was a paradigm for equality during a time when relationships were very much dominated by men. They had their respective roles and knew not to overstep any boundaries. Effa realized that she and Abe were equals: "Abe and I had a magnificent partnership. He got the club together and I took care of the business details. It was a perfect partnership. I never interfered in the way he ran the club, except once."9 Their "magnificent" and "perfect" collaboration was one of constant support for one another. Effa often looked to Abe for encouragement, and she was quick to give him credit when he deserved it. His support of his wife gave her the confidence she needed to make her own decisions and be a truly effective leader over the years.10 The mutual support and reinforcement that Abe and Effa found in each other as business partners and as husband and wife was a rare quality for the 1930s and 1940s. Their relationship is an illustration of Effa's foundation of a belief in equal rights to all citizens.

Effa's belief in equality for all people influenced her actions not just as a woman, but also as a supporter of African Americans and black baseball. Her relationship with the Eagles players that she managed demonstrated her desire to uplift black baseball and bring about racial equality. To her players, Effa was a matriarch who forced the men to present themselves well through their dress and actions outside of the ballpark; she wanted them to successfully represent the entire African-American race while giving Newark a team that would make the Newark community proud. According to player Max Manning, "...in Newark, you always dressed properly. She didn't want to see you sloppy. If your shoes were muddy, she'd remark about it."11 Effa expected the players to dress well and also to behave well off of the field. To her, they were always representatives of the Newark team, during a game or not. She and Abe both advised the players on their behavior, warning against too much drinking, gambling, and carousing.12 Effa held Newark's fans to the same standards, enforcing rules and regulations to keep the stands orderly and respectable. The stands at Ruppert Stadium were patrolled by policemen who were responsible for keeping order and preventing violence from breaking out. Fans were also kept in line by Effa's own undercover security force: "So I personally hired some men on the side [the fans] didn't know about, who worked in the taverns."13 Effa believed that if the black fans and players presented themselves well in public, they would directly affect their status as American citizens: "She wanted them to present their race properly and held them to high standards: they were to dress well, pay their bills, and live respectably..."14 As a race, the African Americans would be socially uplifted and respected, which was a major goal for Effa as she managed the Eagles.
Effa’s relationship with her players also demonstrated her desire to uplift black baseball in other ways. Effa served as a surrogate parent for many of the players, especially those who were younger. In this way, she showed how much she cared for each of them and how much she wanted them to succeed as young African-American baseball players. The Manleys treated their players like family, and more often than not, Effa acted as a mother: “...[her relationships] were a mix of formality and personal concern that reached the category of ‘mother hen’ behavior with some.”

Effa felt personally responsible for the success of many of her players as indicated by letters she wrote to parents and money that she lent to several of them. She corresponded with Larry Doby, Don Newcombe, and Jimmie Hill in letters that show her parental nature for these young men. To Jimmie Hill, she wrote, “I have been more than an employer to you, as you well know...I have come to the conclusion that I have pampered and petted you entirely too much...I expect you to get yourself together, and start showing some signs of good sense.”

Effa was not hesitant to bluntly tell her players what she expected of them in order to make them better players and better public figures. She wanted them to be the best that they could be in all ways so that public opinion of the team would remain high and respectful.

In addition to treating the players like family, Effa constantly worked for better accommodations for them as they traveled and she was always willing to financially help the players. When Monte Irvin was short for a down payment on a house, he borrowed two or three thousand dollars from the Manleys. Effa also provided the Eagles with a $15,000 Flexible Clipper bus, something that had never before been used by a Negro League team. She wanted her players to be comfortable and satisfied. If they were happy on the team, they were more likely to be successful as baseball players, and more likely to stand as symbols for racial equality. Effa understood the value of her players’ satisfaction in the overall outcome of the games: “Without [satisfaction], you’ve just got a guy in a uniform. Our players actually enjoyed what they were doing.”

This satisfaction was the foundation of the Eagles’ success and was due in large part to the actions of Effa Manley as she strove for equality among blacks and whites.

Effa’s strong beliefs in civil rights shone forth in her involvement with her surrounding community as she constantly worked for the progress of African-Americans toward equality. Even before her official career with the Eagles began, Effa was interested in social justice and civil rights; this is demonstrated in her organization and leadership of store boycotts in Harlem. When Abe and Effa were first married, they lived in Harlem, New York. It was here that Effa began to delve into social and civil rights and where she gained experience as a public leader against injustice. The largest businesses in Harlem were owned by white people, but frequented by blacks. The problem that Effa recognized, however, was that these businesses would not hire any black people as store-front employees. At one department store in particular, Blumstein’s, over $7,000 had been spent by black people, yet they were not hired as sales clerks.

As secretary of the Citizens’ League of Harlem, Effa was an important leader in the black community’s response to such discriminatory hiring policies. Along with other league members and people of Harlem’s black community, Effa boycotted Blumstein’s and picketed outside for several weeks in the summer of 1934. In a meeting with the store owners, it was Effa’s personal note that changed their minds about hiring black workers. She said, “You know, we think just as much of our young colored girls as do your young white girls but there’s just not work for them. The only thing they can find to do is work in someone’s home as a maid or become prostitutes.” This shocking statement helped the Blumstein’s agree to hire black sales clerks; by September, there would be thirty-five of them total. This victory over discrimination was a pivotal point in Effa’s life as a civil rights activist. She celebrated her success with fifteen hundred other people in a parade and rally in Harlem, a crowd that spoke directly to the widespread effects of Effa’s work against discrimination.

She carried with her this desire for equality among the races to Newark, where she and Abe moved the Eagles in 1936.

When Effa moved to Newark, she found a city with rampant discrimination and inequality among the races. Known as “the Georgia of the North,” New Jersey was a state filled with lower-paying jobs and inadequate housing for its black population. It was an appropriate time and place for a positive change for African Americans, something to which Effa would gladly contribute. Throughout her career as manager of the Eagles, Effa organized many fundraisers at the ballgames for African American organizations, like the NAACP, in order to promote
the welfare of Newark's black population.

It was because of Efifa that the relationship between the Eagles and the Newark community was strong and unyielding: "Even if they had only won now and then, the Eagles might still have had a place in black Newark as fund-raisers and publicizers of the community's charities and helping organizations."26 There are several examples of events that were put on at Ruppert Stadium that functioned as both a public relations event for the Eagles and a charity event for organizations in Newark. Efifa was a member of the NAACP, and at one point was treasurer of the New Jersey chapter. Game day fundraisers would reach hundreds of dollars for the NAACP, something that was common among other ball clubs in the Negro National League. What was uncommon, however, was Efifa's ability to continuously plan successful events that truly impacted the community. In 1989, Efifa organized what author Donn Rogosin called "the most remarkable special day in Negro baseball history."27 That summer, she staged a "Stop Lynchings" benefit in Ruppert Stadium in order to raise funds and awareness for what Efifa considered a very important African American issue. The NAACP helped by sponsoring buttons that argued against lynching practices that sold for a dollar each; an important publicity photograph was taken of Efifa selling one of these buttons to the Newark mayor.28 This important day in black baseball was just one example of how Efifa constantly demonstrated her desire to support the black community while managing the Eagles.

Efifa's civil activism grew during World War II with more opportunities for uplifting the entire African American race, especially those in the segregated military. In 1941, segregation in the military became a controversial topic in the black press. Efifa played a role in this contentious issue when she invited the all-black 372nd Infantry Regiment of twenty-five-hundred men to the Opening Day game. This blatant support for the black members of the military was also supported by the Newark mayor, who declared the day an official "372nd Day." At another game, Efifa invited the black members of the Free French forces, with an invitation that added that "white members were also welcome, if there was room."29 Efifa's obvious support of African Americans in the military speaks to her desire to bring about equality for everyone, even those in the armed forces. She was proud of those men serving in the military, especially the fifty-four black baseball players who volunteered to serve.30

Efifa held high ideals for black baseball overall, which often led to struggles against white owners with whom she did not always agree. Throughout her career, Efifa constantly made known her interest in and support of full black control of Negro League baseball, which she believed would contribute to the overall success of the entire league. She was not afraid to fight the white dominance of the Negro leagues, which involved the monopolization of the best stadiums and control of the schedules. The only concrete progress that Efifa made was by ensuring that the Negro Leagues' treasury obtained a quarter of the booking fees, money that may have ended up in the pockets of white agents.31 Perhaps the most conflict with white executives, however, came after the integration of the major leagues. Efifa had significant struggles with the Brooklyn Dodgers' president, Branch Rickey because of his unfair treatment of other Negro League owners as he began to integrate major league baseball.

Efifa Manley did not agree with her so-called "arch enemy," Branch Rickey, immediately upon his integration of Major League baseball.32 Although she was a proponent for integration and a partnership between the Negro National League and the majors, Efifa wholeheartedly disagreed with the way that Rickey signed Robinson in 1946. She expressed her feelings to the public in a delicate manner at first, but when Efifa and Rickey met at a game in the middle of the 1946 season, Efifa was able to verbally let him know how she felt. As described in an article from the New York Daily Mirror, Efifa said, "You know, Mr. Rickey, we could make trouble for you on the Newcombe transaction if we wanted to."33 She understood that what he was doing was wrong and unfair. When Rickey signed Robinson, he failed to consult with the Kansas City Monarchs ownership or even offer them compensation for their player. He continued this practice, signing four more players before the 1946 season was over.34 Efifa vocally and publicly responded to these practices when she spoke at a luncheon before the Optimist Club at a Newark department store in 1948. During her speech, she said that Rickey used unfair practices, making her feelings known to a larger portion of the public.35 It was imperative that the public knew that although baseball was integrated, the integration was not completed in a fair or reasonable way.

One struggle in particular for Efifa concerned her former ownership of Monte Irwin; when Rickey...
wanted to sign Irvin without compensation to the Eagles, Effa stood up against Rickey, standing as a symbol for all of the Negro League owners who felt this way. When the Dodgers signed Irvin, "Mrs. Manley stuck her fine feminine hand into the glowing picture and charged that the Dodgers had taken Irvin away from her Newark Eagles without permission." Effa felt that her rights and the rights of the other Negro League executives had been violated. She felt that she had to stand up against these injustices as a representative of the entirety of the Negro National League. With a lawyer, Effa managed to get compensation for Irvin and successfully set the standard for compensation for black players: "I was glad to have it resolved that way. But that started the bargain basement. All the teams started grabbing the Negro players for $5,000." Despite the fact that it was minimal sum, it was important to recognize the fact that Effa was successful in gaining compensation for players from the entire Negro league. This was an incredible feat for Effa in the struggle for the respect and justice that was due to the black players and their leaders in the Negro leagues.

To fully comprehend the effect that Effa Manley had on society, it is required that her emphasis on gender and racial equality be taken into account. She spent her life organizing, fundraising, and even arguing for the benefit of African Americans in the 1930s and 1940s. Furthermore, her work for civil rights always had a foundation in her ability to break gender stereotypes and bring men's and women's roles closer together. Her aspirations for equality laid firmly in her relationships with her players, the Newark community, and other executives in organized baseball. She stood as a symbol for women's rights and for social justice across the races. Her legacy remains today in the ideas of full civil rights for all people. As written in a Pittsburgh Courier article, "Mrs. Manley contends that the [African American] race does not know its own strength, and when it begins to realize what really fine things the race is capable of doing, it will show rapid progress." This inevitable progress in which Effa believed occurred in part because of her relentless leadership toward a true elevation of the African American race.
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Muhammad Ali: And the Vietnam Resistance Movement

Michael Cooper II

Muhammad Ali is one of the most recognized and controversial figures in the world. Not only did he revitalize the sport of boxing, he sent shock waves through the American Government and public. Historians, boxing fans, and the general public alike have sought answers and motives for Ali's actions and beliefs, questioning why this young champion, equipped with all the tools and ingredients to bring about positive change and reconciliation between the races, used his position to create more dissention than reconciliation. Opinions and theories on what or who was behind the Ali's intentions are prevalent in the world today, with the true reasons being known to only the man himself, Muhammad Ali.

In 1960, Cassius Clay, a young man from Louisville, Kentucky, returned home from winning a Olympic gold medal in boxing for the United States. He was very proud of his accomplishment, and assumed his countrymen would be as well. However, racial tensions in the United States were seemingly stagnant and little progress was being made. Upon returning home, he noticed that he was still denied entry into certain restaurants, stores, and areas of town. Cassius was a determined young man, and envisioned himself becoming world heavyweight champion, and becoming the sole provider for his family. He stayed out of trouble, did not get involved with alcohol or drugs, and he worked tirelessly at his craft.

Prior to 1964, Cassius Clay did little to rock the boat, he was tall and handsome, very sharp, was not a rebel, and had no criminal record. He was simply a young man with unprecedented boxing ability, with the sole ambitions of wealth and the world heavyweight title. White America viewed him as a "toy that presumably could be discarded as soon as his entertainment value waned." Cassius had never focused his attention on race relations, but instead focused on his boxing career and on expanding his popularity and fame. He had fallen in love with wrestling great Gorgeous George, who he had heard in an interview before one of George's matches. In the interview George mouthed off to the press about what he intended to do to his opponent. Cassius was intrigued by the man's boastfulness and openness and learned that the excitement George built up leading into his own matches is what attracted fans. No matter what the outcome of the fight would be, there was a "must-see" attribute that George brought along to all of his fights. This type of self-publicity was right up Cassius Clay's alley. The young boxer had dealt with racial hatred for much of his boyhood and saw how many of his friends and other blacks were treated. The story of Emmett Till, a young black man who was fatally beaten and executed by a group of white men for allegedly whistling at a white woman in a store, frightened the young Cassius. In an era where many young blacks were ridiculed, called ugly, and told they would never amount to anything simply because of their skin color, Cassius felt he was the complete opposite. He had learned to love himself through these times, and developed a deep self-awareness that fueled his fire and ultimately allowed him to exceed many expectations.

Cassius knew that if he were going to reach his goal of heavyweight champion, he would need to generate interest in himself and his ability in order to make a claim for his shot at the title. He feared that the example set by many blacks before him had failed because they were not vocal or forceful enough with their aspirations to become successful. They had played into the desires of the "white man" and eventually fizzled out over time or were run out of the business. Cassius had his own formula for generating a hype around himself, which would come to define his personality. "Where do you think I'd be next week, if I didn't know how to shout and holler and make the public take notice? I'd be poor and I'd probably be down in my hometown, washing windows or running an elevator and saying 'yes suh' and 'no suh' and knowing my place. Instead, I'm one of the highest paid athletes in the
world. Think about that. A southern coloured boy has made a million dollars. Cassius knew his personal attributes were what would pave his way to the top. He knew that he had to be different if he had any chance at bringing about the success that he longed for.

Cassius used his charisma, his loose personality, and his witty jokes to help break out of a racial stranglehold that had inhibited the black athlete for decades. He felt that those champions before him who he admired for their boxing ability, but disavowed for their complacency and compliance with the white man’s orders and parameters for how they should carry themselves, could not be effective in the black community in erasing racial oppression. He drew much attention to himself with his style, which is exactly what he wanted, for he knew his boxing ability would captivate his audiences, and he could channel the attention to himself.

Cassius first heard about the Nation of Islam and their Messenger and chief leader: Elijah Muhammad in 1959 in Chicago while participating in the Golden Gloves Tournament. He didn’t think much of it, but arbitrarily took a copy of the newspaper entitled *Muhammad Speaks* and looked at it during his spare time. Contrary to popular belief, the Muslims did not seek out Cassius. He was intrigued by and drawn to them after hearing bits and pieces of their message. He did not have an instant interest from the beginning and was quite skeptical and weary of many of the things he first heard and learned about the organization. After returning from Rome and being invited to a Muslim temple in Miami, Cassius first began to think seriously about the Nation of Islam: “the first time I felt truly spiritual in my life was when I walked into the Muslim temple in Miami. A man named Brother John was speaking, and the first words I heard him say were, ‘Why are we called Negroes? It’s the white man’s way of taking away our identity.’” After the speaker began elaborating on how many blacks got their names from their slave owners, Cassius felt like he had come across something he could fully identify with. He was named after one of the largest plantation owners in the South, who later turned into a valiant abolitionist, Cassius Marcellus Clay. His father had also had the name, as well as his grandfather, and great-grandfather. This stood out in his mind and generated his further interest in the message.

Cassius became increasingly interested in the Nation of Islam’s message and sought to learn more while still maintaining his doubts and questions. He had been raised in a Christian home and attended church with his mother regularly. The only God he had ever been exposed to and worshipped was Jesus Christ. Continuing to endure racial hardships and witnessing the stagnant state of racial tensions, his speculation turned into an increased interest and he continued to be taught by different ministers within the faith who were generally assigned to him. Elijah Muhammad was initially unsupportive of Cassius Clay in his early years, as the organization was against violent activities such as boxing, in which men fought each other often to the death, in pursuit of a pay check from the “white man.” He even originally reprimanded one of his ministers who taught Cassius for engaging with the boxer, reminding him he been sent south “to make converts, not fool around with fighters.” Muhammad’s disdain for Cassius’s trade eventually turned into support once he realized what a prized possession had stumbled upon. This realization sparked a new interest in the young boxer which made the Muslim leader deeply invested in the well-being of his future and the proper management of his undertakings.

Malcolm X, rising leader of the Muslim organization and prominent speaker of his day, was introduced to Cassius in 1962. Of their meeting, Malcolm X said: “I liked him. Some contagious quality about him made him one of the few people I ever invited to my home. Betty liked him. Our children were crazy about him. Cassius was simply a likeable, friendly, clean-cut, down-to-earth youngster. I noticed how alert he was even in little details. I suspected there was a plan in his public clowning.” Cassius and Malcolm’s relationship grew into a sibling type of friendship. The two were seen together by the media on several occasions, which began to raise questions about what they were doing together. Malcolm was already a prominent leader in the organization and his involvement in Cassius’s camp only generated speculation about what the young contender had in mind.

Cassius had not gone public with his ties to the Nation and the only information known was that which was speculated by media members and others who witnessed Cassius in the company of known Muslim activists. Of his keeping his interest a secret, Cassius stated: “for three years, up until I fought Sonny Liston, I’d sneak into Nation of Islam meetings through the back door. I didn’t
want people to know I was there. I was afraid, if they knew, I wouldn’t be allowed to fight for the title. Later on, I learned to stand up for my beliefs.” It wasn’t until after Cassius won the title by defeating World Heavyweight Champion Sonny Liston on February 25, 1964, that he came out with his conversion and his new alliance with one of the nation’s most radical racial groups, the Nation of Islam, also known in America as the “Black Muslims.” This announcement sent shockwaves around the world and showed just what the new champion intended to promote with his newly acquired position. In a speech 2 days after the Liston victory, Clay announced his ties with Islam and claimed that all he wanted was peace and did not want to force integration or force himself places he was not welcome: “I know where I belong. I’m not going to force myself into anybody’s house. I’m not joining to forced integration movement, because it don’t work. A man has got to know where he belongs.” Cassius spoke to the press about the hate crimes that continued to take place all over the country and how many of those fighting for their rights were the very ones being killed daily. He states: “they want me to carry signs. They want me to picket. They tell me it would be a wonderful thing if I married a white woman because this would be good for brotherhood. I don’t want to be blown up. I don’t want to be washed down sewers. I just want to be happy with my own kind.” By pronouncing his faith and beliefs to the entire world, Cassius was beginning a long and difficult journey that would come to define his entire life.

Now that the Muslims had their champion and a new figurehead for their movement, they could use him for whatever means they desired. Elijah Muhammad began involving himself with the affairs of the young champion, assigning his own son to become his manager and head man in Clay’s camp. They handled the majority of his business affairs, as well as his promotional endeavors. This new alliance angered many Americans and frightened a host of others. This icon of boxing was embracing a militant hate group, the less radical equivalent of the Ku Klux Klan, and announcing to the world his allegiance to it. Support for Cassius slowly declined and he was vilified by many members of the media. Jim Murray of the Los Angeles Times labeled him the “white man’s burden.” Jimmy Cannon of the New York Journal-American referred to Clay’s ties to the Nation of Islam “the dirtiest in American sports since the Nazis were shouting for Max Schmeling as representative of their vile theories of blood.”

Not long after his acquisition of the title, Cassius Clay announced that he would no longer be recognized by his slave name, but was now to be called Cassius X. A few days later on March 6, Elijah Muhammad, via radio broadcast, proclaimed: “This Clay name has no divine meaning. I hope he will accept being called by a better name. Muhammad Ali is what I will give him for as long as he believes in Allah and follows me.” This name change signified the freeing of self from past oppression and from the stranglehold of the “white man” on his inner being. He was liberated and free to do as he pleased, as he was now a new creature with the birth of Muhammad Ali. Elijah Muhammad knew it was in the best interest of the organization to fully support Ali and embrace him during this time, as relations between Malcolm and the Muslim leader had soured. Despite the close relationship of Ali and Malcolm, Ali sided with Elijah Muhammad and denounced Malcolm X and his retreating from the principles espoused by the Nation of Islam. The two former “brothers” only encountered one another on one occasion in front of a hotel in Ghana. Their words were short, with ultimately Ali turning his back and walking away from Malcolm, in a public display of allegiance to Elijah and disdain for Malcolm.

Elijah Muhammad and the Nation of Islam continued to influence every decision the young champion faced. His 1967 decisions would come to define him. With the escalation of the Vietnam War imminent, the draft board changed its aptitude requirements for inductees. Ali, once classified as 1-Y (not qualified under current standards for service in the armed forces) had been reclassified after a lowering of draft standards to 1-A (qualified for service). Robert Lipsyte, who was with Ali when he first received news that he had been reclassified and was likely to be drafted, described the scene of a terrified young man. He recalled the champion repeatedly questioning, “How can they do this to me? I don’t want my career ruined.” Ali viewed this as an attempt by the white man to sabotage his career and force him to serve overseas, which he felt was the only way he could be defeated. He immediately spoke out against the draft and hinted towards the possibility of refusal of induction. While taking calls from the press concerning his newly acquired draft status, and after hours of questioning, Ali infamously replied, “I ain’t got no quarrel with them Vietcong.” This phrase made
headlines all over the country the following day and many who supported Ali were now against him, for they concluded he placed self about country. Ali’s statement seemed innocent in his mind; a simple statement that reflected how he truly felt concerning the situation. At this time most Americans still supported the war and anyone not willing to serve his country was considered a rebel and a traitor. It also showed Ali’s belief and support for the separation of races and his non-alliance with white America and its’ endeavors. Ali’s religious ties did nothing to help his cause and his statement only revealed his true feelings, in the mind of many Americans. The young champion now feared for the well-being of his career, as well as his life. His initial reaction seemingly had little to do with political or religious ambitions or desires, but solely rested on his fear for his career as a boxer.

In a statement released after his refusal to take the ceremonial one step forward to signify induction into the Armed Forces on April 28, 1967, Ali made his objections public:

It is in the light of my consciousness as a Muslim minister and my own personal convictions that I take my stand in rejecting the call to be inducted in the armed services. I do so with the full realization of its implications and possible consequences. I have searched my conscience and I find I cannot be true to my belief in my religion by accepting such a call. My decision is a private and individual one and I realize that this is a most crucial decision. In taking it I am depended solely upon Allah as the final judge of these actions brought about by my own conscience.11

In this statement, Ali’s articulated his stance and justification for his actions. It also began a new chapter in American history, in which youth of all races were questioning the motives of the American policies and the current system which seemed to have little to no concern for the well-being of middle and lower class families.

Ali didn’t view his actions at the time as radical, but simply believed he was fighting for what he felt in his heart of hearts was just and right. However, the fear of the fate that lay before him being shipped to a foreign land to engage in warfare that he believed was not warranted troubled Ali more than anything else, more than his religious beliefs, and more than his effort to become a voice for the youth. Ali’s stated peaceful mentality and desire to refrain from aligning himself in the fight for integration allowed him a political leg to stand on and gave him a justifiable reason for opposing the war and his induction. Ali believed that justice would prevail, and that his religious affiliation provided more than a substantial basis for refusing induction: “as a prospective defendant in criminal proceedings, Clay is expected to attempt to establish that ‘preaching and teaching’ the tenets of the Muslims is a full-time occupation and that boxing is the ‘avocation’ that financially supports his unpaid ministerial duties.”12

After being denied conscientious objector status by the Army on two separate occasions, Ali did not initially apply for it a third time when he came before the appeal board on March 17, 1966. Ali instead sought a ministerial deferment, which would keep him from any form of service or obligation in a war he viewed as unjust. To demonstrate that the ministry was his primary occupation, he told Judge Lawrence Grauman, a retired jurist and a special hearing officer for the Justice Department, that he typically spent several hours a day speaking at mosques and college campuses on behalf of the Nation of Islam. He went on to say: “Sir...it would be no trouble for me to go into the Armed Services, boxing exhibitions in Vietnam or traveling the country at the expense of the Government or living the easy life and not having to get out in the mud and fight and shoot. If it wasn’t against my conscience to do it, I would easily do it.”13

Ali felt as though he was the victim of a brutal plan aimed at redirecting support for him in exchange for vilification and a sentence to fight overseas in an effort to mar his career and discredit his stand as an influential and outspoken black leader. A vast majority of the public seemed to disapprove of Ali’s religious ties, claiming that he was part of a relentless racial hate group. Ali had a quite different outlook on his religious affiliation, and envisioned himself as an advocate of peace. When asked by a white reporter about his Muslim ties, Ali responded, “If I go to a Muslim meeting, what do I see? I see there’s no smoking and no drinking. I see the women wearing dresses down to the floor. I see great wisdom and a way of life that will save the world.”14 He believed that the message presented by the Muslims would solve racial issues by disengaging itself with forced integration and developing a pride and contentment with one’s
own race. However, not all blacks agreed with their ideals for peace or their beliefs and tactics. “While the Black Muslims are thought to have recruited only a relatively small number of black Americans, most Negroes admire their discipline, thrift and their record of conversions of former criminals and drug addicts and their rehabilitation of slum neighborhoods. Alleged anti-white teachings within the sect are called ‘simply very pro-black teachings’ by the membership.” Unbeknownst to many with knowledge of the Nation of Islam, as well as some intrigued by its message, is the falling away from many basic teachings and beliefs within the true and original religion of Islam.

While the Nation of Islam did cater to many characteristics of true Islam, there were many differences that were either ignored or altered to cater to the needs of blacks at the time. Warith Deen Muhammad, son of Elijah Muhammad, who eventually broke from the Nation in 1975, said that his father was aware of some of the differences in teachings between the Nation of Islam and true Islam. However, he maintained that his father’s teachings were essential at the time, “...in order for blacks to pull themselves up from the circumstances of genuine degradation in which many found themselves to a station of pride and self-respect, thrift and discipline, and economic stability.” Islam teaches that all races are equal before God, whereas the Nation of Islam taught that the white man is the devil. These admitted differences give way to the notion that the Nation of Islam maintained a political and racial agenda from its inception, and incorporated beneficial elements, while disassociating itself from teachings and beliefs that were not suitable or desirable for the times.

Ali embraced the Muslim message and was a true advocate and representation of its beliefs. He said what they wanted him to say and objected when they wanted him to object. However, times were not always happy between Ali and the Muslims. Upon releasing a statement reflecting his desire to return to the ring in early 1969, Elijah Muhammad released this statement; “I want the world to know that Muhammad Ali has stepped down off the spiritual platform of Islam to see if he can make money in the sports world. This statement is to tell the world that we, the Muslims, are not with Mr. Muhammad Ali in his desire to work in the sports world for the sake of a ‘little’ money.” A week later, Elijah Muhammad would “strip” Ali of his name and he would once again be referred to in the Muslim community as Cassius Clay. This action from the one Ali revered most came as a blow to the champion, as he lost the name he esteemed and the fellowship he cherished. Ali’s disfellowship shows the dedication of the Muslims to their desired mission and anticipated outcome of martyrdom, rather than a dedication to their man and chosen figurehead of the Nation of Islam.

While many politicians and those engulfed in the legal system argued the nooks and crannies of the Constitution in search of a guilty or innocent verdict for Ali, the rest of America became engulfed in other questions. Black and white Americans alike debated the effectiveness and fairness of the system as a whole; race relations, draft inequalities, and other issues that were moved to the forefront. Ali’s initial reaction to being drafted had nothing to do with becoming a hero, nor did he aim to cause an uprising about the nature of our country and its values.

I never thought of myself as great when I refused to go into the army. All I did was stand up for what I believed. There were people who thought the war in Vietnam was right. And those people, if they went to war, acted just as brave as I did. There were people who tried to put me in jail. Some of them were hypocrites, but others did what they thought was proper and I can’t condemn them for following their consciences either.

However, his actions lead to a variety of reactions, each differing depending on who was asked. Many in the African-American community followed the Ali story closely because racial progress was often measured by the government’s treatment of black celebrities and politicians. Many young blacks protested the government’s persecution of Ali, while they felt white celebrities were being allowed the privilege to live their lives at elite status with no interference from the government. In their eyes, only a conspiracy fueled by racial intolerance could explain the actions against such an outspoken and well-known black man. This time period revealed America’s true feelings toward race, and ultimately the shifting perceptions of the war in Vietnam.

Although he had the support of many communities, others were terrified, insulted, and openly against the champion and his values. Congressman Frank Clark of Pennsylvania voiced his opinion: “The heavyweight champion of the world
turns my stomach. I am not a superpatriot. But I feel that each man, if he really is a man, owes to his country a willingness to protect it and serve it in time of need. From this standpoint, the heavyweight champ has been a complete and total disgrace.  

Facing intense criticism such as this, as well as that of many others in positions of authority and leadership, Ali continued his fight for what he believed to be right. Although he gained much of the anti-war attention, others all across the country began to participate in the resistance movement. In 1967, a group of antiwar men around the San Francisco Bay Area voiced their intent to stop all association with the Selective Service System. They hoped to join with other resistance groups, arguing that noncooperation with a government conducting an immoral war was the only appropriate moral path.  

The entire tone of the discussion of the Vietnam War in American was rapidly changing. From a war of peacemakers and liberators; it was now being viewed by many as criminal activity. The Resistance Movement that began in California had now become a nationwide movement with organizations in New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Oregon, and California. In October of 1967, the organization declared, “We will publicly and collectively return our draft cards to the selective service system in major cities throughout the country. We will clearly challenge the government’s right to use any young lives for its own nefarious purposes. Our challenge will continue, and we will openly confront the Selective Service System, until the government is forced to deal with our collective action.”  

Ali was the initiator and leader of something much larger than what he had originally envisioned; however, the champion was prepared to become a symbol of youth in America, and the hope and freedom that they sought for the country.

Nonetheless, Ali’s path took a different road. He had already announced to the world his conversion and allegiance to the Black Muslims. He had aligned himself with this group that many distanced themselves from and viewed as trouble to the country and to the American ideal. However, the circumstances in which Ali found himself from a racial standpoint, left him vulnerable to the Muslim idea and notions of the way life should be lived for every black man. Ali was never ‘anti-white.’ He had embraced his white supporters just as much as his black supporters in his early years. His trainer and leading man in his corner throughout his career was Angelo Dundee. But Ali’s position in America was altogether changed through his choice of acquaintances and influences. By the mid-sixties, the captivating champion had evolved from a symbolic warrior for the nation to a standard bearer for racial militancy. All of Ali’s fights were now political and extremely racial to the very core and filled with intense cultural slurs and ideologies about different races and religions. Ali envisioned himself as the model ‘black man’ and any blacks that did not support him or believe as he did were instruments of the ‘white man.’ His fight seemed to undergo an acute transformation and took on a different meaning from when it originally started.

There are differing opinions on Ali’s actions and how much they truly reflected his thoughts and how much were a byproduct of the Muslim influence. Jeremiah Shabazz, one of the first to instruct Ali in the faith, declared, “Nobody put pressure on Ali not to go into the Army. The Messenger might have counseled him regarding what to say and not to say, but the final decision was all his own.” While this may have been true, the mounting pressure from the higher ups in ensuring the young champion spoke the right words, maintained the same approach, and stood by each and every one of his beliefs, undoubtedly shaped and influenced his every move. Regardless of how much or how little he was directly fed in regards to how he should carry himself, he still was aware of what the faith subjected him to and the moral responsibility he had by aligning himself so closely with the religion. Ali admits that “the Muslims insisted he never be in uniform and never be given a rank.”  

This “command” affected Ali’s will to negotiate and presumably left him with two options, neither of which appealed greatly to the champion; go to the Army or stand trial. His misgivings in adhering to the Muslims’ advice in the previous year, which led to his denouncement, kept him from ever again choosing a path of self-determination.

The extent of the Muslims’ influence on Ali has been a topic of debate for decades. Some believe that Ali’s notorious line, “I ain’t got no quarrel with them Vietcong,” was fed to him directly from his Muslim counterparts, following intense questioning concerning his newly acquired draft status. Although this claim has never been fully accepted or disputed, it does provide a new angle from which to view the entirety of Ali’s public statements. Mort Susman, head of the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of Texas claimed, that she believed
Ali and his camp were close to settling on a court deal which would have sent him into the army, but with an almost certain guarantee that he would be fighting exhibitions and entertaining troops rather than fighting in some 'rice paddy.' One conversation between Susman and the champion discussed whether or not Ali would be publicly humiliated if he changed his position and went into the Army. He later said: "...and my own view...is he was very close to changing his mind but some of his advisors wanted to make a martyr out of him." Ali was unwilling to do anything which might upset the Muslim leadership or bring into question his loyalty to Elijah Muhammad. He also did not want to compromise his stance by giving in to the mounting pressures and undoing all he had done in his fight for justice. He stood firm by his decisions and on several occasions, politely refused advice to compromise. A meeting with prominent black figures including Jim Brown, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, and Bill Russell, in hopes of persuading Ali to possibly lighten his stance and to consider all options and consequences of his actions, proved futile in swaying Ali from his position. The champion held true to his conviction, which ultimately won him the admiration of many.

On June 28, 1971, Muhammad Ali was cleared by the Supreme Court of the charge of refusing induction into the Armed Services. An unsigned opinion from the Court claimed that the Justice Department had misled Selective Service authorities by advising them that Ali's claim as a conscientious objector was neither sincere nor based on religious tenets. The court found that the earnestness of Ali's beliefs and their foundation in religious training were beyond doubt. It noted that the government had conceded that Ali met these two criteria and that the Appeal Board could have made its decision on unlawful advice from the Justice Department. Ali also won his suit against the boxing commission after his lawyers, who were provided by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, "...had documented numerous instances in which boxing authorities had licensed men who had previously been convicted of rape, theft, and military offenses." Muhammad Ali had concluded his most epic fight and emerged victorious. Through his trials, both socially and legally, he had become the symbol of American freedom and justice. He maintained his belief in the system and endeavored to face whatever scrutiny would come his way, believing that justice would ultimately prevail.

Ali was subject to many differing opinions and received guidance from a wide range of people, all of which influenced his actions. To understand his motives, it is critical to understand his surroundings. Through his conversion, he had found the inspiration and satisfaction of a higher being, which he acknowledged as Allah. Only Allah could truly influence his decision making; and ultimately Allah would be his final judge. In his later years, Ali denounced many of the teachings of Elijah Muhammad; the man he once viewed as next to God, however he retained his belief in the basic teachings of true Islam. Time contributed to him becoming wiser and has allowed him the ability to examine the faith for himself and through conviction, shape his devotion into what it is today.

Whether Ali was manipulated Ali by the Nation of Islam or not, he maintained his true conviction and spiritual connection throughout. He had found something that gave meaning to his life and placed a value on it that he would allow no man to take away. Even in his struggles with the Nation, he learned that following his heart and not the desires of other men would be the decisive factor in attaining his salvation. It is through his understanding, determination, and sincere belief in his morals and values that propelled Muhammad Ali to victory in the ring, in the courtroom, and in life.
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BRIDGING THE GAP: MARRIAGES BETWEEN WELSH AND ANGLO-NORMAN ARISTOCRACIES, 1066-1282

Abigail Cengel

Wales and England in the High Middle Ages could not have been more different. Each had its own languages, laws, and customs, and each saw the other as hostile and foreign. This is clearly reflected in the literature of the time, as the English and Anglo-Norman writers complained of Welsh barbarism, and the Welsh in turn complained of Anglo-Norman oppression. These two peoples were forced together directly after the Norman conquest of England in 1066, when the Normans began to aggressively act on their territorial ambitions throughout the entire island of Britain, so the Welsh and the Normans had to find ways to cope with each other in a way that was beneficial for both parties. One method that was frequently used as a political tool by both domains was marriage between their respective aristocratic families; these marriages were utilized by the Welsh in their attempts to preserve their political identity and independence against the incursions of the Anglo-Normans, and the Anglo-Normans used the marriages to gain land and influence in Wales. In other words, these marriages were meant to bridge the gap between the two people during a time when the Welsh were trying to affirm their political independence and when the Anglo-Normans were attempting to assert their own dominance in Wales.

Even though the Welsh were not often unified under a single political leader, they had laws, customs, and a language that distinguished them from the Anglo-Normans and that gave them a sense of unity. The Welsh were fully aware of their identity and had an acute sense of unity as a people despite their political fragmentations and local divisions; even outsiders referred to the Welsh as one country and acknowledged that they had their own unique language, laws, judgments, and customs. The Welsh were also united by a conviction to defend the Welsh frontier at all costs, by a common mythology and literary tradition, and by the name they adopted for themselves, Cymry, which highlighted their awareness of themselves as fellow countrymen. Their common literary tradition is especially telling of their unity because Welsh poets and story-tellers drew on their uniform literary language and common mythology in order to express love for a beloved country. In his poem “From Exile,” Dafydd Benfras (d. 1257) expressed his joy upon his return to his homeland: “To a Wales made one, contented and fair...where Welsh freely flows!”

The medieval Welsh literary tradition also reflected the tensions between the Welsh and Anglo-Normans. In Welsh poetry, authors frequently expressed a desire to drive foreigners from their land, and from the early Middle Ages, there is evidence in Welsh literature of strong resentment for the foreigner, such as in the anonymous Armes Prydain Fawr (The Great Prophecy of Britain, tenth century). The poet includes a scathing attack of the English rule in Britain and the treachery of the English while prophesying an alliance of the Welsh, the Irish, and the men of Anglesey, Pictland, and Cornwall that will be led by the ancient heroes Cynan and Cadwaladr to drive the English out of their land. The theme of resentment towards the foreigner is continued in the poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, such as in Gwalchmai ap Meilyr’s “Exultation” (1130-1180), which states that “They tremble, the English, before my blade” and “Gwalchmai I am called, foe of the Saxons... Against England a champion will not hide.” It may seem strange that Gwalchmai refers to the Welsh fighting the Saxons, as the Welsh at this time were fighting the Anglo-Norman lords, but this phrasing was rhetorical device used by the poets of the time – called the Gogynfeirdd or Beirdd Y Tywysogion (Less Early Poets or Poets of the Princes), these poets incorporated ancient heroes and stories into their works, using their more glorious past to honor
the rulers of the present (who were also the poets' patrons). Thus, when Gwalchmai said that he was fighting the Saxons, he was using a historical occurrence that reflected the present Welsh struggle against the Anglo-Normans to express Welsh resentment against Anglo-Norman oppression. The major Welsh chronicle of the Middle Ages, Brut Y Tywysogion (Chronicle of the Princes, thirteenth century), also voices Welsh aggression against the Anglo-Normans throughout the work, saying that the Welsh were "unable to suffer [the Norman's] tyranny," and frequently states that the Welsh believed that the Normans wanted to "destroy all of the Britons [Welsh]."

Anglo-Norman literature reciprocates these negative feelings, as it often depicts the Welsh as a barbarous group on the periphery of English society that was in constant rebellion and that should be subdued by the kings of England. William of Malmesbury, an English Benedictine monk, frequently referred to the rebellious habits of the Welsh in his Gesta Regnum Anglorum (The History of the English Kings), and how English kings such as Harold "reduced the whole of that barbarous country [Wales] to the status of a province owing allegiance to the king," and later said that King William I "had all the Welsh as tributaries." Similarly, the author of the Gesta Stephani stated that the peripheral Wales "breeds men of an animal type...volatile always in breaking their word," and said the Normans "perserveringly civilized [Wales]." These authors do acknowledge that the Welsh were hardy and persistent fighters, but this is only a negative aspect of their warlike nature, and was not viewed in a positive light. Walter Map, a Welshman by birth, but heavily influenced by his Anglo-Norman education and career in England, made satire out of the rage of the Welsh, telling his audience: "See how foolish and unreasonable is the wrath of these Welsh, and how swift they are to shed blood," and noted "the fierceness of their assault and the keenness of their resistance." However, there is one exception to these voices of hostility: Matthew Paris. In his Chronica Majora, he recognizes that the Welsh were unwilling to accept English rule, that they were being "miserably oppressed," and that "their time-honored aristocratic pride fell into decline," a rare sympathetic voice from the English perspective. Unfortunately, we can only guess as to why he felt this way, but his account demonstrates that not all Anglo-Normans viewed the Welsh in a negative way, which may have been why they were willing to make marital alliances with each other.

From an examination of these attitudes, it is surprising that the Welsh and Anglo-Normans would want to make marital alliances with each other. Wales could have made alliances with countries such as Ireland, who had their own similar battles against the Anglo-Normans, but the Welsh chose instead to make alliances with the people they professed to hate. Welsh historians such as R.R. Davies often comment upon the brilliant negotiations of Welshmen like Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, who made multiple marital alliances with the Anglo-Normans; Davies often states that Llywelyn knew just how to manipulate the politics of his time and location in order to successfully keep the Anglo-Normans at bay and create a (mostly) unified Welsh political body. Llywelyn may have forgone creating an alliance with Ireland (he abandoned plans to marry the daughter of the Irish king of Man) because he predicted that more advantages would come from a marriage alliance with his domineering neighbors. Such unions would allow him to better assert his supremacy over the other Welsh lords and princes by drawing power from the English crown and would create amicable relations with the people that were attempting to overthrow his power. Other Welsh lords may have seen similar advantages when arranging their own marriages with the Anglo-Norman aristocracy; Ireland might not have seemed like a viable option because of its political turmoil. This may have weakened Ireland in the eyes of the Welsh, so the Welsh might not have wanted to make alliances with a country that lacked the necessary strength to help them beat back the Anglo-Normans. Even though the Welsh ruler Gruffudd ap Cynan (d. 1137) was actually born in Ireland of an Irish-Scandinavian mother and used Irish troops to try and take back Gwynedd, this appears to be one of the last major cooperations between the Welsh and the Irish in the Middle Ages. Additionally, when Owain Gwynedd (d. 1170) married Cristin, the daughter of Gronw ab Owain of Ireland, Cristin and her children were viewed with contempt by the Welsh. Thus, the Welsh decided to make marital alliances with their Anglo-Norman neighbors.

This being said, the Welsh and the Anglo-Normans both expressed their views towards marriage in their respective literary traditions. These literature sources were works of fiction and were often highly stylized and exaggerated, so they do not truly represent how marriage was contracted,
but they can at least give strong hints as to how people of the time viewed marriage. Welsh poetry in the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries did not define or discuss marriage, but did have works dedicated to women, such as Hywel ab Owain Gwynedd’s “In Praise of Fair Women.” This and other poems with similar themes exalt the beauty and grace of women and their unattainable nature.15 Also, because Hywel did not mention marrying any of these women, it may indicate an acceptance of extramarital affairs in Welsh society. Cynnellych Brydydd Mawr (The Great Poet) also dedicated poems to women, such as “To A Girl” and “A Love Poem for Efâ”, in which he tells how he was rejected by many beautiful Welsh women.16 These poems all demonstrate that Welsh women were able, to some extent, choose the men they associated themselves with, in marriage or otherwise. These poems also briefly mention the lineages of the men’s prospective women, which shows how the Welsh put great stock in arranging marriages with people of noble and worthy families. Welsh prose also reflects this concern, such as in The Four Branches of the Mabinogi, which were mythological stories that included frequent references to marriage.17 For instance, in the tale of Culhwych and Olwen, the protagonist Culhwych needs to prove his worth to the father of the woman he wants to have for his wife,18 which demonstrates that the prospective husband needed the father’s permission to marry the daughter, and also that the worth of the prospective partners was taken into consideration before the marriage was contracted.

Anglo-Norman literature from this time displayed a similar concern about the practically of marriage. Neil Cartidge, a prominent scholar of medieval literature, argued that the authors of this time sought to define marriage as a contract between two individuals and emphasized the fundamental place of marriage in the social order.19 For example, in Le Petit Plet by Chardri, the younger man in the story said that men should exercise caution when choosing a wife and to not be blinded by a prospective bride’s wealth, which demonstrates Anglo-Norman society’s perception of marriage as business-like and the necessity of marriage as a functional unit of society.20 Similarly, the Chanson de Saint Alexis (found in the St. Alban’s Psalter) presented marriage as a business arrangement and emphasized the importance of the bond between husband and wife.21 Because marriage was so fundamental to the social order, works such as the anonymous debate poem The Owl and the Nightingale condemned adultery because it endangered the important inter-familial ties that a marriage created – the nightingale stated a person should not come in between a man and his wife because it was an offense to the social order.22 Furthermore, the bird denounces clandestine marriage because the practice gave unmarried women a convenient way to save themselves from shame if they were caught having a love affair with an unmarried man, thereby damaging carefully constructed marriage plans and eradicating any pre-determined advantages that could have come from the marriage.23

With these practical uses of marriage in mind, the Welsh and the Anglo-Norman aristocracies decided to make marriage alliances between their families. While there is some evidence of the benefits that came from these partnerships, the exact reasons for their unions can only be estimated due to the lack of sources. Nevertheless, it appears that the first phase of these marriages began in the late eleventh century, during which time Normans (mainly from the Welsh march) contracted marriages with Welsh aristocracy to gain additional land and influence in territory they wanted to rule. The Welsh agreed to the alliances because these marriages brought influence and powerful alliances in England and in the march of Wales, and allowed them to more fully secure their land holdings in the volatile march. Wales at this time did not possess much military or political strength because their political unity had fragmented with the death of Gruffudd ap Llywelyn (“King of all Wales”) in 1063, making them more vulnerable to the Anglo-Normans’ aggressive territorial ambitions.24 Therefore, the weakened Welsh used the marriage alliances to help them cope with their hostile Anglo-Norman neighbors. One such union was between Nest ferch Gruffudd ap Llewelyn and Osbern Fitz Richard Fitz Scrop, lord of Richard’s Castle and Byton in Shropshire (see Chart 1).25 Osbern was one of the first Normans to come to the Welsh march, so a marriage with the daughter of the man who had been the “King of All Wales” most likely appeared advantageous to him. From this union, he could inherit land that Gruffudd once held to extend his reach farther into Wales and hopefully ensure peaceful relations with this Welsh family in the future. Additionally, one of their daughters married Bernard Neufmarche, another marcher baron, probably for similar reasons.

Another Nest, the daughter of Rhys ap
Tewdwr, was married to Gerald of Windsor, the first constable of the castle at Pembroke, and a close companion of marcer lord Amulf Montgomery (see Chart 2). Rhys ap Tewdwr, called "King of Deheubarth," was one of the most powerful Welsh leaders of his time until his death in 1093, so a marriage alliance with Gerald meant that each family could draw on each other's strengths in their respective territories, and they theoretically would have to worry about one less family attacking their lands. Additionally, Cadwgan ap Bleddyn, a prince of Powys, married the daughter of Picot de Sai, who held lands in Shropshire and was a vassal of the earl of Shrewsbury in the late eleventh century (see Chart 3). Cadwgan at this time was fighting his brothers for their share of his father's inheritance, so this marriage eradicated one less ambitious marcer baron for Cadwgan to be concerned about while he battled his brothers, and was advantageous for the Sai family because they would be able to gain land in Wales through this connection. However, as the Anglo-Normans were the dominant power in Wales during this time, this set of marriages provided more benefits for the Anglo-Normans in terms of land, and the Welsh agreed to the marriages because they saw these new partnerships as a means of survival in the face of Anglo-Norman domination, utilizing any advantage they could find in order to protect their territory. However, the marriages did not necessarily prevent conflict, as the Welsh/English border continued to fluctuate into the twelfth century.

The weakened state of the Welsh at this time also gave rise to a new period of Welsh literature that paralleled Wales' need for marital alliances; almost no literature was produced from the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries because the political strength of the Welsh was greatly reduced at this time. As the Gogynfeirdd were closely connected to Welsh rulers, the weakness of Welsh leaders meant that the poets did not have many outstanding leaders to glorify or write about since their homeland and leaders were being vitally crushed by Anglo-Norman invaders (and as noted above, much of what they did produce was included strong themes of resentment towards the Anglo-Normans). Thus, the political strength of the Welsh was directly related to the production of their literature as well as to their utilization of political marriages with the Anglo-Norman aristocracy.

The next phase of Welsh and Anglo-Norman marriages began with the death of King Henry I in 1135, which plunged England into the chaos of a succession dispute and civil war. Because the Anglo-Normans were now more concerned about their existing holdings in England than expansion into Wales, the Welsh were able to recover much of their former independence and territory as the Normans withdrew from Wales. This process included a change in marital strategies, and the Welsh made alliances with other Welsh nobles instead of with Anglo-Norman lords. For example, the powerful Lord Rhys of Deheubarth (d. 1197), made many marriage alliances with with the families of Gwynedd in order to consolidate and fortify his existing powers and land holdings in Deheubarth. Similarly, the Anglo-Norman marcer lords sought marriage alliances among other marcer families in order to consolidate and fortify their existing land holdings in the march rather than in Wales. This phase of Welsh history also had a parallel development in Welsh literature, as the Welsh had gained back much of their former political strength and because their leaders were gaining power, there was a revival of poetry because the Gogynfeirdd now had more material to build into their poetry. As a result, there were many more poems written and preserved in manuscripts from this time.

However, the literature of the next phase of Welsh history, beginning with the ascension of King Henry II to the English throne in 1154 and the restoration of order in England, had a grimmer outlook, and much less poetry was produced. Because the English state was now politically stable, there was a resurgence of Anglo-Norman aggression in Wales, and because the Welsh most likely realized that it would be more difficult to stop Anglo-Norman advances this time, there was an underlying unease expressed in the poets' works. This new period of literature paralleled the final (and longest) phase of marriages between Wales and England. Breaking with the previous phase's tradition of marrying with other Welsh families, the ruling houses of Wales began to marry into Anglo-Norman families again; however, these marriages were made with different goals in mind for both the Welsh and the Anglo-Normans. The Welsh now had increased political and military power that enabled them to more successfully resist Anglo-Norman incursions. Because the Anglo-Normans were rising in power as well, the Welsh used these marriage alliances to counteract and absorb the new stronger Anglo-Norman advances. The Anglo-Normans complied with the Welsh if they saw land and influence
benefits in the marriage for themselves, but were also able to control the formation of some of these marriages for the same purposes.

The first of these marriages were arranged for the children of the Lord Rhys, who had previously made numerous alliances with other Welsh families, but was now changing tactics; his son Gruffudd was married to Matilda de Braose sometime between 1154 and 1189, and his daughters were married to leading Norman lords of Cemaes in Dyfed (marcho territorial) (see Chart 2).\(^{34}\) Lord Rhys, having a strong foothold in Deheubarth and calling himself the "prince of the Southern Welsh," arranged these marriages to extend his influence beyond Wales into marcher territory and to secure the eastern flank of his kingdom.\(^{35}\) However, these alliances did not bring permanent security, as Deheubarth lost much of its power and influence after the death of Lord Rhys, power that his children were not able to fully recover due to the rise of Gwynedd's hegemony. For instance, one of Lord Rhys' grandsons, Maelgwyn Fychan, was even forced to marry the daughter of marcher lord Gilbert Marshal, who took advantage of the weakness of Deheubarth in order to gain more territory and influence for himself.\(^{36}\) Deheubarth also saw a decrease of significant marriages between their ruling family and the Anglo-Normans, as there were only a few unions contracted with the Braose, Hastings, and Clare families of the march in the thirteenth century.

The region of Powys had a similar situation to Deheubarth's later years of weakness; the heirs of its ruling family were constantly fighting over their father's lands, and they were politically the weakest area in Wales. Even Powys' strongest ruler, Gwenwynwyn ap Owain Cyfeiliog of Southern Powys, was either a pawn of King John or of the house of Gwynedd.\(^{37}\) Thus, the ruling families of Powys were less attractive marriage partners, but Powys' natural assets still drew in the Anglo-Normans for marital alliances. Powys had access to the markets of Chester and Shropshire and its land served as a buffer between the march and Gwynedd, which the Anglo-Normans hoped to benefit from through marriages with the nobility of Powys.\(^{38}\) The families of Powys also had their own reasons for marrying into Anglo-Norman families: they recognized that they needed to survive the incursions of Anglo-Normans and other Welsh families, so Powys' rulers decided to join the side that they most likely perceived as the stronger power, the Anglo-Normans (they even went so far as to mimic Anglo-Norman customs).\(^{39}\) When King John allied with Gwenwynwyn of Southern Powys against Gwynedd in the late twelfth century, Gwenwynwyn married Margaret Corbet (see Chart 3), demonstrating that he had abandoned his aggressions towards the march by his new union with the Anglo-Normans.\(^{40}\) Gwenwynwyn acted as an intermediary in the negotiations between Wales and England until about 1200, when he fell from royal favor.\(^{41}\) Thus, any benefits he gained from his marriage with the Anglo-Norman aristocracy were as temporary as his alliance with King John.

Later marriages in Southern Powys dealt with gaining alliances against a particular marcher family, the Corbets. Gwenwynwyn had married Margaret Corbet, but his son Gruffudd married Hawisa Lestrange circa 1242 (see Chart 3), which aligned him against the Corbets, who had a land dispute with the Lestranges and with Gruffudd himself.\(^{42}\) Gruffudd then married his daughter to an enemy of the Corbets, Fulk Fitz Warin's son, from which Gruffudd gained the allegiance of the Fitz Warin family against the Corbets.\(^{43}\) However, when King Henry III gave a portion of Gruffudd's territory to the Corbets, and then ordered Gruffudd to join forces with the Lestranges, Corbets, and other marchers, Gruffudd switched his loyalties to Llywelyn ap Gruffudd of Gwynedd and subsequently plundered the Corbet's lands.\(^{44}\) These actions demonstrate how Gruffudd used his marriage with the Lestrange family in his land dispute against the Corbets in order to preserve the land that should have been passed down to him by his father, but also shows that the marriage alliance with the Lestranges did not help him retain his land as he had anticipated. Similarly, Gruffudd Maelor of Bromfield and Northern Powys married Emma Audley (see Chart 3), whose family was engaged in constant hostilities with Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn, so this marriage was most likely made to support the claims of the family of Northern Powys over the claims of the family of Southern Powys.\(^{45}\)

The regions of Powys and Deheubarth pale in comparison to the political maneuvering of Gwynedd in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Gwynedd's marriages with Anglo-Normans were revived with the union of Owain Gwynedd's brother Cadwaladr and a Norman lady (most likely of the Clare family) in the late twelfth century (see Chart 4), which was created to help secure Gwynedd's influence in Ceredigion where the Clare
family held some power. The next marriage was contracted as a result of the good behavior of Dafydd ab Owain Gwynedd; by refraining from taking advantage of the instability of King Henry II's reign in 1172-73, Henry II allowed Dafydd to marry his half-sister Emma of Anjou in 1174, which came with the lordship of Ellesmere and gave Dafydd substantial prestige. However, despite his royal connections, Dafydd was eventually overpowered by his nephew, Llywelyn ab Iorwerth in 1197, so the benefits of his union again were transient.

With his growing power, Llywelyn ab Iorwerth was able to forge his own connections with the royalty of England beginning with his marriage to Joan, the illegitimate daughter of King John in 1205 (see Chart 4). This maneuver served Llywelyn's ultimate goal of controlling the entirety of Wales because the union brought him the manors of Ellesmere and Shropshire and gave him amplified influence in the royal court of England. It also helped to legitimize his own power because he was the only Welsh ruler at the time to have marital connections with the royal English family, giving him an advantage over his rivals. John most likely believed that this connection could give him more control over the man who was trying to completely free Wales from English control. This goal was partially realized when Joan took actions to benefit her father, such as when she allegedly warned John about a rebellious conspiracy among his barons in which Llywelyn was involved (1212), but she also proved useful for her husband. In 1211 the Welsh Chronicle records that Llywelyn sent Joan to King John "to make peace between [Llywelyn] and the king on whatsoever terms she could." However, the marriage did not create a cessation of hostilities between England and Wales, and Llywelyn and John were constantly at odds with each other, so the only permanent benefits derived from the marriage were those of land acquisitions.

Llywelyn continued his policy of marriages with Anglo-Normans and married all of his legitimate children into marcher families (Braose, Mortimer, Clifford, Lacy) to gain support of the marcher lords and to better secure his own position in Wales. Some of these marriages provided military aid for Llywelyn, such as the marriage of his daughter Gwladys to Reginald de Braose (see Chart 4), who gave Llywelyn military support against King John in 1215, but this alliance did not last; two years later, Reginald gave his allegiance to King Henry III in exchange for the return of his family lands.

Llywelyn's son and heir Dafydd also married into the Braose family through his union with Isabella de Braose in the early 1230s, which Llywelyn hoped would create peace and stability with the Braose family in order to more fully secure a peaceful succession in Gwynedd, but the union also came with the added land benefits of the lordship of Bulth for Dafydd. However, Gwynedd's supremacy dwindled with the death of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, and his son Dafydd was not able to fully recover his father's dominance despite the measures that Llywelyn had gone through to secure a stable succession. Gwynedd would not recover the superiority it once held over Wales until the rise of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth's grandson, Llywelyn ap Gruffudd. As the prince of Wales (princeps Walie), Llywelyn was constantly battling the English crown for independent political control of Wales, a goal that greatly influenced his political and marital decisions. He sought to marry Eleanor de Montfort, daughter of the late Simon de Montfort (see Chart 4), who had led the baronial revolt against King Henry III from 1264 until his defeat and death in 1265. Llywelyn had been Montfort's ally in the baronial revolt, during which time the agreement of the future marriage of Llywelyn and Eleanor was most likely made, and even though Simon was killed, Llywelyn still wanted to make an alliance with Simon's family because Simon had opposed what he and Llywelyn both saw as the tyrannous practices of England's royalty. Thus, Llywelyn hoped that this marriage could help him escape being subjected to the English king, especially since England had recently imposed humiliations on the Welsh. Eleanor was also the niece of King Henry III, which fulfilled Llywelyn's desire to marry someone connected to the king of England as Llywelyn's grandfather had done with Joan, for the union's political benefits. There had also been a recent attempt on Llywelyn's life by his brother Dafydd and Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn of Southern Powys, and Llywelyn had also failed to do homage to King Edward I multiple times in the 1270s, which provoked Edward into renewing the English military campaign against the Welsh in 1277. Therefore, Llywelyn felt threatened enough to make arrangements to more fully stabilize his position in Wales. The Montfort family no doubt saw this marriage as an opportunity to slight the English king for the brutal slaying of Simon de Montfort.

However, King Edward I wanted to prevent
the creation of this alliance because he knew it would be a great danger to his power if Llywelyn and the Montforts regained their strength, so Edward had Eleanor and her brother captured on their way from France to Wales in 1275 and kept them captive until 1278, all the while steadily depriving Welsh rulers of their authority with the campaign mentioned above. After Llywelyn agreed to a cessation of hostilities with Edward, Edward allowed the couple to marry, but made it clear that he was the dominant force behind the marriage. The wedding took place on the feast of St. Edward in an English cathedral (Worcester), and Edward gave the bride away as well as paying for the entire affair, making sure that Llywelyn knew his position as vassal of the king. Whatever Llywelyn's intentions were for this marriage, it appeared that the union would bring no immediate benefits to Wales in terms of gaining independence from the English crown.

Unfortunately for Wales, Llywelyn ap Gruffudd was killed in December of 1282, and Edward I swiftly asserted his control in the power vacuum left by Llywelyn's death, making sure to imprison or kill the remaining members of the house of Gwynedd that could have started a rebellion to undermine his power, truly crushing any independence that the Welsh had from Anglo-Norman control. This sparked a brief revival Welsh poetry – two laments written by Gyffinfaidd express the sorrow of losing the last independent ruler of Wales and the subsequent takeover by the English king. Gruffudd ab yr Ynad Coch in his "Lament" says "Mine now to rage against Saxons who've wronged me, Mine for this death bitterly to mourn, Mine, with good cause, to cry protest to God who has left me without him..." and calls Llywelyn "A lord all-triumphant... No Saxon dared touch him, a Lord of all Wales." Similarly, Bleddyn Fardd in his "Elegy" says that "Great Wales has lost her most manly princes... Man who was killed for us, who ruled over all, Man who ruled Wales..."

Even though the Welsh attempted to assert their political independence from England through marriages with the nobility and royalty of England, the marriages brought no permanent advantages to the Welsh. Some of these marital alliances temporarily allowed the Welsh to consolidate their power in Wales and to gain land in the march, but loyalties always shifted if either party found a more advantageous arrangement, destroying whatever benefits or security that may have come from the marriages. Other such marriages did not give the Welsh any advantages at all, such as in Powys, where the families were the pawns of the more powerful houses of Wales and England. In addition, the amount of force that England was using to penetrate into Welsh territory directly affected to the amount of marriages that were created between the two regions. This political fluctuation was reflected in the varying production of High Medieval Welsh literature because the poetry was inextricably linked to the success and failures of Welsh leaders. Therefore, as evidenced by these marital alliances and medieval Welsh literature, the political situation in Wales was at the mercy of the politics of England, a reality that even marital alliances could not change.

Marriage Charts

Chart 1 – Miscellaneous
Gruffudd ap Llywelyn

| Nest = Osbern Fitz Richard Fitz Scrop |
| Nest = Bernard Neufmarche |

Chart 2 – Deheubarth
Rhys ap Tewdwr

| Nest = Gerald of Windsor |

The Lord Rhys

| Gruffudd = Matilda de Braose |

Maelgwn Fychan = dau. of Gilbert Marshal
Chart 3 - Powys
Cadwgan ap Bleddyn = unnamed dau. of Picot de Sai
Gwenwynwyn ap Owain Cyfeilog of Southern Powys = Margaret Corbet

Gruffudd = Hawisa Lestrange
unnamed dau. = son of Fulk Fitz Warin

Gruffudd Maelor of Bromfield and Northern Powys = Emma Audley

Chart 4 - Gwynedd
Cadwaladr (brother of Owain Gwynedd) = unnamed Anglo-Norman lady

Dafydd ab Owain Gwynedd = Emma of Anjou (sister of King Henry II)

Llywelyn ab Iorwerth = Joan (dau. of King John)

Gruffudd (illegit.)

Dafydd = Isabella de Braose
Gwladys = Reginald de Braose

Llywelyn ap Gruffudd = Eleanor de Montfort
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Complementary Partners: The Marriages of Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Queens

Lauren Cengl

Several misconceptions of medieval marriage exist in the present day; it has been commonly assumed that the husband dominated the marriage and that the wife suffered under his oppression. However, a closer examination of the marriage relationship reveals much more than a cursory glance at medieval marriage suggests. The marriages of twelfth-century Anglo-Norman queens provide a prime example to demonstrate how the husband did not, in fact, suppress his wife, but rather allowed her the opportunity to take a complementary part in his rule that suited her strengths. A study of the lives of queens Matilda II of Scotland, Adeliza of Louvain, and Matilda III of Boulogne reveal much about what was expected from a queen in her marriage to the king in the early twelfth century, which could include various aspects of rule, from patronage to diplomacy. Twelfth-century sources reveal much about their authors’ attitudes towards these queens, and the modern reader can glean much information by applying literary and historical analysis to the texts. Literary and historical analysis of twelfth-century sources reveal that each of these queens was considered a “partner” in her marriage with her husband the king in that the duties she was expected to perform complemented the king’s duties, even though the manner in which the sources limit the queen’s role can be interpreted as somewhat misogynistic.

The first twelfth-century Anglo-Norman queen was Matilda (formerly Edith) of Scotland who married Henry I in 1100 (see genealogy chart). Contemporary chroniclers, such as William of Malmesbury, strongly stress Matilda’s heritage and connection to the line of English and Scottish kings. This suggests that Henry I married Matilda in order to legitimize his rule of England by connecting himself to the old Saxon monarchy through her. Also, Matilda was very active in her role as Henry I’s queen, indicating that the two acted as partners in their marriage as king and queen until Matilda’s death in 1118.1 Henry I’s second marriage to Adeliza of Louvain in 1121 came about from quite different circumstances, however; his only legitimate son and heir died in the sinking of the White Ship in 1120, and he needed another wife to produce a male heir to secure the succession of his line. As such, Henry kept Adeliza with him for most of their marriage, limiting the political roles that she could play, although she did utilize other means such as patronage to influence the realm of England during her time as queen.2 Stephen I, Henry I’s successor, married Matilda III of Boulogne in 1125 before he became king, so the primary consideration of his marriage was most likely to create an alliance with the family of Boulogne. Nevertheless, Stephen seemed quite eager to involve his wife in affairs in England once he became king, especially during the Anarchy when his cousin the Empress Matilda challenged his claim to the throne.3 The manner in which these queens became involved in their husbands’ rule was not insignificant, and there are several areas of involvement that display their influence best: interaction with public officials, education of their children, and intercession with the king.

From these, the area of a queen’s involvement in the governance of England most highly visible to the public eye was her interaction with other members of government and the church. The queen was in a position where public acts were highly visible to twelfth-century authors, who commented on her acts of patronage, regency, diplomacy, and the like. Patricia Dark writes that medieval society held the expectation that, in marriage, women would act as a helpmate for their husbands, and a politically astute queen could wield a great deal of influence in the governance of the country in acting to help her husband with his rule.4 John Carmi Parsons agrees with this statement, arguing that
expectations of the queen aiding her husband in the governance of his realm could even go so far as the queen ruling in the king's stead in his absence (that is, acting as regent). The actions of Matilda II of Scotland, Adeliza of Louvain, and Matilda III of Boulogne, as represented in contemporary texts, demonstrate the importance of the role of the queen in the political realm of England.

For instance, contemporary texts show Matilda II as quite active in her political role as the king's wife. Lois L. Huneycutt, who has done extensive work on Matilda, writes that "Almost from the day of her marriage, Matilda began to play a part in the public life of her new realm" by participating in councils, issuing charters, and sitting in judgment at court. One contemporary author who describes Matilda's work is William of Malmesbury, a twelfth-century cleric who recorded the deeds of the English kings in his Gesta Regum Anglorum. He mainly notes her piety, which he stresses as the main quality with which she helped the king in his rule. He writes, "She [Matilda] was a woman of exceptional holiness..., in piety her mother's rival, and in her own character exempt from all evil influence," showing his praise and approval of her pious influence on Henry I's rule.

The Life of St. Margaret also gives insight into what was expected of Matilda in terms of acting in the public sphere. Matilda commissioned the text from a twelfth-century clergyman to learn more about life of her mother St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland. The author also meant for the text to be a didactic tool for Matilda in her reign as queen, showing how Matilda should imitate the way her mother used her pious and compassionate qualities to temper the king's harsher tendencies of his public policies. For instance, the author writes that, Margaret, "with God helping her, made the king himself more obedient to justice, compassion, charity, and good works of merit." Thus, Huneycutt writes that "The author of the Life of St. Margaret explicitly approves of the queen's public role" by showing how she should use her devotional qualities to affect the king in his rule of the kingdom; this was her duty as the king's wife that complemented the king's role and would greatly benefit the kingdom by making policies more fair and just.

However, Adeliza of Louvain does not seem to have been as active as Matilda in the public sphere of the realm. Laura Wertheimer states in her article that Adeliza was the exception to the pattern of queens left as regent by Norman kings when the kings were absent from England. This was likely because Adeliza was rarely left in England by herself, since Henry I was more concerned with producing an heir with Adeliza than other queenly duties she could have performed, such as serving as regent. However, Adeliza was able to exercise her influence in the public realm of England through another means: patronage. Huneycutt writes that Anglo-Norman queens were also expected to be active in patronizing literary works at court. This would not necessarily directly influence the king's policies, but could at least allow the queen's subjects at court to glimpse her "personality, tastes, and abilities;" one such work that she commissioned was a now lost life of Henry I. Much other literature patronized by queens in this time emphasized piety and good works of its subjects, so one can reasonably argue that the life of Henry I emphasized his piety and goodness as a Christian king, even though the text is not extant today. This could favorably influence public opinion of Henry, which shows how patronage could be a way for queens to complement their husbands' rule by portraying them as good kings.

Matilda III of Boulogne, was much more active in the governance of England like Matilda II; and, like Matilda II, Matilda III is positively portrayed in acting as her husband's helpmate in the governance of their realm. During the Anarchy, Matilda III was quite active in the governance of England, becoming involved in many duties that aided Stephen in his reign. For instance, Heather J. Tanner writes that Matilda III was active as a diplomat attempting to rally support for Stephen from foreign barons in Boulogne, and even commanded Stephen's military forces. Matilda besieged Dover castle in 1138 while Stephen was occupied at Hereford, took control of Stephen's army and government with William of Ypres (Stephen's mercenary friend) when he was captured in 1141, and succeeded in driving the Empress Matilda out of London with an army several months after his capture. The author of the Gesta Stephani praises Matilda for her efforts in helping Stephen, writing that she was "a woman of subtlety and a man's resolution." Matilda was "resolutely supportive" of Stephen in her actions, showing how she was most definitely expected, as the wife of the king, in aiding her husband in the governance of his realm. The fact that Stephen relied on his wife, the queen, for many of his public affairs shows how he trusted her strengths that enabled her to be his complementary partner in rule.
Literary analysis of twelfth-century texts gives further insight into the mindset of contemporary authors commenting on these events, and how they viewed the queen’s role as her husband’s helpmate in public affairs. Neil Cartlidge writes that a prominent theme in literature from this time period was the harmony of two partners in marriage. This theme can clearly be seen in several twelfth-century texts, such as the Life of St. Margaret of Scotland.

Margaret is shown throughout the work aiding the king to promote the well-being of their subjects, complementing his duties as king. There is a certain tender moment displayed in this text that clearly displays the harmonious nature of her relationship with her husband: When Margaret would run out of her own money to give to the poor, she would commit “pious thievery” from the king to obtain more alms. And, “even though the king knew full well that she did this, he would pretend not to know.”

He greatly loved this sort of jest. Sometimes he would seize her hand full of coins and lead her to me [the author] for justice, joking that he wanted to accuse her in court. This interaction shows the apparent harmony between the couple, and that medieval queens reading this text would most likely perceive this theme of harmony, and would want to complement the king’s rule in a similar manner.

Another instance of the king and queen ruling in harmony can be seen in a Latin poem written for the court of Henry I. In the poem, the anonymous author gives Matilda II a voice in influencing the policies of her husband’s realm; Matilda persuades the king in bringing about a change in unjust legislation. Matilda says, “Lex injusticiae, rex bone, cesset!”, which, loosely translated, means “[The law of injustice, good king, cease!]”

Henry obeys Matilda’s command and corrects the unjust laws of which she did not approve. Even if this event did not occur exactly as the author described, it still shows how the author expected the queen to aid her husband in making his rule more fair and just, and that twelfth-century authors expected similar actions of their queens.

Another piece of literature that can give insight into the medieval mindset of how the queen was viewed as a helpmate to the king is the Historia Regum Britanniae by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Geoffrey wrote this text in the early twelfth century, and it was widely circulated throughout the English court where these queens would have been present. Paul Dalton writes that a major theme of this work was the theme of peace, which Geoffrey displays by warning the Anglo-Norman aristocracy of the dangers of civil war; one manner in which he does this is by showing how a just woman’s involvement in governmental affairs could help keep the peace in England. For instance, he writes of a wise king and his queen, Marcia, who rule “with kindness and moderation.” Part of the reason Geoffrey portrays this couple as great is because, “Among the many novelities devised by this intelligent woman [Marcia] was the law which the British called Marcian.” Also, when the king died when his son was only a child, “His able and intelligent mother therefore came to rule the whole island [of Britain].”

So, one can clearly see here that Geoffrey of Monmouth expected able queens to aid the king in his duties to the kingdom by creating just laws and acting as regent, taking part in the rule of their kingdom, all to keep the peace.

William of Malmesbury displays similar themes of marital harmony and peace. He shows how Matilda II aided Henry I in negotiations with his brother Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy. Robert had come to England to claim the land for his own, and Henry promised Robert three thousand marks in a negotiation for Robert to leave the country. However, Henry was able to gain this money back because, “the following year at the queen’s request [emphasis added] he [Robert] relinquished it of his own accord to give her [Matilda] pleasure.”

So, through Matilda’s aid, Henry was able to regain his lost money. Because William includes this detail of Matilda’s involvement, one must conclude that he expected her to act as the king’s partner to establish peace. So, through literary and historical analysis of these texts, one can see how early twelfth-century authors positively portrayed women acting as the king’s helpmate in the governance of England, complementing his duties with her strengths of bringing justice and peace.

Another aspect of the queen’s duties as the king’s wife was her role as a mother; as the mother of the king’s children, the queen was expected to partake in the rearing and education of her children, helping to prepare them for their lives as future rulers, and helping to secure their inheritance. Parsons writes that medieval authors greatly focused on the queen’s ability to bear the king’s children, and that authors showed that the queens’ “maternal instinct to protect their children and their children’s inheritance deserved sympathy and respect.” In addition, the queen was also expected to prepare her
daughters for marriages to other royals or powerful members of the aristocracy so that important familial alliances could be made. The attitudes of twelfth-century authors, shown by their texts, reveal that these maternal qualities were one of the greatest duties expected of Matilda II, Adeliza, and Matilda III.

The *Life of St. Margaret*, for instance, gives St. Margaret as an example for her daughter Matilda to follow; one can see that the author expected Matilda to take part in rearing her children to be good and just rulers. The text says, "She [Margaret] poured out care to her children not less than to herself, seeing that they were nurtured with diligence and that they were introduced to honest matters as much as possible." The author also writes that Margaret corrected the children when necessary, that their manners were exemplary, and that she taught them to fear the Lord as good Christians should. As a didactic text, one can clearly see that the author expected Matilda to act in a similar manner with her children, educating them and taking part in their upbringing as future rulers. Matilda most likely did have a significant role in preparing her daughter, also named Matilda, for her marriage to Holy Roman Emperor Henry V by teaching her skills she would need to rule as empress. The Empress Matilda displayed such skills by rallying forces to assert her claim to the English throne when Stephen usurped it from her in 1135. While the Empress Matilda proved unsuccessful in recapturing the crown from Stephen, her actions were most likely affected by the influence of her mother's education.

Also, William of Malmesbury's focus on Matilda II's lineage shows that her maternal genealogy was very important in establishing a legitimate rule for both her husband and her children, especially her son William as the future ruler of England (see genealogy chart). He writes, "The king's wife Matilda, a daughter of the King of the Scots...was descended from an ancient and illustrious line of kings." He continues to write about her children: "The bearing of two children [by Matilda], one of either sex, left her content." These passages show the importance of Matilda's lineage passed on to her children, as well as the importance of her role as the bearer of the king's children.

Adeliza of Louvain most likely would have been portrayed in a similar manner, if she had borne any of Henry I's children. She was never actually able to conceive when she was married to the king, which is perhaps why she was somewhat neglected in twelfth-century texts and why she was limited in her participation of her husband's government, as Wertheimer argues. Wertheimer also writes that when chroniclers did mention Adeliza of Louvain, such as with Hildebert of Lavardin in his letters and with John of Worcester, they "sadly" remarked on her childlessness. This lack of attention for Adeliza, except to focus on her childlessness, and her limitation of participation in government shows the great importance of the queen's principal duty as the bearer of the king's children, and that this could serve as a barrier for a queen to be more active as the king's helpmate in governance of their realm.

However, Matilda III presents great contrast to Adeliza in her actions on behalf of her children. Her involvement in the war against Empress Matilda was most likely motivated by more than just partnership with her husband - she would have wanted to ensure that Stephen's reign was secure to promote the succession of Eustace after him. This can be seen in her later years as queen near the end of Stephen's reign; Tanner writes that, in charters from King Stephen's rule, Matilda makes less and less frequent appearances from 1147 onwards. She says that this "diminished public presence...reflects the need to groom Eustace, now of age, to succeed the king," which was expected of her as the mother of the heir to the kingdom. Tanner also notes that Matilda's last public appearance, in 1152, was at a church council where she and Stephen attempted (unsuccessfully) to have the bishops of England crown Eustace as the next king. Although there are no direct references in extant twelfth-century texts of Matilda interacting with Eustace, it is clear from these charters that a primary duty of the king's wife was to prepare their heir to succeed as king, which would complement the training the heir also received from his father.

Examining twelfth-century texts from a literary perspective also shows that queens' maternal duties as the king's wife complemented his duties as the primary governor of the realm; the theme of the wife as a mother in the literature demonstrates that the authors were very approving of the queen's role in her children's lives. For instance, Geoffrey of Monmouth portrays a strong queen that secures the succession of her son. The queen, Guendoloena, first holds her son's place to rule by acting as his regent when he is a young boy, and "when she saw that her son Maddan was grown up, she had him crowned king." Geoffrey shows his readers here that he believes part of the queen's duty was to care
for the king's children by securing their succession when they came of age to rule, which even meant that she could act as regent to hold their place in the line of succession. This scene recalls the manner in which Matilda III of Boulogne worked ardent to secure the succession of her son, Eustace, in order to preserve the order and peace of the realm of England.

The Life of St. Margaret also shows the theme of the queen as a mother by depicting the queen mother educating her children. The author of the text writes, "Margaret had her children brought to her very often, and she taught them about Christ and faith in Christ, using words suitable to their age and understanding." This emphasizes Margaret's role in her children's lives as their educator, especially as educator of Christian principals. Childhood is rarely described in the literature from the twelfth century, so the fact that one of the rare times childhood is mentioned, like in the Life, coincides with emphasizing the queen's motherly duties shows that the queen's role in her children's lives was considered quite important.

Also, M. T. Clanchy argues that there is enough mention of children in medieval literature to show that pious mothers of the nobility too on a role of educating their children in the ways of devotion to God, further demonstrating the importance of the role of the mother with her children in medieval literature.

However, some might argue that the theme of women as mothers (and mothers educating children about only piety) is misogynistic because of the way that the queen's role is limited to motherly tasks, too weak to take on other tasks such as ruling a kingdom. Laurie A. Finke writes that "misogynistic commonplaces were pervasive in the writing of the period [the Middle Ages], occurring in virtually all male writers and in a wide variety of texts." She also writes that medieval authors portrayed women as "imperfection" and inferior to men, showing how the authors of the texts viewed the woman's role as limited to certain spheres like motherhood because they were not capable of exercising duties elsewhere. While it is true that women are somewhat limited in their portrayal as mothers, twelfth-century authors portray women as mothers in a positive light, showing that she was acting to her strengths by educating her children in the ways of piety to be good and just rulers. Thus, twelfth-century authors saw the queen's motherly role in aiding and educating her children as complementary to the rule of the king, showing how the two were considered partners in marriage.

Another aspect of the queen's role as the king's wife was that of his intimate; Parsons writes that "Queens were the closest of all women to the center of magisterial authority [the king]," and this closeness left them highly exposed for commentary from twelfth-century observers for the manner in which the queen could use her intimacy to sway the king through intercession. Tanner writes that "Queenly intercession was seen as a feminine act - Christ as law, Mary as mercy; woman as peacemaker; wives as forces of moral persuasion in the home," demonstrating how the queen's role of intercessor was meant to complement the king's duties of lawmaker.

Thus, the queen could influence the king to make his laws more merciful and just. Also, texts from this period show that the authors generally approved of the queen interfering in the king's affairs "through the affectionate bonds of marriage," and even expected the queen to intercede with the king to "temper the king's laws with mercy."

For instance, authors commenting on the activities of Matilda II of Scotland greatly focus on her role as intercessor with Henry I. From the Life of St. Margaret, we know that the author expected Matilda to intercede with the king because he depicts Margaret as doing so with her husband, the king of Scotland. An example used previously to show how the queen was expected to be the helpmate of the king also shows how she was expected to intercede with him; the author of the text writes, "she [Margaret], with God helping her, made the king himself more obedient to justice, compassion, charity, and good works of merit" and the king "learned from her." Huneycutt writes that through this text, the author makes it clear that: "Matilda, like her mother [Margaret], was perceived as a peacemaker and as influencing the course of the kingdom" because of the way that Margaret also brought peace to her through her influence with the king.

A major event in which Matilda interceded with Henry to bring peace to the kingdom was the investiture controversy in England; Henry and Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury became involved in a dispute over jurisdiction of appointing church officials, and the rivalry between the men was quite strong. So, Anselm, as a friend of Queen Matilda, asked her to speak to the king on his behalf in order to sway him to concede to the church and give up
his right of appointing bishops.\textsuperscript{43} Honeycutt writes that Matilda's correspondence with Anselm and Pope Paschal is quite revealing, because their letters "continually urged her [Matilda] to use her influence in the right direction," and that one of Paschal's letters "asks Matilda 'to turn the heart of the king away from the bad advice' of his 'evil counselors.'"\textsuperscript{49} Matilda, in fact, was able to soften the heart of Henry and made him more willing to reconcile with Anselm. Nonetheless, these instances show how Matilda II, as the wife and queen of Henry I, was expected to intercede with the king, especially on behalf of the church.

Adeliza of Louvain, however, was not quite as involved in intercession as Matilda II; as mentioned previously, her acts as queen were mainly limited to patronage of the church and of literature. In fact, Wertheimer states that "There is no record of Adeliza interceding with the king as Matilda did.\textsuperscript{50} However, there is record of Adeliza traveling constantly with Henry I up until 1131 because of his need to conceive an heir; so, Adeliza was most likely sexually intimate with the king on many occasions.\textsuperscript{51} Even though the couple may have devoted much time to attempting to conceive an heir, any efforts of Adeliza taking advantage of this intimacy through intercession are not apparent. However, since the Life of St. Margaret was most likely meant to be a teaching tool for Matilda II's successors as well as Matilda herself, medieval authors would have probably approved of intercessory acts made by Adeliza.

This approval of intercession can also be seen in the actions of Matilda III of Boulogne; however, her intercessory acts are not done with Stephen, but on behalf of him with his magnates in order to help create peace in the realm of England. During Stephen's reign, Matilda often interceded with rebellious barons in England and foreign barons in France to gain support for Stephen in his war against the Empress Matilda.\textsuperscript{52} For instance, Tanner writes that Matilda "acted on Stephen's behalf to restore peace with Count Thierry of Clandern," and that while no extant chronicle describes the peace process, grants made by Matilda, Stephen, and William of Ypres shows how she had a hand in scaling the peace agreement. William of Malmesbury also writes in his Historia Novella that Matilda was highly involved in the negotiations for Stephen's release; he includes that she headed the negotiations with Henry of Blois to free Stephen after his capture in 1141, using "her tears and offers" to persuade Henry to release his brother.\textsuperscript{53} So, as the woman closest to the king and one who was supposed to have the skills of a peacemaker, Matilda is shown as exercising her strength of intercession to her and Stephen's advantage. This shows how queens were expected to intercede in political affairs to bring peace, emphasizing the quality of peacemaker that medieval authors saw as a woman's strength that complemented the role of the king.

Literature from the time also shows that the way the queen was able to bring peace to the realm of England through her role as intercessor; this is shown by a theme of the bringing together of two cultures. Susan Crane and Andrew Galloway both comment on this issue in the Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature, writing that the aristocracy of the Anglo-Norman monarchy attempted to "make one people of diverse ethnicities and empires," and that Anglo-Norman authors "sought tactful mediations between Norman and English points of view."\textsuperscript{54} By depicting queens in roles as intercessors and peacemakers, utilizing their intimate connection with the king, twelfth-century authors had a means of showing their readers a viable means for the resolution of conflict between two groups. This theme can most clearly be seen in the Life of St. Margaret, because of the way that the author shows the intimacy of the king and queen, and because of the way that she is seen as a positive influence on the king because of this intimacy (see quote on page thirteen).\textsuperscript{55} This shows how Margaret was able to influence the king through intercession in his policies towards the kingdom; the author presents the two as a pair here, working together to rule justly, displaying to Matilda II how she could rule justly with Henry I to bring together the Norman and English cultures.

William of Malmesbury, in his Gesta Regum Anglorum, shows queen Matilda in an intercessory role that reconciles two disagreeing parties. One way in which William does this is by emphasizing Matilda II's lineage, writing that "she was in fact, of exalted rank as a great-grand-niece of King Edward [the Confessor] through his brother Edmund," and was "descended from an ancient and illustrious line of kings."\textsuperscript{56} This emphasizes her connection to the line of previous English kings, which would give her an advantage in interceding and negotiating in disputes because of her international connections. Another instance in which Matilda is shown as a peacemaker is when she intercedes with Henry's brother, Robert (as mentioned above), in order to
gain back losses of her husband. William writes that "at the queen's request, he [Robert] relinquished it [the three thousand marks] of his own accord to give her [Matilda] pleasure." This further emphasizes the theme of the queen as the peacemaker in William's text, showing how William desired unity and peace in the realm of England, and that the queen could help accomplish this desire by complementing the role of her husband the king in this manner.

However, because of the manner in which twelfth-century authors show the queen as acting through primarily pious and compassionate methods, one might conclude that these authors held misogynistic attitudes about the role of women in society. This is not unreasonable, because, as Finke argues, medieval male authors viewed a wife's sexual interactions with her husband as grounds for unrest in the social, political, and economic aspects of society. However, it seems more likely that authors highlight these aspects of the queen's duties as the king's wife as ones that complement his reign and allow the two to act as partners, each to their own strengths. The authors just happen to perceive the queen's strengths as ones that involved intercession, patronage, and diplomacy, as opposed to the harsher war-making and justice-dispensing duties of the king. So, through historical and literary analysis, one is able to determine that the queen was considered a partner in her marriage to the king through her intimacy with him, allowing her to act as intercessor with and on behalf of him, complementing his duties of soldiering and of dispensing justice.

Through the study of these queens, one is able to see that in the Middle Ages, marriage did not automatically condemn wives to be subordinate or submissive to her husband. On the contrary, she was able to exert her own influence over him, utilizing her strengths, as twelfth-century authors show, to act as her husband's partner in marital endeavors, like ruling as king and queen. The acts of the queens themselves and the approval of these acts by twelfth-century authors show that queens were, in fact, encouraged to aid their husbands in rule because the kingdom could greatly benefit from such acts. Thus, the queen was considered the partner of the king in their marriage, with each spouse acting in his or her own strengths in rule.

Genealogy of Anglo-Norman Queens

- **William I** married **Matilda of Flanders**
  - Died 1087
  - Married 1066-1083

- **Robert Curthose** married **Adela**
  - Died 1087
  - Married 1083-1150

- **Stephen** married **William II**
  - Died 1154-1152

- **Eufrosine of Louvain** married **Henry II**
  - Died 1135
  - Married 1121-1135

- **Adeliza of Louvain** married **Matilda II of Scotland**
  - Died 1160
  - Married 1130-1135

- **Malcolm III** married **Margaret Atheling**
  - Died 1138
  - Married 1093-1113

- **Edmund II** married **Alitha**
  - Died 1101
  - Married 1096-1101

- **Edward the Outlaw** married **Agatha**
  - Died 1110
  - Married 1096-1110

- **William** married **Geoffrey**
  - Died 1129
  - Married 1100-1110

- **Eleanor** married **Holy Roman Emperor**
  - Died 1208
  - Married 1154-1180

- **Henry II** married **Eleanor of Aquitaine**
  - Died 1189
  - Married 1154-1189

---

Legend:
- Bolded names are kings of England.
- Italicized names are Anglo-Norman queens.
- "M."
  - signifies marriage
  - "r."
  - ruled
  - "d."
  - died

Source: Chart compiled by author.
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